

INTERNET GOVERNANCE

- Do we need to re-define IG?
- Define ICANNs role in IG?
- IG = for whom? By whom?
- Perhaps look at this as internet coordination rather than internet governance
- Defining governance model for similar orgs & supporting
- ICANN has legitimacy as a global organization
- While it is important to help the broader IG debate is critical to focus on ICANN's remit
- Communicate ICANN's role
- Ensuring bi-directional communication between ICANN community, stakeholder /ICANN >> End Users
- We should be clear on what we mean by multistakeholderism
- Showcase ICANN as platform for Int. governance/coordination
- How to evolve the role of Governments in the IG ecosystem?
- Better facilitation of developing world participants
- IG debate regarding ICANN functions should move to ICANN and not dealt elsewhere
- I* coordination is key!
- MOUs with Int'l/Req orgs
- Evolve from a representative model into something else?
- Evolve into a more direct democratic model?
- Always be the best alternative for IG/Be more nimble, inclusive, responsive than other organizations
- Community members showcasing/supporting ICANN's IG model
- Topic based vs Org based structure
- What structure would enable wider IG participation; collaboration? Become true independent "organization" vs corporation?
- Do we need to be 'global' like in Geneva (neutral)?
- Evolve USG role in ICANN
- Evolve USG Role w/ fundamental functions – to some sort of global audit – remove single govt role
- We would be better accepted as Int'l Internet Governance body if we broke our ties with the US Government?
- Does IANA become spun off? Or does that diminish ICANN's purpose?
- Is it possible to spin off the IANA Function & have it remain responsible to the US Gov
- Open up Affirmation of commitments to other governments? Expand ties rather than break ties?
- Clearly defined role for Governements
- How to Govts participate/Role of GAC
- Ensure that IG process is not dominated by large commercial players & governments/be inclusive
- Improved policy processes that are predictable
- Improve & evolve governance mechanisms?
- Use of Existing types of tools?
- You won't notice it (the governance) it will not disrupt open internet

- Need to institutionalize and strengthen multi-stakeholder model
- Establish goals for IG
- Role for gov't, private sector
- Self regulatory instead of enforcing
- NGO, Interpol, FBI roles
- Define issues across globe
- GAC restructure
- Increase ICANN representation
- Level of representatives w/in GAC increased – Participate
- Engage at different levels of gov't
- Support of high level
- Awareness at higher level
- Separate ICANN role from internet structures
- Programs on IG
- Basic infrastructure
- WG to support program
- Role of the US, still firmly there despite the changes
- More and more govts care and participate
- Biggest issue is the legitimization, how to enforce the law in another country.
- GAC more effective in its own functioning,
- Recognize countries autonomy
- More engagement and awareness of governments
- Reserve expenses issue “ICANN Expertise” to follow out participate problem for smaller gov. Also there are a number of IG orgs to follow
- Bring more awareness – regional offices and regional meeting
- New people and constituencies will come
- ICANN continue facilitates coming in.
- What’s the difference between ICANN – IGF”
- No decision taken but discussion that will influence how things should be done – not the what and the why
- ICANN doesn’t have the monopoly on MSM currently the model within ICANN has created a lot of delays
- A good goal would be to develop a methodology MSM for problem solving.
- Needs to further improvement
- Currently different governance groups with different interests
- By 2018 hope they can converge and work closer/share interests
- Work with a common goal to retain open internet
- What is the ideal way the organizations and the internet should function to retain specialization but keep common goal with transparency (even in ICANN itself)
- ICANN can move to this ideal by the sharing of stakeholder issues and sharing ideas and meetings
- Help develop industry and government response not necessarily imposition and rules

- To maintain and manage new gTLDs
- Outreach democratic
- Feel engaged
- Language: message more
- Understandable
- Getting a stronger voice in the multi-Stakeholder model
- Develop discussion packages to be used at local workshops for input to the governance process.
- How to make engagements with multilateral organizations
- Not a form to update cross communication
- Ex for IECD <-> ICANN – ITU <-> ICANN
- A lot of organizations on cyber-security – cross coordination
- GAC > 100 countries disproportionate rule of 1 member, ones security is education
- Formation of GAC should limited terms
- Going back to the gov't
- What about best practice
- ICANN set goals and recommendation engagement recommendation
- More liaison ICANN and different ministries Gov't dept.
- Education
 - Not engaging enough with users
 - Need to public education – grow people to engage with ICANN
- Media development underreported Jargon puts people off --> specially in developing new energy
- Mentorship program
- Awareness / Education/Visibility
- Capacity Building
- Strengthening of relationships with governments in developing countries
- What is the position of ICANN on the enforcement of internet governance policies. ICANN policies should permeate national gov't developmental objectives
- Maintaining system for implementation process of ICANN policies
- How does ICANN balance the principle of privacy of communication and the security needs of Governments?
- Increase in population Slow increase in number of devises
- Diversity, language will grow
- IDNS in every language
- Capacity building and harmonization of legal environment with both national and international law
- Technology development should be in line with increasing “internetificata”
- Stable relationship between ICANN and its stakeholders in governance.
- Increase awareness and engagement ICANN with national government international
- Digital inclusion involving developing countries
- Registrars should have responsibility towards national “govts”

- Fundamental rights should inform every level of the organization
- Skills development modules with simplified social infographics to educate young developers from infancy to understand coding conrad@hashtagsa.com
- Need to consider demands from individual constituents not only GAC
- More capacity building in Africa and developing country. – Law enforcement and user information
- More awareness some people in Africa don't know about ICANN
- Develop Countries 1) Simple coding classes that can be taught to rural citizens – with progressive classes for talented students crowd-source differently
- Transparency! Work across the ecosystem: listen, engage, collaborate
- Focus on DNS Technical Mission – stay away from politics
- It looks like ITU
- GAC Should advise their Governments and give opinions to ICANN Board
- Couldn't agree more (with above)
- (robert.barker@stanfordalumni.org) Governance implies ownership. When a thing is governed, it is controlled by a governing body, usually in a fiduciary capacity for someone else or for other entities. The concept of the internet is that it is not owned, but as sovereign governments are quick to remind us in time of war, it can be owned based on the will of a sovereign,

Governance is a difficult concept to embrace in connection with ICANN's mission, since the concept of property implies both the right to use a property and the right to exclude another from using that property.

The internet does not make its own law, nor does it override the property rights that apply in the countries that use the internet. So if China wants to monitor usage in certain ways, that is a sovereign prerogative that it is not likely to give up. Similarly, if the US, after obtaining all the necessary legal authorizations, monitors and stores, then it is up to the people of the US, not the internet governing body, to change the property rights that attach to internet usage in the United States. In some countries, internet usage will be limited, for example, by limiting pornography or anti-government statements. Those restrictions should have no bearing on the restrictions imposed -- or not imposed -- in other countries, and legal liabilities should not cross national boundaries just because the internet does.

ICANN should continue to monitor the legal rights and property rights that attach to the internet -- each country should be represented, both in a sovereign capacity and, where possible, from its citizenry, The council so comprised should publish any deviations from public ownership and usage in the countries using the internet, and make "best practices" available for sharing. The charter of that council, however, should make it clear that it cannot control property right access to any sovereign or person.

- (Van Roste – CENTR; peter@centr.org) The Internet Governance ecosystem should be regarded as an environment where, through expertise and experience based contributions, all stakeholders support the further development of an open and affordable Internet. In this context, ICANN has an important role to play. Not only because of the fact that its mission is critical to the functioning of the Internet, but also because it has a unique decade long experience working as a multi-stakeholder model with a strong track record (with the introduction of IDNs as a prime example). Through its own stakeholders and communication channels, ICANN can also help raising awareness on the importance of an inclusive and bottom-up approach to IG. Without broader recognition and awareness, the IG ecosystem risk to lock itself up in an ivory tower.

ICANN should not strive to steer the IG ecosystem, but be seen as a strong, respected and neutral contributor to advocate the models values.

- I appreciate the holistic view of the governance of the internet! I note that the future is uncertain, working to make it enjoyable for everyone!
- (klaus.stoll@gkpfoundation.org) Internet Governance today resembles a country where 1% of the population governs 99% of the population and 98% of these don't even know that the 1% exist!

In the past IG could be sustained through the engagement and action of a few. What fundamentally changed is that IG today concerns and affects everybody, everywhere, connected or not! Today, everybody has a vital interest and stake in the IG processes. IG as a multi stakeholder process today is only sustainable when it is based on the awareness, knowledge and informed participation of all its stakeholders. IG as an open, legitimate and functioning multi stakeholder process is under threat if it has not a global general awareness about its function and issues at its root.

A broad involvement of all in IG is in the vital self interest of all stakeholders in the Internet ecosystem today. As more people engage and participate in IG as more the existing governance structures will have to reevaluate and reform themselves in an organic ongoing process. The processes of renewal of IG will not be a revolutionary one but as an ongoing process of evaluation and reform.

IG has to make the awareness and involvement of the general public a priority. An INFORMED global public, will participate in the making of INFORMED choices that will result in INFORMED policy making, resulting in the sustained development of the common good we call the Internet and Information technologies. IG has to become a topic of common debate and interest for everybody like peace, the environment and climate change are.

It can only become so, through a joint outreach, information and capacity building campaign by all those currently involved in IG. No single organization, including ICANN, can and should implement such a campaign on its own. A joint initiative, that is based on the creation of win/win situation and the respect of all stakeholders needs and abilities will also open up much needed spaces and opportunities of exchange and collaboration.