EN

NETmundial – Working Session 4: Roadmap Part II
Thursday, April 24, 2014 – 11:00 to 13:00
NETmundial – São Paulo, Brazil

>>   Ladies and gentlemen, if you would be kind enough, we'd like to get started with our next session, so if you can kindly take your seats, we would greatly appreciate it.

Once again, we'll be getting started very shortly, and if you can find your seats, it would be wonderful. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. May I ask you to take your seats? The second session on the roadmap will start in 30 seconds.

Once again, good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Janis Karklins. I am ambassador of Latvia, and I have the privilege to chair -- or co-chair this session, together with Dongman Lee.

We will start with a very brief report, what happened yesterday.

For those who were not present yesterday after the consultations on the first two sections of the roadmap, the editing group met and reviewed comments which were presented during the meeting, as well as those comments who were sent to the Web site -- or to the email address which was published on the Web site in relation to the published document.

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.

We did some changes, and at this moment I am asking those who were with the drafting group around 11:45 in the evening, are there -- and you saw the text, you saw changes.

Is there any sort of burning thing that you would like to say?

I can allocate maybe five minutes for that conversation, in case there is something burning to say. And if there is, I would like to ask you to say it now. Is there?

I see that there is. Theresa Swinehart, please.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you. Thank you very much, Chair.

Just -- I'm Theresa Swinehart. I'm senior advisor to the president at ICANN.

Just a quick observation to make. There's been some discussions around language in what's referred to as Paragraph 26, and the language regards the separation of policy and operations.

There's some concern that this language comes across as unnecessarily prescriptive and that it may be looking towards preempting a process.

The issue of the separation of policy and operations is really a topic around accountability. As many may be aware, ICANN has launched and begun discussions on multistakeholder processes to address two aspects of the announcement of the USG that occurred in March.

The first is the process around the NTIA transition of the IANA stewardship function. There's been dialogues on that, and a process being proposed.

The other is actually around ICANN accountability and strengthening mechanisms and how to address those, and discussions began in Singapore, and a proposed process will be launched for the community dialogue by the end of this month.

As an example of being inclusive in many of the dialogues that are occurring, we're also running a panel session this afternoon to ensure there's awareness and discussions around the processes that are being run in these two contexts.

So again, there's some concern that the wording in the paragraph is prescriptive and that it is preempting a process that's underway, and we just wanted to raise this as an area of concern and observation. So thank you very much.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you for that observation.

Any other burning issues in relation to the first two parts?

I see none.

So now we are moving, then, to the -- as we agreed yesterday, we're moving now to the Part 3, issues dealing with specific Internet governance topics; Part 4, points to be further discussed beyond NETmundial; and Part 5, way forward.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

And I would like to now ask Dongman to maybe very briefly give some statistics about comments which were submitted to this topic.

DONGMAN LEE: Hello. Okay. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'm very honored and privileged to be here. I'd like to give you short statuses on how many public comments were made on Section 3 and 4 and 5.

As you know, the Section 3 I think is one of the most challenging sections. It received many public comments. 91 public comments were received on Section 3.

And the Section 4, 34 comments were received.

And Section 5 is 26 comments.

So the -- I believe the -- Janis and I will allocate enough time for you, but as we saw in the last session, maybe at the last meeting too many people lined up. We may need to reduce the amount of time for your comments, so maybe one minute or 30 seconds, but -- one, yeah. One -- 1:30, yeah. Okay. So let's -- because the chairship has the full right how to order the speaking, so I'll start with the civil society and go to government and academia/technical and business sector and remote participation, so please.

>> Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Antonio Martinez from Article 19 Mexico and I'm reading a joint statement from civil society organizations that met here in Sao Paulo.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

We suggest to insert the following in Paragraph 35: "Mass surveillance is fundamental human rights violation. Targeted interception and collection of personal data should be conducted in accordance with international human rights law. Critical and intermediate infrastructure must not be tampered with, in service of targeted interception."

We suggest to add the following at the end of the Paragraph 35: "Using the necessary and proportionate principles."

Thank you.

DONGMAN LEE: Okay. Thank you. The secretariat, please to change to the minutes to 1:30, so please keep that in mind. So we're going to stop you at the 30 minutes left, okay? Thank you.

Please go ahead.

>> Thank you. I speak on behalf of the Government of India. We believe that any roadmap for the future of Internet governance would be credible and acceptable only if it is also representative, democratic, transparent, and accountable involving governments and other stakeholders as per Tunis Agenda. We seek inclusion of this idea in Paragraph 2.

The structures that regulate and manage Internet should be broad-based and internationalized and anchored in an appropriate

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

international legal framework. We seek inclusion of this idea in Paragraph 28 and other relevant places.

We seek involvement of all legitimate stakeholders in the deliberations as part of the decision-making process. The principles of democratic representation can alone offer representative credentials to participants who seek to represent various sections and interests.

Just as we in governments are responsible and accountable to our people, stakeholders also need to be accountable to an oversight mechanism that is rooted in appropriate international legal authority. This proposal may be included in Paragraph 28.

We also believe the Tunis Agenda has not been fully implemented. This highlights the urgent need for identification of gaps in its implementation at the upcoming WSIS+10 review in 2015 and by establishing new mechanisms, as well as strengthening the existing ones, if any.

We seek a reference to this idea in the outcome of the meeting in the way forward segment.

Again, we want to reiterate this. Given the diversity of the views and attendant challenges in encapsulating all views in one document, we, once again, wish to reiterate that the chair's summary of the meeting is the most appropriate form of outcome of this meeting.

We have made some point in other working groups. We would like this to be reflected now. Thank you.

[Applause]

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

DONGMAN LEE: Okay. Next, academia.

>>   My name is (saying name) from Thought Works. I'm a developer of free
                            software and a privacy, anonymity, and cryptography researcher.

                            I have several different issues that I would like to bring up and
                            emphasize. They are larger issues that are mostly not directly discussed
                            in the outcome document but should be.

                            Specifically, Paragraph 35 as -- is not sufficient, either in its current form
                            or as drafted.

                            First, I think we have to condemn all kinds of surveillance and we have
                            to condemn weaponization of the Internet.

                            This is currently being done for both active and passive purposes. It is
                            extremely dangerous and will destroy the fantastic potential of the
                            Internet.

                            Because of its importance, it is crucial for the discussion about Internet
                            governance.

                            Every user of the Internet has to have absolute rights to privacy,
                            anonymity, and cryptography. This is necessary to keep safe on the
                            Internet and there can be no restriction to these rights.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

For safeguarding the Internet, we need to make sure that our core infrastructure runs only on free and open software and hardware and that everything we depend on is open standards.

We need the running of the Internet to be completely transparent and open, and we need net neutrality to be an internationally agreed principle.

We need end-to-end forward secrecy for all protocols traveling on the Internet and we also must encourage decentralization in practice, not just in theory.

We need to minimize the amount of data that is retained. The only way to safeguarding citizens is by minimizing the amount of information that is available. The information will, without a doubt, be stolen or misused sooner or later. Thus, minimizing it is the only way to actually protect citizens.

Finally, we need legislation and agreements about data custodianship and information self-assurance. Thank you.

[Applause]

DONGMAN LEE: Okay. Let's move to business.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

>>   Thank you. My name is Jimson Olufuye, the chair of the public-sector led Africa ICT Alliance based in Abuja, Nigeria, also a member of ICC/BASIS and a member of the business constituency of ICANN.

Speaking to Paragraph 34, I would like to propose this brief addition: "In this context, nations and regions are encouraged to institute cybersecurity legal and institutional frameworks within their jurisdiction."

Well, the idea is that we're talking about international level and we need to really localize the discussion on cybersecurity, also at a national and regional level. That's a gap I propose that should be taken care of with our text. Thank you.

DONGMAN LEE: Is there any comments from remote?

>>   So we have a text comment coming from civil society in Canada.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Telecommunities, Canada. Paragraph 2, the phrase "a distributed and coordinated ecosystem" is a symptom of a shift in social attitudes. The claim of nation states to special status is grounded in the imperatives of geography. That leads to the conventional classification of participation in Internet governance in terms of national, regional, and global interests.

But the Internet has altered humanity's relationship to and understanding of geography.

In keeping with term -- Tim Berners-Lee's reference to the emergence of nonnational societies and consistent with the concepts and operating principles of open and distributed systems, the time has come to redefine a global -- the global as a federation of locals. Thank you.

>>   We also have a video interaction coming from Jakarta. Jakarta? So we'll have to skip that. Sorry.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Test, test. Hello? My name is (saying name). I come from ID config (indiscernible) for Internet governance, a network from 20 civil society organizations in Indonesia.

We would like to make an input for Paragraph 32.

We suggest that the article should include that transparent, accountable principles are in place, especially when a country is having discussion and making policy before going to international level.

The principles also have to be monitored and reviewed frequently among multistakeholders.

The rationale is because the multistakeholder manner does not necessarily guarantee it is transparent and accountable. We have experiences in Indonesia when the quality of discussion is very poor and

the suggestion from the stakeholders is not being taken seriously. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS: So thank you. Thank you very much, Indonesia, for your comments.

I would like to ask, once again, secretariat, for sake of clarity, change 2 minutes for 1.30. 1 minute, 30 seconds, if I may ask you. Because we agreed to -- to have 1 minute 30 seconds interventions.

Next speaker on my list is representative from civil society. Please, sir.

>>   Thank you, Chair. My name is Ian Peter and I'm from civil society.

I'm concerned that having lost the battle to remove all references to mass surveillance in Section 35, some parties are now doing their best to make sure that any language that is included is so wishy-washy and ambiguous as to lose all meaning.

And if all we do is refer to the U.N. resolution, I believe that's all we have got is wishy-washy and ambiguous, nonmeaningful language.

Mass surveillance is an insult to human dignity. It's an invasion of privacy.

If we do need to do stuff, I do have a suggested wording here that we might be able to include.

If it's absolutely impossible to refer to the widely accepted, necessary, and proportionate principles, could I suggest that we might, in the section that begins "Surveillance of Communications," say that they should be conducted in a necessary and proportionate manner? And if that was included, that may be a compromise that may be acceptable, but we do have to have strong language here because it is a strong issue. Wishy-washy language is not appropriate.

One second point I would like to make, it's just on when we get to the section on way forward, and it's more a point of process than anything else.

I just have a suggestion that issues that we cannot resolve here -- and one of those obviously would appear to be net neutrality. We don't appear to be able to get language. Issues we cannot resolve could be included as issues under way forward to be discussed later. Thank you.

[Timer sounds]

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS: So thank you very much for your proposals and specifically that you're mentioning the paragraph where your proposals should be looked at.

Next is a representative from the government. Please, sir.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

>>   Thank you, Chair. Sweden would like to add to -- Sweden would like to add to colleagues that have given their praise to this conference and all those many people that have contributed to it. All praise is well deserved.

We agree with the interventions that are expressing their satisfaction with the draft text as it stands. Things could be better in the details, but we're generally very positive towards this text.

We don't support relegating this important document to a merely chairman's summary.

I would like to suggest two changes to this section.

First on Paragraph 32 in the roadmap, the text reads, "It is necessary to continue work pursuing international agreements on topics such as jurisdictions." This could imply creating new international treaties in this area, something for which there is no widespread support for in either multilateral or multistakeholder context.

We, therefore, propose to exchange the word "agreements" for the word "cooperation."

On Paragraph 41, there is reference to the need for a principle-based code of conduct. The wording "code of conduct" is controversial and has special connotations in international relations.

There, it can imply the creation of instruments that could be used by governments to control content. Therefore, we propose to replace it with "principles," so the sentence would read, "Principles and related indicators for the Internet governance ecosystem."

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

These were our points. Thank you for your attention.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much. Next, technical community.

>>   Thank you very much. My name is Nii Quaynor. I'm a professor of computer science at the University of Cape Coast in Ghana.

I refer to the initial comments made by Ms. Theresa Swinehart and I share my concern regarding the repeated calls for structural separation with respect to the transfer of the NTIA stewardship of the IANA functions.

The issue is being actively debated in multiple fora at the present time, and it will be premature at this time, and especially at this meeting, which is supposed to concern itself with high-level principles and an overall look at how we proceed.

To put such a specific recommendation in any fora in an output document from this meeting would be considered premature. Let's stay with the process of finding areas in which we can agree, with the understanding that there are issues that this meeting will not be able to resolve and that will surely be taken up in other venues that are more appropriate. Thank you very much.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you. Now I refer to private sector.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

>>   Hi. My name is Roy (saying name). I'm the chairman and founder of
                       Thought Works, a global I.T. consultancy with 3,000 people working in
                       31 countries.

                       Four quick points.

                       I think it's a myth that all businesses are against net neutrality. Speaking
                       on millions of small businesses around the world, net neutrality is
                       actually vital to commerce and the creation of employment around the
                       world, so I strongly believe that net neutrality should be mandated.

                       Number two, we also believe that there ought to be something in
                       Internet governance around the banning of software patents, which
                       actually massively stifles innovation, and we are in favor of very short-
                       term copyrights. We think there should be a lot of collaboration of
                       countries to guarantee the reduction of copyright terms to five years or
                       less.

                       Third, as a shareholder and an executive, I also believe in
                       multistakeholderism, which means I have to be responsible to my
                       clients and to my employees globally and to society.

                       Therefore, it seems to me that the private sector ought to be first to
                       condemn the idea that corporations are on equal footing with citizens.
                       It's ludicrous. Citizens are what makes the world. They're the human
                       beings. Corporations should not be, in any form, on equal footing with
                       citizens.

                       Fourth, the question of the role of surveillance on corporations is very
                       bad. We have mandated surveillance now going into corporations. This

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

is bad for business because when you have a flaw that the NSA can look at a client's records, I no longer can guarantee the financial integrity of transactions with our clients, so we need protection as businesses from this intervention. Thank you.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS: So thank you very much for your comments and proposals.

Now I'm turning to remote participation.

>>   Okay. Now we have a comment from civil society in Ecuador, and followed by a video interaction from Tunisia.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Ecuador have civil society on the surveillance on the Internet mass and (indiscernible) surveilling breaks the trust on the Internet and needs a government ecosystem and represents an unacceptable violation to human rights.

The surveillance of communications, interception and collection of personal data, have to be conducted only when this is agree -- in agreement with the obligations of the states and international regulations of human rights. A multilevel is required on this topic at international level through fora such as the IGF, the Human Rights Council, and the WSIS+10 aimed at trying to develop a common

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

understanding on all the aspects related to this, with a view to establishing an international pact to restrict mass surveillance by governments, corporations, or other partners.

>>   Now we have a video interaction coming from our remote hub in Tunisia.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Hello, everyone. I am the VP here in Tunisia and I have some comments to relay on the matters of Internet governance.

We believe that the Internet ecosystem and its governance should be a part of the vision we have regarding the future of the Internet and we should develop a good governance of the Internet at the international level in every country and to have a consistent implementation of the governance all over the world at the regional, global, and national level.

We should implement these national processes of the governance of the Internet and the institutional approach to Internet governance should, of course, be based on the transparent participation of all stakeholders, with tangible effects at the level of Internet governance and as regards working methods as well.

We finally consider that the consulting stages, after the IGF, with the U.N. general Secretary should guarantee diversity of opinions and it will be adequate to evolve these opinions as we did in 2004 by following a real model of Internet governance.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

We are very glad to have been able to participate at this international meeting and I would like to seize the occasion to congratulate all on this work. Thank you.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you, Tunisia.

Okay. Let's get back to on-site. Please speak out of the civil line, gentlemen. Thank you.

>>   Hello. My name is Jacob Applebaum and I'm here for civil society but that -- I speak for myself as a developer of free software.

I think it is important that the document should recognize the historical context, specifically the bravery and courage of the whistle-blower Edward Snowden who is not mentioned one time in this document. Without him, we would not be able to have this discussion.

It is important specifically to put this in the security and stability section, in that it is important that we understand how it is that we arrived here and what it is that we are planning to do.

So it is important to have an historical context.

And specifically, it's important to create a new historical context moving forward.

So when we talk about law enforcement assistance and promotion of cyber-security and prevention of cybercrime, I think we should also say

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

that we have the intentional goal of cyber-peace building and that we specifically talk about the need to uphold human rights, not merely to prevent cybercrime.

Furthermore, we must encourage transparency and accountability and whistle-blowing. There should be a whistle-blowing mechanism where people can anonymously leak documents about the process when it is not working, including in the security process.

We must get rid of security through obscurity and we must ensure our right to anonymity and strong cryptography and we must condemn mass surveillance as it chills free speech and association with regard to the process.

And it is absolutely critical that there's free software for all of the interactions that are required in this process. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you very much for your comment. We'll try our best to incorporate your comments as much as possible in our revising session.

Let's move to government.

>>   Yes, good afternoon -- good morning still. This is Canada. First and foremost, we would like to reiterate our gratitude to CGI, to 1net, and to the government of Brazil for organizing this very open, transparent

and inclusive multistakeholder event.   We're looking forward to an outcome document which is non-binding that reflects the views of all participants.   And we recognize and commend you for your efforts in putting this together.

We have, however, some very brief observations concerning the roadmap, first of which on the security and stability. We believe on 32A that the reference to international agreements may not be required, and we would strongly advocate a reference to strengthening existing stakeholder cooperation and collaboration agreements.

In the same token on 34C, we believe that the reference cybersecurity organizations should be better reflected by reflecting cyber security mechanisms and initiatives.

On 35 in surveillance, we strongly believe that the work undertaken by the third committee of the United Nations General Assembly, in particular the operative paragraph 4C, should be taken into consideration.

On codes of conduct, we believe that there are existing principles in international law, including international human rights law, that properly reflect those principles and a code of conduct could call into question those principles.

Finally, in regards to the IANA functions, we believe that there is a process in place that should not be (indiscernible) --

[Timer sounds.]

-- by the document. Thank you.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you. Let's move to academia and technical community.

>>   My name is Lisa Fuhr. I'm from the Danish registry, Danish Internet Forum. Two principles of the outcome document are diversity and inclusiveness. And I urge that these principles are also carried out when choosing the people to ensure the way forward. By this I mean the people chosen through draft documents to participate in panel debates.

Not to offend anyone but when I'm looking at the people chosen to prepare this meeting, a lot of them are well-known participants in ICANN and IGFs. And I think we need to broaden this participation in order to ensure a true multistakeholder model and a successful outcome of Internet governance.

We need to carry out active outreach and to actively encourage a prouder part of the global Internet society to participate.

So we need a different approach, and I don't see any of this reflected in the outcome document. Thank you.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you very much. Let's move to private sector.

>>   Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm Robert Pepper from Cisco representing ICC/BASIS, the business community. First, we would like to support the

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

suggestion -- the word edit suggestion from Sweden in paragraph 32 because we believe that the way to approach security issues is broader than just traditional agreements and treaties, but it should also be towards cooperation. We'd also suggest perhaps changing the word "pursuing" to "furthering international cooperation on topics such as." But that does not preclude agreements, but it is broader.

Second, following up on the intervention I had earlier about not having a consensus on net neutrality, we're proposing the following in Section 4, the issues beyond NETmundial. The specific language which I have also given to the previous panel that are upstairs, quote, "there were very productive discussions on the initial of net neutrality at NETmundial without consensus to include the specific term as a principle in the outcomes. The principles do include concept of an open Internet in paragraph 12 and individual rights to freedom of expression and information. It is important that we continue the discussion of the open Internet, including how to enable freedom of expression, competition, consumer choice, meaningful transparency and appropriate network management, and recommend that this be addressed at forums such as the next IGF." Thank you. And we can make this available.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you very much. Let's hear our remote participants' comment.

>>   Okay. We have a comment from private sector in Brazil followed by a video interaction from the remote hub also in Brazil, Sao Paulo.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

REMOTE INTERVENTION: The comment suggests that in paragraph related to security and stability that there should be more discussion about the way we treat different kinds of cybercrime. When intellectual property needs further analysis, cases of digital fraud are very clear and easy to identify and could be way more efficient if we had standard procedures of notification and removal between instant response teams and Internet service providers. Thank you.

>> Now we have a video from remote hub in Sao Paulo, Brazil.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We have now a video from Sao Paulo in Brazil. Sao Paulo.

The cost of hub live stream, we're here. Our contribution to NETmundial, this is Gabriel.

>> I'm Gabriel, student, I.T. student in (indiscernible) Sao Paulo. I'm going to present proposals for Hub Brazil now to preserve neutrality and security of network with a multistakeholder (indiscernible) of cyber bullying and virtual attack and adding an Article 33 to careful treatment of Internet businesses for digital assurance with cooperation that is adequate between different sectors, specialists, government, NGOs, et cetera, multistakeholders to get together and discuss more and more with civil society, especially organizations which are more sensitive as to

infrastructure and tariff matters. Article 31, safety, stability accessibility, including in Section 3 which is necessary to include a unique and global standard to be followed by all manufacturers that have access to user data.

[Timer sounds.]

So these terms will become relevant and users will feel more sure and safer as to the use of the applications. Thank you very much.

JANIS KARKLINS: So thank you very much, Sao Paulo, for this intervention and for your proposals.

Next on the list of speakers is representative from civil society. Please.

>>   Hello. Can you hear me? Okay. Hi, my name is Robin Gross. I'm with IP Justice. I've got six very small points that I would like to make. Well, they are not small but I just would like small wording changes.

So the first is in paragraph 6. I suggest we remove the clause "recognizing the different roles played by different stakeholders." I think the rationale for this is I think this is an outdated language that elevates governments over other stakeholders.

The second point is on paragraph 10. It talks about meaningful participation, and it says there should be meaningful participation by all

interested parties in Internet governance decisions and decision-making -- discussions in decision-making.

I propose that we add the words, quote, "bottom-up decision-making" to that paragraph in accordance with democratic principles.

In paragraph 14, it talks about all of the organizations with responsibilities in the Internet governance ecosystem should develop and implement principles for transparency, accountability, and inclusiveness. And I would like to add to that section there that these organizations also have an obligation to respect human rights protections in their own policies, such as privacy, free speech, and due process. And I guess this would apply to ICANN.

In paragraph 7 -- excuse me, paragraph 27. I would like to see the language put back in that calls for separating the policy process and the operational aspects.

[Timer sounds.]

On paragraph 28, I would like to see the word "external" in front of "accountability."

On paragraph 35, support for the necessary and proportionate principles. Thank you.

[Applause]

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much.   Just a reminder for ourselves, we are concentrating today's debate on Sections 3, 4 and 5.

Next speaker is from government. Please.

>>   Christopher Painter from the United States. First, I want to, as many others have said, commend both NETmundial, the committee, and the government of Brazil of putting together a truly unique structure with all the multistakeholders here and, really, I think a very powerful document which we don't think needs major changes.

Specifically, though, I had a couple of comments. One, welcome the endorsement of the IGF. We think that's very important. I know that's not in paragraphs 3 and 4, but we thought that was important.

On paragraph -- or in Section 3, paragraph 32, I would concur with what some others have said, that the term "agreements" should be replaced with the term "cooperation." "Agreements" is a very laden term. It is directive, that we need these things for many of us. And there is consensus that we need to have more cooperation in this area, and there is an urgency in that cooperation. So we'd ask for agreements to be replaced by "cooperation."

We also agree in paragraph 41 that perhaps a better term than "code of conduct" would be something like "non-legal framework" or something like that manner because again "code of conduct" has meaning depending on who you talk to and has different meanings because of that.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

Thirdly, just on the surveillance, as we said earlier, we believe it should be grounded in the U.N. Third Committee resolution which achieved consensus this fall. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much for your comments.   Technical community, academia next.

>>   Thank you, Mr. Chairman.   I will echo the thanks to you and your colleagues for all of the hard work and the excellent facilities you've put on. My name is Jonathan Robinson. I'm speaking here in my personal capacity. And I joined the queue in response to Theresa Swinehart's point she made earlier over a concern of unduly prescriptive language.

I should say that I work extensively within the ICANN policy-making structures, and I'm very familiar with many elements of policy-making at ICANN. And I'm aware through that role, there is extensive and broad-based work going on both within ICANN and more broadly than that to deal with the NTIA transition.

I should say my opinion is that this is at a very early stage. There's a lot of work being done on process. So to that extent, my concern would be that we shouldn't prejudge the outcome of any of that work. So whilst the addition of some language may be appropriate, we should be careful that it doesn't presume or prejudge the outcomes or the extensive work that's going on in various fora, both within ICANN where I work extensively but also outside of that. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much. Representative from private sector.

>>   Yes. Laurence Papilla (phonetic) from Telecom Italia, also talking on behalf of the ICC/BASIS community. I have some comment on paragraph 39. In my previous intervention this morning on the Internet principle, I mentioned the idea that Internet today is much more dynamic and heterogeneous. And I think this also shows an impact on the dynamics among the stakeholders and Internet governance.

To take this into account, we suggest that paragraph 39, the issue of roles and responsibilities should be amended as follows. The sentence would read, "different roles and responsibilities as determined by the stakeholder and relevant to the function or situation."

We believe also that there is a support among our colleague sector here for these changes. We thank them for their consideration. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much for your intervention.

And now I'm turning to coordinator of remote participation. Do we have interventions from remote participants?

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

>>   We have a text comment coming from civil society in Moldova. >> This is a comment from Open Government Institute by Veronica Cretu. First of all, congratulations, everyone, for impressive work.

A few suggestions on the way forward. It is important that next steps include a declaration on the Internet governance principles that is endorsed by all stakeholders.

It is also crucial that efforts are put in place at national country level around the implementation of this declaration and practice, be it through national action plans or Internet governance or through other means. At the core of the process, OECD principles on citizens and partners should prevail. Thank you.

>>   And no comments from remote video hubs at this point.

DONGMAN LEE: All right. Thank you. Please speak up, representative of civil society. Thank you.

>>   Hello? My name is (saying name). I represent (saying name). Our contribution is coming a little bit late because it's to paragraph 6. Still, we suggest a change where it reads it is important that multistakeholder decision-making and policy formulation are improved. Our suggestion that it should read, "It is important that multistakeholder decision-making policy formulation and infrastructure

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

discussions are improved."   The rationale for such change is that in Brazil, for instance, outside of urban centers and going to the interior of the country, Internet access is very poor. And the infrastructure, private and public, mostly emphasis on public, investment on infrastructure must be discussed with society. And private investment should be, too, on forums -- multistakeholder forums like we are pushing for these changes. Thank you.

DONGMAN LEE: Next. Move to government.

>>   Thank you. Hello to everybody. My name is Thomas Schneider. I work for the Swiss government. I have a comment on the way forward but not on the text but maybe on something like a matter level.

First of all, I want to thank the Brazilian government and everybody involved for this amazing learning experience that we are having here. And I think this is mainly what it is.

We've been talking about multistakeholder processes and decision-making processes for quite some time.

Now we are experimenting with one, and we realize it is not so simple. It is not so simple.   It is not so simple if you are serious about participatory democracy on a large case. I come from a country where we have 700 years of experience in this, and we are still not happy with our processes.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

So how to move this forward? I think we first have to agree what we can achieve here in two days with the time we have is nothing more than a rough consensus. This is a term coming from the technical world. We need to apply this to the political world. We need to see that not 100% of the people can agree to 100% of the text we are producing in two days. If we want more, we need to go for a more sophisticated process that we need to develop. And ideas that we can take from is the IGF. The IGF doesn't make decisions on substance, but it makes decisions on process. They have a procedure to agree on agendas, on people on a podium in a multistakeholder process which is more or less elaborate until now.   EuroDIG goes further.   We even agree on messages in a non-negotiated manner as a rough consensus.

[Timer sounds.]

And we suggest that --- and try to get more sophisticated. Thank you very much.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you for your comment. We really appreciate it. Next. Let's move to academia.

>>   Thank you.   Robert Uzal, Nacional University de San Luis, Argentina. This morning, we mentioned in this forum the classical human being resistance to change, independent of individual interests, individual current opinions, individual current jobs, Internet scenarios are

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

changing their culture. Please consider Brazilian President Dilma yesterday's speech and today's Sao Paulo's newspapers.

Outcome document, final version, must be mandatory different than the first one. Consider the severe and top priority to (indiscernible). Audience members develop top-level contribution that must be included in the final version, modifying deeply the original one that was at the beginning an excellent reference draft.

Half an hour ago, joking, I insist, joking -- I mention to a top-level organizer that a very good version of outcome document already exists. Here, you have it, the headlines of today's newspaper.

As I said, I was joking. But in these times, very frequent changes (indiscernible) go ahead (indiscernible) innovation --

[Timer sounds.]

Finally, I insist the specific agreement needs to improve Internet governance. In the current real-world situation, a general cooperation scheme is not enough. Thanks a lot to the organizers for this wonderful event. Thank you.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you. Let's move to private sector.

>>   Hi, my name is Jim Seng from (saying name). I am a member of the ICANN strategic panel on identified technology, but I speak in my own

capacity today. My comments with respect to Section 5 or more specifically the lack of the wordings on the way forward on the root server and the root zone file. It is also important to recognize there are differences between the two.

RFC 2826, IAB comment on unique root speaks about the importance of maintaining a single root zone file. In the consistency with the stability principle that we discussed earlier today, we should have a session on next steps to ensure the unionness of the root zone file in accordance to RFC 2826. We need to kickstart a discussion on the future management of the root zone file which is the pinnacle with respect to the NTIA release of control of IANA.

However, it is also important to realize that the discussion of the limits on the 13 root servers is not the same as the unique group zone group issue. In Anycast today, we have over 380 servers, instances that serve the root zone file, the same root zone file. And there's no magic to running a root server. It is just a server.

Only thing that's restricting is the 13 (indiscernible) tests that is supposed to be a technical restriction, but we never really put that to a test. We never have the will to overcome this technical limitation, and I believe that it can be overcome if we put our heart to it.

For the continuity and stability of the Internet --

[Timer sounds.]

-- we need tens of thousands of servers so we can ensure that they all serve the unique root zone file. Thank you.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you very much. Are there any comments from remote participants?

>>   Yes, we have a text comment coming from Tunisia. And afterwards, we have another text comment coming from civil society in Saint Lucia.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Salim Jamil from Tunisia. He works in the communications system.

I propose that you will include the management of the important domain names and that you can maintain the sustainability of the Internet and to combat any cyber-activity and fraud or malfunction that might happen on the Internet.

Thank you very much.

>>   And now a comment coming from Saint Lucia.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: This is a comment from civil society.

Please include in Paragraph 39 an intention to attempt to establish a definition for multistakeholder model.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you for these comments. Actually, we tried that 10 years ago, but it's not easy.

Next speaker is a representative of civil society. Please, ma'am.

>>   So speaking on behalf of (saying name) International, a charity based in the U.K. committed to fighting the right to privacy across the world, we had three comments.

Two on Paragraph 35.

In response to a request to remove the term "mass surveillance," we request that the term be maintained as it stands, as it is referenced as such in the U.N. General Assembly resolution on the right to privacy in the digital age, which was adopted in December 2013.

The second point, on Paragraph 35, supporting the request from civil society, we would like to request a direct reference to the international principles on the application of human rights to communication surveillance, also known as the necessary and proportionate principles, as they constitute comprehensive guidelines to the steps required to ensure surveillance policies and practices are proportionate, necessary, and in accordance with human rights obligations.

Given the severe consequences these policies and practices have on individuals, we must maintain a strong language on this issue and not settle for good enough.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

Under Paragraph 40, on jurisdiction, we would like an inclusion of the application of the principles of nondiscrimination and an expansive understanding of jurisdiction, to ensure that noncitizens are involved to enjoy their rights as they do not choose where their data and communications flow and the right to privacy is a universal right whose enjoyment does not depend on nationality or location. Thank you.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS: So thank you for your proposals.

I would like to draw attention to the room, on the length of line under -- in the governmental line.

In order to shorten that line, I will -- I propose to take two at a time, two interventions from government and then one from other sectors. Otherwise, we may risk having, at the end of the meeting, only government interventions.

Please, government representative.

>> Hello. Hello?

My name is Sarah Taylor. I'm from the U.K. government. Thank you, Chair.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

Like many of the U.K. submitted comments on the draft text, like many we haven't seen all of those comments reflected in the text that was published before this meeting.

However, we commend the organizers' commitment to producing an outcome document and we commend the focus on common ground.

And there's much on the common ground of this text that we saw before the meeting started to commend.

In particular, I'd like to draw attention to the commitment to strengthen the IGF. The U.K. supports the IGF financially, as do many here, and we would encourage others to do so too. And why is that important? Because the next billion people to get online will be from the developing world and it's vital that the IGF and other multistakeholder fora improve and involve to facilitate their participation.

We also commend the language on the transition of IANA, that it should be thoughtful and that it should focus on the stability of the Internet. It's very important that this process is right rather than it's fast.

As many have said, this is not a perfect process and it's not a perfect test, but we mustn't let the perfect be the enemy of the good. It's a good text and the U.K. thanks everyone here for their participation in making it so. Thank you.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much. Another government representative, please.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

EN

>> Thank you, Chair. My name is Keith (saying name). I'm with the Australian Department of Communications. I have just four brief points.

Firstly, I'd like to add my congratulations to the organizers.

Australia quite likes the output -- outcome document in its current form, so we're not actually looking for major change. We think that it encapsulates the issues quite well.

Having said that, Australia does wish to associate itself with the -- with Sweden's proposed changes to Paragraphs 32 and to Paragraph 41 relating to codes of conduct.

We also wanted to say that we do not support the suggestion made by some delegates here to incorporate hard deadlines or targets into the way forward. We simply believe that they would be unrealistic. We would rather that the process takes the time that it needs to take than have artificial deadlines attached to it.

And the last thing we'd like to say is, we think it would be a great pity if the outcome of yesterday and today and the process so far was simply characterized as the chair's summary, because we believe that it's actually something much more than that. That it's the product of an awful lot of input from an awful lot of stakeholders.

If we can't think of anything else, why don't we just continue to call it an outcomes document. Thank you, Chair.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much. Now technical community and academia.

>>   My name is (saying name) from JPRS, the ccTLD registry of Japan.

                         In Paragraph 44, WSIS+10, IGF are some of the target forums. Actually, in Paragraph 17, IGF is described as deemed to be the body or forum that will receive and implement the recommendations we are discussing on here, but we all know that there are also opponents against IGF.

                         Although I also tend to agree that IGF will be the appropriate body in a pragmatic sense, the reason why IGF should be described in the document to persuade the readers of this document and the IGF itself to decide on what direction IGF should be strengthened.

                         Having said, I propose to add sentences in Paragraph 44 or 17 that goes like, "IGF has nearly 10 years of experience with multistakeholder led agenda setting and discussions, with continuous enormous effort to improve itself."

                         IGF is one of the bodies that have the potential to receive and implement the recommendations.

                         Thank you for your attention.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much. Now a representative from private sector.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

>>   Thank you. I speak on behalf of (saying name), the Brazilian federation of I.T. organizations, and of WITSA, the World Information Technology and Services Alliance.

Those entities are broadly supportive of the work that all have done to create the documents as they are, and our -- and appreciate the dedication of all to achieve a positive outcome from our hard work here together.

We recognize the limitations of time so our comments are short.

We support Paragraphs 3 and 5.

In Paragraph 4, we suggest insertion of "and strengthen open and inclusive" just before "multistakeholder mechanisms."

In Paragraph 16, we believe that the IGF should be considered as a first option to consider and discuss emerging topics and issues. It is not clear to us that it is useful to consider new fora, but instead existing fora, including activities of the private sector and civil society and technical community, should first strive to address such issues.

In Paragraph 17, we strongly support active participation in the IGF and many of our companies are actively attending national and regional IGFs.

We support the importance of a strengthened IGF with an increasing funding and expansion of the present excellent secretariat to address the increased expectations that we all have on the IGF.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

[Timer sounds]

On Paragraph 25 to 29, our comments will be provided later to specifics.

We support Paragraph 32 to 35.

And in Paragraph 36, we again note the importance of this paragraph for recognition.

We support Paragraphs 37 to 45. Thank you very much.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS: Now turn to remote participants.

>>   We have a text comment coming from Dominican Republic, and also video interaction with Chennai in India.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: This is a comment from (saying name) in the Caribbean, the Dominican Republic, of the multistakeholder group.

Which will be the mechanisms for the coexistence of the entities that will set up the multistakeholder entity that will deal with Internet

governance and the critical -- the management of critical elements at the global level? Because this will be the mechanisms that will voice the decisions and will be the ones making decisions.

>>   --- coming from Chennai in India. Please, India, go ahead.

JANIS KARKLINS: India, go ahead, please.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: This is on the outcome document, roadmap, Paragraph 21(c). this is from all Chennai hub participants, in agreement. IGF should reach out to a broader target of commercial beneficiaries of internet beyond the present contributors to mobilize funds on the required scale. On event funding, larger sponsors should offer to fund in the interest of promoting the overall cause of the IGF and offer to refrain from influencing decisions related to the location, topics, lead participants, and participants of the event. on participant funding, respective stakeholders should contribute to a stakeholder fund to contribute to improve representative participation within the stakeholder group. At the same time, the more affluent stakeholder groups -- namely government and business -- could contribute to create a balance by improving civil society participation.

If overall cross-stakeholder funding is infeasible, participant funding could be coordinated from a central fund with a transparent process to reveal the names of the contributors. at the same time, the allocation

could be made in such a way that the funding received by a participant is not directly related to a specific --

[Timer sounds]

-- donor. In other words, the process could be coordinated in such a way that a recipient would not trace his funding to a specific donor. All of this would ensure that the IGF will establish a process of unconditional funding with the exception of conditions related to the broader purpose and proper utilization of funds. thank you. thank you from Chennai.

DONGMAN LEE: Okay. Thank you, India. Now, let's move to the lady in the civil society line.

>>   Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.   I'm Anna Kovacs from the Internet Democracy Project in India, but I'm speaking on behalf of a hundred civil society organizations from the south and the north.

I have three comments on multistakeholderism.

First, we commend the extensive treatment of multistakeholderism in the document, especially the extensive references to transparency and accountability, which we see as a recognition of the need for improvements to the systems we have.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

We suggest that the language on multistakeholderism in Paragraph 6 be further strengthened to ensure a balanced, democratic multistakeholder approach, but I'll read out the text of this at the end of my intervention.

We also recommend that balanced democratic multistakeholderism be added as a point for further discussion following the NETmundial in the outcome document, in addition to the reference to rules and responsibilities, as there are many more aspects that require further discussion, including the issue of how to be genuinely participatory.

Finally, for the way forward -- and here I speak on behalf of a smaller group of organizations -- we would like to call on the global Internet community to make possible that the discussion on strengthening multistakeholderism in line with democratic values takes a similar form as the process that we have followed here in the NETmundial, which we have found of great value to take the debate forward, and this can be organized either in the context of the IGF, if time still allows, or possibly as a next NETmundial over the next six to eight months.

And the text of the Paragraph 6 is "Internet governance processes, policies, and decisions should respect and support full participation of all affected current and future stakeholders and foster democratic bottom-up decision-making. Any multistakeholder approach should particularly enable meaningful" --

[Timer sounds]

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

-- "participation from women, developing countries and underrepresented groups." There's two more lines but I'm happy to send them on email if that's okay. Thank you.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you very much.

I would like to refocus the -- emphasize what Janis said earlier, because the -- I fully understand your eagerness to make a comment on the other -- earlier, you know, part of the documents, but today, we strongly ask you to focus on the Section 3 and 4 and 5, so that we can have more inputs to the later part of the document, so we really appreciate.

And now move to government. As like just before, we're going to have two people on the government line speak in series. Okay. Thank you. Please go ahead.

>> My name is (saying name), Brazilian government. The Brazilian government believes it's very important, this effort that we're making to build consensus in this event.

So in spite of the fact that the draft document is not perfect, we've got some points that we do not agree with, but it is a good document and we are moving forward.

To contribute to the perfection of the text, we'd like to express our concern with the language on page -- on Paragraph 35. The current

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

language seems to characterize mass surveillance. This cannot occur. Surveillance, arbitrary surveillance, is not acceptable. Collection and use of personal data can only be conducted in procedures that take into account human rights standards at the international level.

As we have already said in other international fora, and in line with the German position at the U.N., illegal surveillance and arbitrary interception of documents is intrusive and arbitrary and violates freedom of expression.

This is not acceptable because this goes against the pillars of a democratic society.

So we propose the following change to Paragraph Number 35: --- Internet entrusting the Internet governance ecosystem, collection and treatment of personal data should be conducted in accordance with international --

[Timer sounds]

-- human rights.

[Applause]

DONGMAN LEE: Next person in the government line. Please go ahead.

>>   Cuba. So I'm sensing that we want to (indiscernible) that we believe that the document is supposed to be improved more than to join the consensus of our colleagues here in this meeting.

So I'll do it in English because we have a concrete proposal and it's regarding the security and stability section, where we believe it's the section where we have more lacking in this document.

That's the reason that we are suggesting to say something along the line, "It is necessary to address concerns regarding the fact that without proper multilateral agreement, regulation, cooperation, coordination, whatever language you find, in accordance with international language, these technologies can be misused, damaging nations and their citizens, including militarization of civil space. The absence of this coordination eventual (indiscernible) can generate significant human, financial, and material damage due to their negative impact on the critical infrastructure of (indiscernible). This idea, I think that is a very important one and that's supposed to be reflected in the text.

Something that we also would like to say is that we support (indiscernible) in Paragraph 35 in the way that was suggested by some colleagues, including Brazil just now.

And then in paragraph -- in the paragraph on the code of conduct, so we really believe there is a paragraph that is needed in this -- in this document and we strongly support. Thank you.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

DONGMAN LEE:	Thank you. Let's move to academia and technical community. Please speak up.
>>	Yes. Good afternoon. My name is Olivier Crepin-Leblond, and I'm the chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee at ICANN but I'll be speaking on my own behalf.
	Two issues I wanted to bring up quickly. The first one is to do with the orphan issues, which some people say are not orphan, some people say are orphan issues.
	Spam, for example, not being addressed in any of the documents here, and I would suggest that there would be a clause somewhere in the roadmap that would mention that these would have to be taken care of by multistakeholder systems, maybe existing multistakeholder organizations or fora.
	The second point is to do with the transition of oversight on the IANA contract, and I'd like to reiterate the points that were made by a few people earlier that we are, at the moment, engaging in ICANN -- ICANN is currently engaging in dialogue and a whole process to discuss where this will go. Focusing on a roadmap at the moment, focusing on the results already, is really premature. Don't put the carriage before the horses. You've got to have a -- a first set, what the roadmap is going to be, and then start a discussion going. Thank you.
	[Applause]

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

DONGMAN LEE: Okay. Thank you. Next, move to the private sector.

>>   My name is Marilyn Cade. I'm going to make comments about three things, but I want to open my comments by recalling again the comment made yesterday about the spirit of NETmundial, the spirit that brought us together to try to reach as much common agreement as possible.

I've heard expressions of concern about what's not being included, and I really want to respect the concerns that are being expressed, but to call on all of us to try to focus on the commonality that we can.

I appreciate the fact that we do have a section, points for further discussion beyond NETmundial, and I think that's particularly important for us to recognize and acknowledge and reinforce to those who are concerned about what's not in the document, that there is a sincere commitment to further discussion.

I do believe that the IGF is a place for us to bring many of these discussions and I made comments on that yesterday.

My comment now is actually about the way forward.

I think it's important to note -- perhaps not in the in the document, but for all of us to note -- that many of the fora are not just developed by governments for discussion, even if they're multistakeholder, but they're also developed by NGOs, by civil society, and by business.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

And much of the discussion that needs to continue about the -- these topics and about post-NETmundial should be taken up in these settings.

To that note, I will mention the World Congress sponsored by WITSA in September, which is just one example --

[Timer sounds]

-- which will bring over a thousand people together to continue discussion on a wide number of issues including the outputs of NETmundial.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you. Let's hear about the remote comments.

>>   We have a text comment coming from civil society in Germany and also a text comment coming from remote participation hub in Brasilia.

REMOTE PARTICIPATION: The comment from civil society is this: Net neutrality plays an important and indispensable role in achieving principles like accessibility on equal basis, stability and resiliency in an unified and unfragmented space. There might be a lot of money in giving up on net neutrality. And although this money might help connect rural or secluded areas to the Internet on short term, we should really consider whether that goal is worthy enough to abandon an equal and neutral network.

Therefore, we pledge to make a commitment to net neutrality a part of the outcome document again and not delay to later meetings and then we might have already have fait accompli. If that is not possible, we at least should add a clear statement of intention towards net neutrality to the roadmap part of the document. Thank you.

>>   And now a comment from remote participation hub from Brasilia.

REMOTE PARTICIPANT: Brazil academia. Roadmap for the future evolution for Internet governance. We suggest including in paragraph 6, third line, the participation with the right to vote of different social sectors in policy making and decision-making on Internet governance. To justify this, the forum of participation of the Internet in general do not give right to vote to everyone. Society includes social organizations, academia, governments and companies. And they all should have a right to a voice and a vote and Internet (indiscernible) is democratic and transparent. This is an example, for instance.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much. Since we have 45 minutes remaining in this session, I would like to close the speakers' list. That means that all those who are now standing in line at the microphones are the ones who will have a chance to express themselves during this session, maintaining one minute, 30 seconds rule. Thank you very much.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

And those who are now last in line, please like the cashier in the grocery store, if somebody tries to get behind you, say "No, no, no, no, you are last in line."

Civil society, please.

>>   My name is Anna Harkins. I represent a society of around about 70,000 computer users, and I'm also a senator in the Netherlands. If we want to enable innovation and creativity as is put in the principles document, I think this should also be in the roadmap. Especially to support and to promote initiatives from all the regions so the end user can choose services which are not mainly from the United States companies.

There are many good initiatives out there, but they don't have the means to promote them. To have more regions or services not only gives cultural differences more meaning but will also give the end user freedom of choice.   For example, the IGF could show more best practices from all the regions, and I want to ask you to take this into account for the roadmap. Thank you.

>>   JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much for your suggestion.

Government, please.

>>   Thank you. Helga Mieling from Austria. We are pleased with all the efforts to reach consensus, and we also support the first sentence of paragraph 35. However, we ask to delete the rest of the paragraph and instead insert some reference to United Nations resolutions to the right of -- sorry, to the right of privacy in the digital age adopted in December 2013. I would be happy to provide the document. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much. That will be very helpful.

                          Please, sir.

>>   (saying name). I'm the special envoy for the Dutch government on cyberspace/cybersecurity. Congratulations to Brazil on the NETmundial.

                          As to the roadmap, the Netherlands will host a global conference on cyberspace after London, Budapest, and Seoul on the 16th and 17th of April next year, one year from now. The conference will focus on three specific angles, freedom and privacy, economic and social development, and cyber security, of course, in their interrelations.

                          April 2015 will be a good moment to take stock of the progress on Internet governance.   We would love to see many of the multistakeholder community and not the least our host Brazil in the Netherlands to do so. We want to make progress in turning ideas into reality, putting principles into practice, getting concrete deliverables, including on capacity-building.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

We are keen on getting your ideas and inputs, if possible concrete ones. We'll try to take them on board in true recognition of the multistakeholders model. With 15 seconds to spare, I congratulate you once more with your appointness to the chairman of the Internet Governance Forum. Obrigado.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much. Now I'm turning to academia.

>> Hello, this is Milton Mueller, Syracuse University. I want to respond to the points made by defenders of ICANN or employees of ICANN regarding the separation principle that was adopted -- or reinstated into the document. As far as I understand their argument, they are saying that we should not be intervening in an ICANN-run process to make suggestions or comments on how the process should go.

I find this argument to be not very logical and also contradicting the advice that ICANN got at its own Singapore meeting from the GAC and from many of it constituents. Civil society here and in ICANN is totally behind the idea that the process for the IANA transition should extend beyond ICANN itself and should incorporate the entire Internet governance community.

During the Singapore meeting, some people suggested that NETmundial should not talk about the IANA transition, and this idea was soundly rejected by most of the people there.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

Now as for the idea that we are prejudging the outcome of the process, the idea of separation is not just a proposal, it is simply generally a principle that is supported by many people and it is -- can be taken into account by the ICANN process as something that they should think about and seriously consider because it has support elsewhere. Thank you.

[Applause]

[Timer sounds.]

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, Milton, for your comments. Please now, private sector.

>>   Thank you, Mr. Chairman.   Mike Chardier (phonetic), Intel.   My comments are on the way forward and the final disposition of the principle and framework documents. I think the committee has done an extraordinary job so far. Nonetheless, there remain a couple of areas of contention.

Because of this, we have heard proposals to publish a document as part of the chairman's or meeting report and we agree with Australia, that would be a pity. However, we have also acknowledged that there is far, far more consensus in the documents than non-consensus. Accordingly, we propose as a way forward in comity and consensus that we as a meeting approve and publish as rough consensus the text in the document where we agree and for those areas that do not have

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

consensus, that all views be noted and fully documented in the meeting report. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much. I hope that the host country is carefully taking note on your proposals.

And now I'm looking to the remote participant coordinator. Do we have anybody from the distance?

>>   We have a comment from civil society in Cuba and also a comment from the United Kingdom civil society.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Comment from Rafael (saying name), Cuba civil society. We would like to congratulate the Brazilian authorities to organize this magnificent event. And, remember that in Cuba, we have a civil society that is just being born and wants to be fully independent from the government. As you all know, Cuba has the lowest Internet penetration rate in the western hemisphere. We have been trying for several years to create an Internet society chapter so the young Cuban civil society can contribute its share to the issue of a global Internet governance.

We think that these events are good, and we would like to know how our voices might be taken into account if to participate from Cuba in these events is impossible due to problems in the connections and context with the authorities. To speak about multistakeholders in

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

countries like Cuba, when the digital divide is so wide it is senseless if we don't have international support.

[Applause]

>>   And now we have comment from a civil society in United Kingdom.

>>   The participants of the remote participation hub at ThoughtWorks London would like to call for the creation of a cyberspace treaty modeled after the outerspace treaty, putting clear restrictions on the militaristic activities of states and other actors online. This is a necessary step due to the increased activities of state actors towards militarization of the Internet, suggests with the establishment of specific military branches and the expansion of traditional intelligence roles toward large-scale offensive activities which impact the entirety of the Internet, which is rapidly becoming the entirety of humanity.

This is equally vital to commercial interests as the Internet is growing to become one of the largest economies in the world, currently roughly $11 trillion annually, and growing at a rate similar to that to which many country's economies are shrinking. This suggests that there is much to lose and little to gain for humanity as a whole by allowing furtherance of state.

[Applause]

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you very much, comments from Cuba and U.K. civil society. Let's continue to hear the comments from civil society.

Please.

>>   Hello.   My name is Debra Brown, and I'm speaking on behalf of a number of diverse civil society groups. I would like to reinforce two points that were already made and to offer specific edits to the text.

First, following paragraph 44, we suggest the following text.   The WSIS+10 overall review should be informed by the processes and outcome of NETmundial. The modalities for the overall WSIS review should embrace an inclusive approach to agenda-setting participation and development of its outcome.

Second, we support the intervention made by Bill Drake yesterday relating to paragraph 24. The suggestion is to end paragraph 24 after the second sentence and to start a new paragraph with the following text: "Full consideration should be given to establishing multistakeholder mechanisms to promote the ongoing monitoring and analysis of Internet governance developments and the on-demand sharing of knowledge on policy issues, models, and experiences that governments, stakeholders need to help them develop and identify effective solutions." Thank you very much.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you. Let's move to government. Please speak up.

>> Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Paul Ash. I'm from the government of New Zealand. First, I would like to thank the organizers and the multistakeholder community for this useful meeting.

Overall, we are very comfortable with the meeting and the document itself as a useful contribution to future discussions. We have four brief suggestions.

Paragraph 27 refers to striving towards a completed transition of the IANA function by September 2015.

We propose removing this reference. It is important to get this right, and it may take time to ensure the transition is well-considered, supported by the community and considers accountability and the appropriate separation of operational and policy functions.

In the interest of reaching consensus, we think the text in paragraph 35 on surveillance activities should conform to agreed language from the 2013 UNGA resolution. We also request replacement of the word "agreements" in paragraph 32. As a first step enhanced international cooperation is urgently needed to address cybersecurity and cybercrime issues.

Finally, several paragraphs including 16 and 34 refer to a need for new mechanisms, forums, or initiatives. We agree such new forums or initiatives support and not duplicate existing structures and think this text should say there may be a need for new forums and initiatives. Why? Care should be taken in establishing new forums. There are

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

many existing fora, and most stakeholders especially developing and small island developing states find it difficult to participate fully in these.

Finally, discussions regarding the IGF and WSIS actions should take into account existing work in other areas such as the U.N. WSIS+10 --

[Timer sounds.]

-- development agenda. Thank you.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you.

>>   My name is Olga Cavalli. I'm from the government of Argentina. Our comments are suggested text to be added to paragraph 24. I will read the text: "Promote relevant and ongoing participation of experts from all regions and from all stakeholders considering gender balance in the decision-making process of Internet governance, including leadership positions; promote affluent and permanent interaction of Internet governance-related organizations with national administrations."

The rationale for that comment is that Argentina believes there is sufficient experience and trained professionals in all regions from all genders, even in countries with lower degree of relative development to be considered for leadership positions in these organizations including board of directors. Argentina believes there should be gender balance in the board of directors and leadership positions in these organizations. There are enough women, professionals, perfectly able to be considered

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

as good candidates for these positions. Thank you very much for this opportunity. And congratulations to Janis Karklins for his appointment. Thank you.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you.

[Applause]

Now move to academia and technical community. Please speak up.

>>   Thank you, chair. I will speak in English -- in Spanish. Sorry. I'm Carlos Aguirre from (saying name.) I'm the international director of this organization that is a non-for-profit organization that works in certain Latin American countries.

We want to ratify all the interventions made in favor of the importance of net neutrality. We would also like to ratify all the expressions against mass surveillance. We want to raise our voices -- or I want to raise my voice in paragraph 36 because if we need leaders capable of holding discussions, those leaders should previously have knowledge. And the knowledge is built through capacity-building. And capacity-building is a responsibility of all stakeholders, of all sectors, not just of the academic sector.

The 800 participants who are present in this room or who are participating in NETmundial just account for 1/10 millionth part of the population in the world. So if we want to have all kinds of

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

representation, we need to build capacity to turn this into leadership so that these leaders can discuss the changes that are required.

[Timer sounds.]

Finally, we advocate for the drafting of a final outcome document where none of the issues proposed in the original document are excluded. Of course, all these issues can continue to be discussed on the basis of this final outcome document. Thank you.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you. Let's move to private sector.

>>   Hi, I'm Seth Johnson. Again -- hello? Again, okay. Again, I speak for a diverse interest group of people who advocate recognition of the Internet and the Information Society Project that is proceeding and intend to contribute to. We need to assure that the information society does not proceed without providing specific system for recognizing impacts that its initiatives will have on the open Internet, which as currently designed will easily accomplish.

Now, on the way forward section, you have this thing about you intend to contribute to outcomes to other processes. I just don't want to proceed to the next processes in a way that improperly regards the WSIS action lines as being fulfilled adequately, specifically in light of a distinction between the Internet and other I.P.-based networks. I don't need to reiterate my much fuller comments yesterday on the roadmap which developed this point further.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

So I would suggest a language that says we want to have a full candid review of the WSIS action lines notably in terms of addressing the difference between the Internet and other I.P.-based networks and how well the WSIS goals are being met on the terms. Thank you.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you very much.   Let's check whether we have received any comments by remote participants.

>>   We have a text comment from Council of Europe and afterwards a comment from civil society in the United States.

>>   This is a comment from the Council of Europe.   Add the following sentence to paragraph 35 at the end, Article 17, ICC PR requires that U.N. member states ensure the right of everyone to the protection of the law against arbitrary or unlawful interference with privacy or correspondence irrespective of whether such interference is done by public or private stakeholders.

And the U.S. civil society comment is: As the chair noted the attempt to define multistakeholderism ten years ago did not reach actual fruition. So we do not know actually what we are talking about today in this meeting when the term "multistakeholderism" obviously is central to the discussion. That is not any sort of basis for setting a way forward certainly when the global Internet is at stake.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much for those comments.   Now, I'm turning to representative of civil society. Please, sir. Jordi Loriano (phonetic) is the vice president of the Federation of Latin American Internet Users. We bring together as a federation several Internet user communities in Latin America.

Basically I just want to ratify our conviction and our plea that in this discussion on multistakeholder Internet governance, that the outcome document should refer to the Internet users and their roles as people who are -- manage or are beneficiaries and other capacities.

All -- everyone has manifested its intention to contribute to the building of the new Internet based on the multistakeholder model and that is satisfactory to us.

We would like this proposal to take a step further, also to incorporate societies that represent not just civil society as an academic entity or an entity concerned for the development of society, but also those individuals who are capable of standing up for the interest of the individual users.

Believe me that when I say that in this beautiful meeting where everybody is paying attention to the outcomes of NETmundial, Internet users are the most interested parties in these outcomes, so Mr. Janis, please try to echo this proposal. There is a very relevant thought.

[Timer sounds]

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

Give me a support point and I will move the entire world. That is why all Internet users need to continue supporting the development of the communications network in order to continue building toward the regulation of communications. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much for your comments. And now I'm turning to a representative from the government sector.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name is Yamaguchi from Japan.

Regarding the Paragraph 32 about security and stability, I'd like to just comment that the word for international agreements should be replaced to international cooperation to make the flexibility, because ensuring the cyber-security, it is important for us to have not only international public partnership but also public/private- a wider public/private partnership. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much for your suggestion. Please, again, government.

>> Thank you. My name is (saying name). I'm from Polish Ministry of Digital Affairs.

Clear it or cut it. This is a suggestion I address especially to the Internet (indiscernible) in Paragraph 35.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

Text in the current form may suggest that there might be mass surveillance interception and collection programs which are consistent with human rights and democratic values. By definition, mass surveillance is not consistent with human rights and democratic values.

The rule of law and democratic values states that surveillance must respect specific and strict rules. There must be specific legislation setting limits of powers of surveillance authorities and providing necessary protection for citizens' rights. Use of surveillance mechanisms must be under supervision of court. Such mechanisms may be used only in a case of reasonable suspicion of committing a crime and only against specific person or persons.

Mechanism used must be proportional and may be used only for specific time period. Thank you.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS: (non-English word or phrase). Thank you very much. Now, I'm turning to a representative of technical community/academia.

>> Hi. My name is Byron Holland. I'm the CEO of the dot ca operator in Canada, top-level domain operator.

I'm the chair of the country code operators group within ICANN, the ccNSO. And I'm on the high-level panel of global Internet cooperation and governance mechanisms.

I'm speaking in my capacity a registry operator.

There are two elements I'd like to speak to.

First is Paragraph 27, where the only real mention of security/stability on the Internet happens, and it's combined with another concept that I think should be completely separate.

It's one sentence. There's a comma. I think the comma should be a full stop, and that they are two completely separate ideas, and I think that half a sentence in this entire document relating to the stability, security, and resiliency of the Internet does not do it justice and that that should be reinforced and emphasized, that notion.

For without that, much of the rest of what is in this document would be moot.

The next thing that I would like to bring to your attention is in Paragraph 21 about ensuring guaranteed stable and predictable funding for the IGF.

I think that we should be more concrete in that and call on beginning with private sector actors, public sector, and the technical community. And to that end, we'll put our money where our mouth is.

Some of my colleagues here in this room --

[Timer sounds]

-- have come together to say that for a number of years going forward, we will commit no less than $100,000 a year to funding the IGF and I

would ask my colleagues in the other lines and those who have done well by the Internet to join us in making multiyear firm commitments to the funding of the IGF. Thank you.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS: So thank you.   Thank you very much, and thank you for your very generous support to IGF.

Now I'm turning to representative of private sector. Please.

>>   Good afternoon, everyone.   My name is Raul (saying name) and I represent Data Security Council of India and (indiscernible) which is also a WITSA member organization.

Paragraph 31, different roles and responsibilities of stakeholder in the Internet governance ecosystem. We endorse the point of recognizing the different roles played by different stakeholders in different issues, as (indiscernible) function institution, which is also reflected in Paragraph 6 of the document.

Paragraph 14, jurisdiction issues, this is most critical as if this is left unaddressed it will continue to lead to simmering undercurrents leading to unavoidable conflicts because of different perspective on content regulation, privacy violation, IPRs and related issues.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

Paragraph 32, international agreements on topics such as jurisdiction and law enforcement assistance to promote cybersecurity and prevent cybercrime. It is primarily a state subject but a multistakeholder model maybe led by government is desired in this direction.

Paragraph 33, I would like to add text that technical matters for cyber-security be agreed upon by developers, implementers, and operators. Paragraph 34, on new forums and initiatives, existing technical institutions such as IAB, IETF, IEEE, W3C, they will continue to develop technical standards and protocols, and (indiscernible) will continue to work on address space.   But this needs to be strengthened by encouraging and adding representatives from countries and regions that are currently unrepresented or have low participation.

On IANA transition, if they're -- if (indiscernible) needs to establish a new body for IANA function stewardship transition, we have proposed setting up a body called Internet governance organization, IGO, modalities of which are explained in our comments submitted earlier.

To conclude, thanks to (indiscernible), Honorable President Dilma (indiscernible) and --

[Timer sounds]

-- efforts of entire Internet community to make NETmundial possible. Obrigado.

JANIS KARKLINS: So thank you very much.   Do we have remote participants in line? Please.

>>   We have a comment from Sao Paulo remote participation hub, and afterwards a video interaction from the San Francisco remote hub.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Hub Sao Paulo. Brazil. Technical sector.

                         Many of the principles which are being discussed here will only be effectively conquered if some of the tactical aspects in the network are to be adjusted.

                         We must include a paragraph for the commitment of all to the -- to implement and accelerate IPv6, DNSSEC, and most importantly a solution for BGP, secure board gateway protocol, which is the main protocol responsible for the Internet today, and the way it is, it has several weak points.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Hi. My name is Beverly Lau.

                         Speaking as a member of the tech community here in San Francisco, how will the principles of the NETmundial outcome document be enforced? If individuals take the initiative to uphold the principles of Internet governance, will there be a safe haven to protect them from retribution? The safe haven should fall under the responsibility of many nations, so that these individual whistle-blowers can have support, no matter where they come from.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

Thank you for your time.

[Applause]

DONGMAN LEE: Okay. Thank you for your comments, and let's move to on-site, so civil society, please.

>>   Thank you.

My name is Jeremy Malcolm and I'm now speaking only on my own behalf, though some of these points do enjoy broader support.

The document that we produce, believe, should be a declaration of its participants, rather than a mere chairman's summary.

I would also like us to concretize some of the general and aspirational statements that currently appear in the roadmap section.

First, the European Commission, in a statement from Vice President Kroes has put forward a set of concrete suggestions about what steps could be taken next and when, in relation to improvement of the IGF, strengthening of the multistakeholder model, and so on.

Those suggestions do not seem to be in any way controversial and I suggest we add those to the outcome document.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

Secondly, Paragraph 39 of the document acknowledges one very important issue, but puts it into the "too hard" basket, the different roles and responsibilities of stakeholders.

I suggest that we don't just acknowledge the issue but specify where it could be discussed next, and I feel that should be the IGF.

However, we should also encourage the IGF to adopt a deliberative plenary process for this task based on that conducted at NETmundial.

NETmundial is a one-off forum, so we need to make sure the value of this innovative process is not lost, and the IGF is the perfect forum to take it up, in fulfillment of its mandate to make recommendations where appropriate. Thank you.

[Applause]

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you very much. Now, move to the gentleman in the government line. Please speak up.

>>   Good afternoon. My name is (saying name), from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Human (indiscernible) of Ecuador.

I would like to stress that on equal footing, my government believes that it is necessary a definition of distinguished roles and responsibilities, assuming that these roles and responsibilities are dynamic, have to be defined over time in a collaborative process.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

We also support the call made yesterday by the European Union to set concrete outputs in the -- in the document. We believe that this has to be an executive process, one that brings clearly defined objectives and a clear deadline for realizing those objectives.

And wrapping everything up and possibly also contributing to a better definition of what accountability means, what multistakeholderism means, and also its relation with multilateralism, we would like to suggest a formulation that could fit or substitute Paragraph 41 or maybe be included in Section 5, which reads, "NETmundial expresses the necessity to elaborate a legally binding international instrument which will constitute the referenced legal framework regarding the governance of the Internet. The ratification thereof by stakeholders must be the requisite for a full participation at the multistakeholder level. A clear deadline for the elaboration for the aforementioned instrument as well as a definition of its nature and scope must be discussed in the context of the next NETmundial which has to be convened within the next six months."

And by the way --

[Timer sounds]

-- I would like to renew the offer of my government to host that meeting.

Just a very quick formulation for Paragraph 35.

We strongly support the mentioning of mass surveillance, so we suggest more dialogue is needed on this topic at the international level using

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

forums like the IGF and the Human Rights Council aiming to develop a common understanding on all the related aspects and to create an adequate binding legal framework to eradicate mass surveillance on the Internet. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you. The lady at the government line, speak up, please.

>>   Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm (saying name) from the Mexican government. We would like to commend the efforts of the Brazilian government in the organization of this important meeting.

Let me make two brief comments.

First, in our opinion, the reinforcement of the IGF is a clear element to avoid the polarization of discussions in other fora and also the duplicity of other efforts. In this regard, all processes related to the Internet that require some kind of resolution, such as meetings to adopt the declarations of principles, should be addressed fully at the IGF.

And my second comment relates to Paragraph 43, where we submit to your consideration in the second sentence replacing the word "encourage" with "invite."

And also, along the same lines, to add "further analysis in a more inclusive platform outside the control of some members of the multistakeholder ecosystem." Thank you.

DONGMAN LEE: Let's move to technical community. Please speak up.

>> Thank you, Chair. My name is (saying name) from the manager of Africa top-level domains organization. I will make some comments on behalf of the regional top-level domains organization that is CENTR, APTLD and LACTLD.

Our first comment is on the mandate, and we don't see why the mandate of the IGF should be constrained to 2015.

This should be reviewed so that there is no time limit, and the Internet Governance Forum should continue for as long as the community sees it as legitimate -- as a legitimate space for discussing these issues, a fact that has been widely acknowledged.

Secondly, we need to encourage mechanisms and processes, where the processes of multistakeholderism and multilateralism converge. They have different logics and outcomes but in the interest of developing the Internet, they should be a deepened understanding that we hope emerges from the enhanced cooperation working group.

Finally, it is important to maintain institutional memory of these events and their results. Discussions on Internet governance have developed

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

and matured and there's a lot that we have learned and this should continue.

We also need to encourage and promote the use of electronic participation tools. Thank you very much.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you.

[Applause]

Any comments from remote?

>>   We have remote comments from civil society in Tunisia.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: This is a comment from Mr. Jamil. He's in the civil society and the telecommunications. He suggests also that the draft of the roadmap will contain a text on protecting the children so -- and also especially that we -- that we have the tools that will protect against children's from -- against improper Web sites, and to be of course putting into consideration the cultures, different cultures we have. And also suggest that the -- that we witness a complete participation of the countries when we talk about Internet governance so we not witness a control of one country and the destiny of Internet and thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS: So thank you very much for those comments and I'm turning to representatives ---

>>   -- in this room. Surveillance causes a chilling effect. The surveillance, the mass surveillance specifically of Sweden and the United States, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Australia, and other countries is seriously interfering with people to actually exercise their right to use anonymity software.

Furthermore, in countries such as China and Syria, we see exactly the same thing as active censorship. We should recognize that states can commit cybercrime and it is not merely individual users themselves on the Internet with no state affiliation that are the only ones.

Cybercrime must address the fact that states can commit crimes as well, and it must also include the case that states do not have the ability to talk about cybercrime and set the agenda without speaking with members of the technical community and civil society, and it is absolutely important to note that intrusions into computers are happening right now, where corporations and free software projects and other proprietary software are required or pressured to add back doors. We should not allow that to happen and we should recognize that we should not create secret agents for the state where they are able to take and create great harm and to put in more risk for people who are working for a better world.

Thank you.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much for your intervention.

Now I'm turning to representative from the government. That would be you, sir.

>>   Good morning, everyone. I'm (saying name). I belong to the federal justice of Brazil. I'd rather speak in Portuguese because unfortunately I do not speak English very well.

Relative to Paragraph 33, item security and stability, I emphasize that the fight against cybercrime requires more than cooperation. Cooperation requires -- or (indiscernible) the idea of volunteers. We need to have treaties signed and the creation of formal communication channels among governments in order to ensure the compliance of international legislation.

We need to be transparent, so I suggest to include in this paragraph a mention to these international treaties.

JANIS KARKLINS: I'm now turning to representative of technical community and academia. Please, sir.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

>>   Thank you. My name is Jordan Carter from Internet New Zealand. Two
                            points.

                            One is to support the idea of the outcomes document. We need an
                            outcomes document that expresses the views of NETmundial on all the
                            issues affecting the Internet's future. We do not need a chairman's
                            summary. So please stick with the outcomes document. The second
                            point relates to the first which is around the discussion on Paragraph 26
                            related to the IANA transition.

                            There is no legitimate process argument to say that text around
                            adequate separation of policy and operations for IANA should not be in
                            the document.

                            It is perfectly legitimate for that to be the case, because that's the point
                            of NETmundial, to express views on the issues facing the Internet's
                            future.

                            If we said we couldn't express views on any issue that was being dealt
                            with elsewhere, we would have an empty outcomes document.

                            All of the issues we are discussing are being discussed elsewhere. All of
                            them are in front of other processes. So there's no process objection.
                            Please feel free to include text like adequate separation in the outcomes
                            document in Paragraph 26. Thank you.

                            [Applause]

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

JANIS KARKLINS: So thank you very much for your comments. Remote participation -- participants, do we have somebody?

No. Well, while we're waiting, let's move to the civil society representative. Please, civil society.

>>   Hello. My name is Evan Leibovitch. I am president of the Canadian chapter of the Internet Society, I'm vice chair of ICANN at-large, but I'm speaking as an individual.

Through both my work in ISOC and my work within ICANN, it's been a challenge to try and represent the interests of end users.

That is, when you're talking multistakeholderism, stakeholders are not just the people that can show up at these meetings that know the lingo, that know the secret handshakes, that understand what's going on here.

And in order to be able to truly be multistakeholder, that also requires representing people that aren't here, that need -- that don't even know what they need to know here.

And so what I would ask is for some wording in the document to make reference to end users, the need to educate, the need to engage, the need to make a special effort to bring to people that don't have either commercial or career-based reasons to be here, and to make sure that representation is adequately brought to bear into meetings like this.

Thank you.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much for your proposal. Now representative from the government.

>>   Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. My name is (saying name). I'm the vice-minister of Telecommunication of Chile, and I will speak in Spanish.

First of all, I would like to thank the government of Brazil for this organization for this event because with the real number of participation show the actual significance and willingness to participate in the Internet.

Chile supportings human rights particularly in the latest 30 years, and now it appears in several mass media spaces, including the Internet. So our country aspires that human rights be protected and guaranteed at the global network.

Additionally, we firmly believe that we have to promote the principle of net neutrality. This principle should be included in the declaration out of this event. We know it is possible. Our country has included it into the law and in practice, it is consistent with the development of technology and information -- telecommunication and information technology.

We have to discuss the critical information on the network, particularly considered this critical infrastructure should have a social development

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

as well as a cultural and political development principle particularly being so deep enrooted in Latin American countries.

We hope these ideas are reflected in this roadmap. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much, Mr. Minister.

>> I'm Leon (saying name). I'm a software developer of a company of digital communication. I have two comments to make. The first, I believe that the nationalization of data should bring more reliance an reliability to the net. And this would make the government provide laws for the security of the Internet and would also create more jobs and would allow other companies, such as google.com to have to create more jobs in developing countries. So I suggest an exemption for startups for up to two years of their foundation.

We should think that during this short time and with a thousand people perhaps in this meeting, we would not be able to express what is important for the future of the Internet. So I suggest that review mechanisms should be put in place. The Internet is dynamic, and we need that our rights and privacies are ensured in order to have trust in this document. Thank you.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

JANIS KARKLINS: We will go to a remote participation hub.

>>   We have a text comment from the Sao Paulo remote hub and afterwards a comment from civil society in India.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Hub Sao Paulo. I propose that on paragraph 7, we include the term "search for the rights of successful information." Why? Today what we see -- what we receive from search providers are sponsored and do not reflect the content of the Internet as a whole.

>>   --- a principle stating when and to whom these principles are applicable. Simply put, we need recognition that these principles that relate to human rights, obligations bind us not only while dealing with citizens or people within their territory.   Extraterritorial application of these obligations to non-citizens must be recognized at least insofar as the negative obligation of states, not to violate -- not to violate those rights goes.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you. So civil society, please, speak up.

EN

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Claudio Reese, and I'm from (saying name), Chile. During these days we are discussing about the future of the Internet. I think it is important to take into account we are just proposing just one part of the international rules who rules, generally speaking at least, the Internet. I want to highlight the fact coming from a developing country the serious effects free trade agreements have in our legal and human rights framework on the Internet shaping those country's priorities in a (indiscernible) way.

Yesterday was ACTA, SOPA and PIPA. Today is the Transpacific Partnership, the TPP. Negotiation and secrecy touching critical points regarding human rights and the Internet as such, intermediary liability, privacy rules, collaboration between ISPs and human rights -- sorry, and corporate owners and aggressive strategy over direct enforcement.

NETmundial's roadmap will face this reality and follow President Dilma's assessment regarding the Internet as a territory of trust and respect of human rights not permitting our government to do strength assessment in a not (indiscernible) for but agreeing in the diminishing human rights on the trade agenda. Thank you.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you.

[Applause]

Let's move to the government line. Please.

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

>>   Hello. My name is (saying name) and I'm representing the government
                            of Denmark. We also very much would like to show our gratitude to the
                            organizers of this conference. We appreciate the great experience in
                            multistakeholderism and practice, and we look forward to drawing
                            lessons from this in practice.

                            I want to reiterate some of the points that has already been made by a
                            large group of countries and stakeholders. We think the document as it
                            stands, it is not perfect but it's good. And in particular, we like the clear
                            agreement on strengthening the Internet Governance Forum, and we
                            appreciate the paragraphs here.   And we appreciate the many
                            interventions and the strong support that we've received from the
                            Internet Governance Forum, from this room.

                            So we need to continue to strengthen and develop the multistakeholder
                            model with a focus on accountability, inclusion, transparency. And we
                            look forward to continuing the discussions on this in the coming years.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you very much.   Now move to technical community and
                            academia.

>>   My name is Mita Peters, and I represent academia. I coordinate a global
                            network of Internet and society research centers, a collaborative
                            initiative of academic research institutions all over the world, focusing
                            on Internet and society issues in the broadest sense and from a wide

range of disciplines. This is not limited to but includes Internet governance.

As the coordinator of --- centers, I would like to stress the relevance of Section 23 of the roadmap regarding the creation of information sharing functions. Global Internet governance should be understood as a collaborative learning process that works but that can be optimized over time.

We would also like to stress the importance of reflecting academically and from a diverse range of disciplinary standpoints on the outcomes and implementation scenarios of what is discussed at NETmundial.

We would like to underline the role of the academic community in this learning process, also referring to point 4 of the roadmap.

In this context, we encourage Internet governance practitioners to collaborate more strongly with academia and to refer to the academic expertise available in this field.

Against this backdrop, we offer the network of centers as a --- for academic reflection through events and independent but coordinated research efforts. Research institutions involved include the Berkman Center for Internet & Society, Harvard University; the Alexander von Humboldt Institute for Society in Berlin; the Institutes for Technology and Society at FRJ Rio de Janeiro and at the state university in Rio de Janeiro and many other institutions from over 20 countries.

[Timer sounds.]

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

We would like to extend an invitation to our colleagues online to join us in this collaborative effort. Thank you.

DONGMAN LEE: Thank you very much. Any comments from remote participants?

>>   We have a comment from civil society in Moldova.

>>   This is an a comment from Open Government Institute. A suggestion on points to be further discussed via NETmundial paragraph 41. It is important that this paragraph focuses on and elaborates on the indicaters to be used for the Internet governance ecosystem and addresses both performance and impact indicaters. Designing the process from the very beginning in a way that could be measured or addressed is essential. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much, Moldova, from this comment. And now we have three last interventions from civil society first. Please, sir.

>>   Good morning, thank you. I'm Alfredo Bilaka (phonetic) from the digital users in Ecuador. First of all, I would like to show my appreciation to the civil society here in Brazil because they have pushing for the civil

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

framework for five years. So in my opinion, they are the reason why we are gathering today here.

And, obviously, the government has given priority to this meeting other needs and other urgencies.

I should say that in the civil society, each of us represents one's self or perhaps times the organization we come from. So on that basis, multistakeholderism becomes critical when on different topics, different governments and corporations hire ad hoc staff in a very specific manner so that they can complete the wheels of the multistakeholder cart to serve their own interests.

The civil society would be threatened about this kind of situation, but companies and also government officials that are present are harmed when they are also part of the civil society. "Transparency" was a word repeated on several locations by government officials. The roadmap has to include mechanisms that will enable to have open data -- open format data to allow the participation of all stakeholders. Remote participation has to gain more ground over political spaces. Congratulations for the achievements in this meeting. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much for your comments.   Now I'm turning to representative of the government.

>>   Thank you. I'm Ambassador Will Ariette (phonetic), government of South Sudan, Minister of Foreign Affairs. The government of South

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

Sudan and its leadership takes this opportunity to thank the government of Brazil and organizers for the initiative of NETmundial stakeholder conference.

The government of South Sudan agrees with the concept of the stakeholder principle of Internet governance. The government of South Sudan is permitted to implementation of a governance to allow participation of all citizens of the well, robust, open, and trusted network communication manner without interference.

Third, however, we must understand that the responsibility and accountability, it is an important duty of government to protect its citizen and sovereignty. And this must be recognized within the NETmundial concept of stakeholder principles.

The issue of capacity-building which is para 36.3, we would want to propose that should be brought within the first principle of NETmundial rather than within the roadmap as it is (indiscernible).

Finally, the government of South Sudan appreciates the contributions made by all stakeholders, and we need to move forward into the future with NETmundial as a future accountable United Nations of global communications network, leaving all the citizens of the world a better world for all. And in this regard, the government of South Sudan would like to move a motion that we adopt --

[Timer sounds.]

-- the outline principle in draft document with improve adjustment as processes continues to evolve. Seems the concept of all

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial

multistakeholderism is an open-ended level of processes. Many thanks. Congratulations, Mr. Karklins, for your nomination.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very sir for being with us. As you know, South Sudan is one of the latecomers in the United Nations system.

Last speaker from technical community, please.

>> Thank you very much. My name is (saying name) from Ethiopia. I'm academia and teaching at (saying name) University. And I'm also a (indiscernible) in software engineering. So I'm here to tell you we only have one telecom company in Ethiopia, which is being operated by the government. Unfortunately, people in Ethiopia are suffering of lack of Internet access. Internet in Ethiopia is not plug and play. It is rather -- it is plug and pray.

So would you mind to include in the roadmap Internet should be -- telecom should free and realized to provide people with affordable and reasonable Internet access. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you, sir, for your comment and proposal.

So that brings us to the end now. We have one -- two more remote participants. Please. Quickly.

>>   So we have a video interaction with Bhimavaram Town, India and afterwards a text comment coming from the Sao Paulo remote hub.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Hello? Good evening, sir. There is (saying name) from Bhimavaram Town and Internet services from India.

(indiscernible) open standards and open frameworks can become building blocks for building the next Internet just like we have TCP and IP protocol. Net neutral should continue without government controls and tech companies who are trying for monopoly (indiscernible) growth and development of new Internet with open governance. This will one day lead to the Internet to think and act to welcome human beings, control cybersecurity. Innovation creators should come, every remote part of world through better broadband network and global standards which (indiscernible). Remote hubs connect. Thank you so much.

[Timer sounds.]

DONGMAN LEE: Final comment coming from Sao Paulo hub.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Enabling environment for innovation and creativity. We suggest including on the fourth line to preserve dynamism of the net, that governance of Internet should continue allowing for open innovations,

encouraging, creating comments, copy left and open contents. And the rationale is a copyright that should be introduced into the network and having its own laws. That's why initiatives such as creative commons, copy left, and open contents need a space to keep the spirit of freedom and democracy in Internet.

JANIS KARKLINS:
Thank you very much. We had, I think, very rich debate. We had more than 60 interventions during these two hours. That was very encouraging. We had a number of remote participant interventions which again is a good example of how we are trying to reach out and get wider participation to our discussions.

So now the expert panel will go to the same place, the same lounge on the second floor of the adjacent building of the hotel to try to digest everything we heard and took note of as well as take into account all those comments which were submitted in writing prior to the meeting and will come up with a proposal for the afternoon session -- for the afternoon closing session. So those who are interested, please feel free to join us. The same rules will apply as yesterday. You can follow the discussion of the group without possibility of intervention, direct intervention at that meeting. So thank you very much.

And bon appetit to all of you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

Global Multistakeholder
Meeting on the Future
of Internet Governance

NETmundial