

20140113_STRATEGYPANELWEBINAR1_ID845898

Alice Jansen:

Greetings. My name is Alice Jansen. It's a pleasure for me to welcome you to this session one, Strategy panel on ICANN's role in the internet Governance ecosystem webinar. Before we begin, I'd like to briefly remind all participants of housekeeping items. This webinar is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. This session is being streamed through the Adobe Connect room. If you have any comments or questions, please join the Adigo bridge. Your lines are currently muted and will be muted throughout the presentation. You may submit questions or comments via the Adobe Connect chat call during the presentation. At the end of the presentation you will be given the opportunity to voice your comments and questions during the Q&A. All lines will be unmuted for the Q&A. If you are on the bridge, please remember to mute your computer speakers once the floor is open to avoid echo. If you wish to speak during the Q&A, please raise your hand in the Adobe Connect room to be added to the queue. Should you not be speaking, please mute your line using star-six. Dial star-seven to unmute. This line's recording and transcript will be made available following this session. You may find the housekeeping indications in your Adobe Connect notes pod. With that we'll turn to Vint Cerf, our strategy panel chair.

Vint Cerf:

Good afternoon or good morning or good evening, everyone. My name is Vint Cerf and it is my pleasure to join you today in a discussion where we are in the ICANN ecosystem panel. This is one of several panels created by Fadi Chehade, the CEO of ICANN to help evaluate ICANN's role in internet governance and our task is to speak to the ecosystem in which ICANN sits. May I have the next slide, please?

Here you see the charge that was given to the panel. I don't propose to read through all of the text. I'm sure that you can see this as well as I can. I want you to understand the scope of the panel's charge. It's actually fairly substantial in the sense that we're looking for insights into how ICANN fits into this complex ecosystem, in particular with regard to his responsibilities and stewardship role for the unique parameters associated with the internet's operation.

We're also looking for guiding principles that should inform our evolution into the evolving ecosystem and particularly the continued use of the multi-stakeholder model. We hope that these ideas will inform as well our interactions with other bodies on a national and international level. In the end, the committee hopes to provide a roadmap identifying milestones that might be sought or achieved along the way towards this improved internet governance ecosystem. If we could go to the next slide, please?

Here you see some of the assumptions that can be made about ICANN's history. As all of you will know, Jon Postel really served as the internet assigned numbers authority and the RFC editor for many, many years until his death in 1998 which sadly but coincidentally occurred just as ICANN was being created in response to an invitation and ultimate delegation of responsibility from the Department of Commerce to ICANN to perform these functions.

We assumed at the beginning that a multi-stakeholder structure was preferred and we organized ICANN around that notion. We also assumed that we should be taking a heuristic approach to internet governance issues as we explored their nature and adapted

to them. I'm sure many of you have seen the evolution of ICANN structures as we try to learn more about internet governance and our role in it has evolved. Our intent was to build legitimacy by simply doing our job well. However, when it comes to specific things like lending, representation also seems to be important. So, you can see the supporting organization structure reflecting that. Participation is key to a successful multi-stakeholder operation.

We also believe that non-internet issues -- for example, what's a country? -- should not be addressed by ICANN but rather in other venues or through other venues that have the authority to make those judgments. We also assume it's important not to break any laws in the course of operating ICANN. We also believe that ICANN should not have to deal with content issues although I think semantics has become a potential hazard for us in the domain name space. There is a strong belief in the community that ICANN should stay focused on its mission and not grow that mission. And finally it is assumed that cooperation among the entities that make up the ecosystem is important even in the presence of competition. I'd like to go to the next slide please.

Here we have a few observations which will remind you that the internet has been around for 40 years in design and 30 years in operation. It began as a very cooperative effort among many organizations and it continues to exhibit this cooperative spirit. A number of US government R&D agencies were involved initially and I think many of you know that other R&D agencies around the world became involved, certainly especially in the 1980s. This has been in many respects an academic and government evolution with the private sector becoming a very significant part as the internet continued to grow.

The commercial equipment providers showed up in the 1980s and commercial service came in the late 1980s here in the United States and I think also in other parts of the world and certainly becoming far more permanent in the 1990s as the worldwide web unfolded. I think it's fair to say that stewardship has been key to internet success and this sense of responsibility for stewardship has colored I think in a positive way the role that ICANN has played and the role which it will have to play in future. And finally, ICANN, the creation was motivated by an interest by the US government to move policy development in this space into the private sector. Next slide, please?

We debated governance and its definition for awhile and concluded that the sensible thing to do was to accept the World Summit on the Information Society definition at least at the start and so as you see, the development and application by governments, the private sector, and civil society in their respective roles, the shared principles, rules, decision making procedures, and programs that shape the evolution of the internet. Whether this definition of governance will serve us well in future is going to be determined but this is where we start at least in the discussions that this panel is undertaking. If I could have the next slide, please?

Here I think it's important for you to recall and appreciate how diverse the ecosystem in which the internet operates and in which governance needs to be undertaken really is. The actors in this space are extremely diverse in their size, their natures, and their function. Some are in the private sector. Some are in academics. Some are part of the technical community. Some are in government. Some are in civil society. These institutions and organizations are extremely diverse. We've also -- and you'll see later -- been able to evaluate or at least assess some of these interest by looking at the layer functionality of the internet itself as a way of organizing the way in which various actors operate and the way in which their interests are expressed. And finally, I think it's important to recognize that in this ecosystem, there is a web of relationships among the actors. There are different ways in which those relationships are expressed. Some involve coordination, some collaboration, some subordination. Some involve tension and friction and all of these characteristics are exhibited in this complex ecosystem that we're trying to understand. Can we have the next slide, please?

Here you see from the ICANN point of view and I want to emphasize that this is chart that was produced to look at things from the ICANN point of view. It does not necessarily express all the possible relationships among all of the various parties in this ecosystem. But from the ICANN point of view, if you look at the lower right-hand side you see a strong sense of stewardship and responsibility for the unique identifiers in the internet space and that stewardship relationship expresses a lot of what goes on inside of ICANN. Then you find that ICANN is involved in coordination among a set of players that is very close to this unique identifier space as you see in the coordination bubble over on the left-hand side, the root server operators and internet society, internet technical task force and so on.

So, there is completely on the coordination that ICANN is tasked to undertake in order to carry out its role. And finally on the upper right-hand side, a number of other entities that are even larger in scope -- the World Intellectual Property Organization, the Internet Governance Forum, national governments, UNESCO, and so on, ITU, are all part of a larger space in which ICANN participates. And so this chart is intended to remind us of the various types of relationships that ICANN needs to cater to in order to carry out its work and of course in order to evolve its responsibilities as the internet continues to evolve and change. The next slide, please?

This is another example and I don't want you to imagine that this is complete. It's simply to remind you that there are many different ways of looking at the actors in the internet space. You can see them from the standpoint of what sector they belong in, whether it's public or industry or social or technical or maybe you could look at it from the incentive point of view, what drives a particular actor, what is the motivation, stewardship being a vital part of ICANN's operations, as to international incentives or research or legal or political incentives can also inform the behavior of a particular actor in this space. And then there is of course an institutional view. Are you an academic institution, business institution, a governmental one? I want to remind you that some actors in this space actually span more than one part of these different perspectives. It's not a smart move to try to assign a pigeon hole for every actor in the internet ecosystem space.

I want to hand over now to Debbie Monahan who has some things to say about stewardship in particular. So, Debbie, I hand it over to you now.

Debbie Monahan:

Thanks, Vint. Well, we looked at the needs of our team based on the specific regions and we thought it would be appropriate to start our slide with a haiku and also I thought that might be to describe haiku but not define it. In many ways, this is the challenge of describing internet governance. We can describe it but it cannot be fully defined. The beauty of a haiku and of the internet is the you read the poem in your own way. So, our haiku starts with a brief haiku and also looks incomplete. So, the haiku is the internet. It can be translated in hundreds of different ways. Haikus also seem to be out of order for some and many times are open to interpretation. The utility, popularity, and richness of the internet ensures that we will continue to innovate, increasing the complexity of the whole internet system.

As such, it is evolving so that the internet is over everything and everyone and everything is over the internet. Although we do not have to take the finality too far, we believe this is an appropriate way to start our thinking about stewardship. The internet emerges after a long term of a series of experiments and developments in collaboration with government, academia, and private sector. The entity is now a global digital communication and information platform that continues to evolve and grow in scope. What the internet means to us today will be different in a decade and it will also be different from people around the globe. Next slide, please?

As the internet grows and more participants get involved, we need different and in a sense develop to make change. Those have shown us that many groups associated with the internet today has altered from initiatives driven by a range of different stakeholders,

including the technical community and the government. The flexibility in the multi-stakeholder approach has been key in the development of the internet as the range of stakeholders involved continues to improve making various entities involved and how they relate an increasing complex task. What emerges from this initiative is a web of documented relationships and commitments and responsibilities among the many participants with specific roles in operations, governance, maintenance, and evolution. Next slide, please?

Among many active in the internet ecosystem, some through academic and research interests, some focused on economic goals, some have political and societal objectives, some primarily serve the needs of the individuals under their protection. So, the increasing pervasive nature of the internet all act to take the common interests and well functioning of the overall infrastructure and a common concern that it is not abused.

So, none of these actors on their own have the capacity to address these issues, let alone create and maintain a safe environment for them. Furthermore, there is an inescapable connection among actors. The actions of one may impact the others, including the reporters. We have therefore a shared responsibility to organize the governance of the common infrastructure and maintain a safe environment.

To save time, looking to language that illustrates the way the responsibilities influence the operations, evolution, and government, which is used among many actors in the internet ecosystem, these motivations brought to mind in terms of stewardship and shared responsibilities and in a deliberate metaphor, it comes down to the notion of entanglement in quantum theories. In these theories, the sight of two or more entangled particles is not to the union of your state. Rather the bridge is merely a single state achieved by all participants. The notion translates into a kind of entangled responsibility for the well being of the internet. It is an inescapable transporter containment among the actors in the internet ecosystem in the supply to government as well. All actors in state governance do so with entangled responsibilities. That means there's no one actor with total control of the ecosystem or government. ICANN is one of those actors. When we refer to enhancing ICANN stewardship in the evolving ecosystem, we are not referring to ICANN enhancing their control. It's important the use of the word stewardship is understood.

From the panel series, stewardship means caring more for the good management and evolution of a shared resource rather than each individual's stake in it. It could be likened to a guardianship role particularly in the domain name side while recognizing and providing for the range of stakeholders involved. Stewardship involves providing principles for how we manage, develop, and protect the site and ensure we avoid activities that may result in imbalances and deficits. Next slide, please?

For some time we've been comfortable with describing the internet technical architecture through a layered model, specific domains and operations. Although there are different ways to look at these layers, at the bottom of the model there's almost always the infrastructure layer, the highway and maintenance, and that layer is closely accompanied by a logical layer of protocols that transfer data including the TCPIP protocols and the management of the domain name system.

At the top of the layer model, most scholars agree there's a content layer, complete technical operations, lists for policies such as copyrights and free exhibitions are most directly implicated. As questions of trust, identify, and human rights gain the spotlight in internet policy, we support the view of an additional social layer which provides an additional means towards stratifying the relevant institutions with the ongoing and handling of policy issues. This new layer would deal with principles that define paramount rights and principles associated a social conduct online.

The slide you can see now conceptualizes in order to trigger discussion about what institutions and stakeholder groups could legitimately be involved in policy issues. It is an overview of these layers that gives a rough and incomplete approximation of governance institutions within them.

Under the current multi-stakeholder internet government ecosystem, no individual stakeholder or influencer plays a dominant role in governance but instead participates on equal footing with the influence of the other constitutions, local policy makers, and regulatory forums with participation in government bodies like the ICU.

Government structures for the internet have emerged principally and largely out of necessity on an issue by issue basis. As such, the internet has seen a constant state of challenge arise and institutions have arisen both formal and informal to address these challenges, including the creation of ICANN in 1998 to give a dedicated home to the coordinating system of unique enterprise known as the internet after the internet was open to commercial activity.

If you had to select one word to characterize the internet governance ecosystem it would have to be diversity. The system is populated by individuals, small or large formal and informal groupings, organizations, and institutions, both from the private sector, academia, civil society, and government, as well as intergovernmental and non-government organizations across the globe. This array of actors and institutions is motivated by their own interests, all of which may not be aligned but all of which imply some connection to the internet. In this kind of intergovernmental regime, you have to take into account the entities in the ecosystem and the interests that motivate their direction. Individuals in this ecosystem may have an interest in authority. There may be friction among the actors resulting from real or perceived outlooks and part of the objectives of an internet governance regime should be to identify effects or create mechanisms to resolve them in a constructive session. Next slide, please?

Where does all this take us? Applying the layered model to the internet ecosystem, the objectives of all parties involved allow the discussion of the responsibilities and help identify what may benefit from being formalized and how does it all fit in the globalization of ICANN? It may also be that effecting the approach to policy development may help the changing environments, that a one-size-fits-all approach is not necessarily in the best interests of the environments. It may also allow us to teach certain parties acknowledged and accommodated and also avoid disagreements.

The respective parts of internet governance may be applicable. Again, stewardship recognizes the range of actors involved and identifies the best entities to work with others to develop the respective roles. There is no such definition although we have guiding principles as shown on this slide, caring more for the good management and evolution of the shared resource than the individual's stake in it. It's a guardianship role, particularly the domain name side, providing for the range of stakeholders involved which involves providing principles for how we develop the space and ensure that we prevent harm or activities that may result in imbalances. The slide shows all the actions involved in this governance. I think I'll hand it back to you, Vint.

Vint Cerf:

Thank you very much. Hang on just a second. Thank you very much. I wanted to make one observation. It's Vint Cerf speaking again. First of all, I'm enjoying the chat from many of the participants. I hope we're capturing all of that. Your immediate reactions are actually quite helpful. Some of these slides are quite notional in their character. I hope you'll allow us some latitude there. I'd like to turn the microphone now over to Alejandro Pisanty who has two slides on principles which are going to be quite important because they will inform some of the other high level panels that will be meeting after us as to principles that will help guide our evolution of internet governance. Alejandro, over to you now.

- Alejandro Pisanty: Thank you. Can you hear me well?
- Vint Cerf: Yes. But the people who are really listening to you can't tell you that. They won't be able to because they're muted until we get to the discussion period. Please proceed.
- Alejandro Pisanty: Hi, everybody. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, wherever you are. The panel works with this, this is one of our charges, looking at the guidelines that orient ICANN's interaction in the intergovernmental ecosystem. These principles are written in a very extensive section, principles for internet governance, and subfields have been proposed. Some of them are really mathematical, even from -- they are really concerned with a number of issues on different points of view. So, these are principles that have proven to be useful, principles that are in the bylaws, principles coming from places like ccTLD managers and many others. In the documents published with the report, these will be in a bit more detail of course. One of the things we mostly say that I want to remark right now is these principles are expressed in more detail, twice each. Once for what we perceive to be the internet governance ecosystem, and the second one, more and more specific wording for ICANN. So, briefly, these principles, we have a longer list of very compelling and something that should be open for discussion that we want to provoke.
- The first one is stewardship, making sure that ICANN has the principle of stewardship, the principle of caring for the -- again, needed in more detail but for the common group of the internet, that's the stewardship function, but it's a problem, caring for the internet. And then the ICANN should acknowledge actions by a group of stewardship resources which are charged with the coordination of DNS and coordination of the IT system and parameters. And together with this stewardship we'd like to propose the cooperation and operational recently that ICANN internally looks for the maximum cooperation amongst the different organizations, advisory council, members of these and all other participants and also approaches the internet governance ecosystem. There are many other participants looking to explore cooperation. This is not a competition in the fact that we're supposed to -- the agency that brought this as a competition is -- all forms of competitive behavior, among there is an occasional -- cooperation should be first.
- The second principle comes from internationality. We felt that we have had a final word to see that there are many proposals to internet governance that are not necessarily thinking of functionality or the internationality of the internet. ICANN focuses half the time that the internet has been open to the public, 15 out of the last 30 years, so there has been a lot of opportunity to observe and grow the ability of the internet and the IP addresses and to make sure that all is keeping apparently a normal option provided by technology but also go forward from the fundamental permutations.
- So, piracy and the capabilities are very important for all these operating principles where I can hand the responsibility to another when the opportunity comes, to grow along documented decisions, so they're documented and a lot of ICANN changes in the bylaws have documented procedures. Another important thing is the conclusion of reaching out to our diverse community and participants as much as possible and use fairness in all actions. ICANN has to work very hard for these principles of cooperation to multi-stakeholders as much as possible and the organizations cooperate with ICANN in general in documenting.
- The next slide, the evolution of internet governance, a very important principle for us is form should follow function. Things should be done only as needed. If you need a mechanism to support governance in emerging technology, wait until it's actually proven to be necessary and then have the form of that mechanism follow the function instead of creating structures which will be trying to perform, fulfill this instead of actually trying to solve and I would mention this has been very successful and the internet governance has been good at this problem solving approach.

Finally, the form follows functions, we have two more principles here which are important to observe. One of them which has been very successful is solving the problems in general as close to where the problem actually exists instead of trying to take a very general approach which will actually not be able to identify the details that face the problem properly.

And loose coupling has been part of the history of the internet governance and working with agencies like the internet governance report and things like the working group and other mechanisms for internet governance in operation for half the operations and the loose coupling means awareness of questions formed, warnings, and general a cooperative approach where possible. But not a call for coordination and call for allowing for the shaping and evolution of the internet and the emergence of it. So, that will be that for the presentation of principles.

Vint Cerf: There is another slide, Alejandro, which also addresses the principles. Can you also take that?

Alejandro Pisanty: I'm sorry. I'm looking at that one now. We go over these principles in another view which is the relationships which I already mentioned in the first more extensive one. Respect for other organizations and respect for freedom of choice and for diversity. This principle which can be expressed in several ways including the services and acceptance. This relationship principle which means you reach out to work and explain and give the rights to the operations and around these principles which I feel the models and theories are measured and tested against this and for example ICANN formal review mechanisms. The response from these are actually taken into decisions. Sorry for having skipped that.

Vint Cerf: Not a problem. Thank you very much, Alejandro. Let me now go on to the next slide, please. This is a relatively empty slide and the reason is that those of you who are participating in today's call and the call on Wednesday are going to help us identify milestones that might be appropriate for the evolution of ICANN's involvement in the internet governance ecosystem. So, we await your discussion at the end of this call coming up very shortly. The panelists are then charged with identifying reasonable milestones that we should recommend. I would also point out that these may not be easily ordered in time and some of them may simply be independent of each other and they're simply milestones identifying ICANN's evolved relationships with other parties who are in the system.

If I can have the next slide, I'd like to illustrate some of the kinds of questions that we are looking to answer or looking for help to answer. And again, I don't suggest that I read these completely in the interest of time. But you can see from the first element, the first question is trying to understand how we reduce tension and friction which has arisen in the past in the context of internet governance. Ideally we'd like to resolve tensions and reduce friction wherever possible. I also wanted to comment on something Alejandro said which is the ideal outcome is relatively loose point, not clockwork environment because we have to be adaptable and resilient to change.

Another issue with regard to ICANN is how we think about globalization. We make ICANN responsible to stakeholders around the world with varying interests and varying conditions beyond where it currently has reached. Another thing which is important is the nature of ICANN's relationships with other organizations and whether there are milestones for change in those relationships that would improve the internet governance system, at least the part that ICANN has responsibility for. Are there things we should be differently? And finally, if you have general comments about topics we failed to address so far or you think should be a priority, we'd like to hear that as well. If I could have the next slide, please?

We're preparing to turn the microphones on. There's some logistics associated with that but I want to emphasize before you begin your spoken responses and comments that we

would benefit enormously from getting texts from you. This is partly for purposes of clarity. We have two options for you. One is to send an email to the IOE panel at IPN.org or if you wish, you could participate in a survey which incorporates the five questions that I listed in the previous slide that you can respond to. Of course one of those is a very general question. Again, the utility of having text responses is significant and we invite you to participate in that way.

Alice? Are there specific things now that you need to tell the participants before we begin the oral part?

Alice Jansen: Yes. Thank you, Vint. We will now open the floor and unmute the lines. We will refer to the hand space in the Adobe Connect room to create a queue. We ask that you please mute your line to avoid echo. You may do so by pressing star-six. To unmute, press star-seven. If you are in the queue, please make sure the computer speakers are muted before speaking to avoid echo. Thank you for your cooperation. Operator? Please unmute the lines.

Operator: Listen-only mode is now off.

Alice Jansen: Okay, Vint. You may now proceed.

Vint Cerf: I see Mikey O'Connor. Alice? Do you want to manage this process? Mikey, you're on.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Vint. This is Mikey. I figured I'd break the ice. I love this. I think it's really good work. I agree with a lot of the comments in the chat. The pictures are terrific and I'll send you some. The thing that I'm really interested in and I'm not sure that this is entirely governance but I'll throw it out here as I've been throwing it everywhere is that at the bottom of the multi-stakeholder process it's a very small group of people that do a lot of the heavy lifting and to the extent that we can broaden that group of people, I think it will improve a lot of the dimensions that we're talking about here. The thought that came to be today as I was watching this is that the needs that we have in ICANN to broaden our base are very similar to the needs that all of the participants in the ecosystem have and that maybe we could do some sort of cross-community effort where it's across the participants in the ecosystem rather than just within ICANN and I'll send you a little email about this but I'll also paste a blog post into the chat for folks that want to look at that. Thanks. Great job.

Vint Cerf: Thank you very much, Mikey. Let me remind you and all the other listeners there is another panel on essentially participation in the governance process that Deb is leading. So, we would be teamed with leaders from her panel as well. I'll make sure that what you suggest to us also gets to her because it should inform some of their thinking. Thank you for that. Who's next?

Alice Jansen: We have no hands raised in the Adobe Connect room.

Vint Cerf: Here we go. Olivier? I see your hand is up.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Vint. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond for the transcript. You know I can't just leave a queue with no hands without putting my hand up. I'd like to thank the panel for all this work so far. It's very refreshing to see a fresh look at the whole multi-stakeholder and how that works within ICANN. I'm very pleased to approve those 5 Rs which certainly seem to resonate very well with what's needed for everyone's input to be taken into account. I would really like to see how that can be implemented. The only question I have is actually just a small one. It's with regards to the input you're waiting for at the moment to come into the period. How is that -- I'm asking this because I think the at-large community may wish to put together as a group to those questions. How long do we have to get back to you?

- Vint Cerf: Thank you. That was certainly an oversight on my part. We're hoping to have responses back by the end of this month, 31 January. We kind of have a deadline to have at least a preliminary draft of our report also by that time. So, I would encourage you to try to get it in before that time. I think we also have to give ourselves and you and others an opportunity to digest what you've seen so far. So, until the 31 January essentially earlier is better. Thank you. We're waiting for other comments. By the way, I also notice that the written comments are easily obtained. You've all been chatting quite effectively. In some sense those may turn out to be more useful. If you're waiting your turn, say something. Okay. Hang on just a second. Olivier, you're back up again.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks very much. I have a question that keeps popping into my head and we had in a chat earlier. You mentioned shared responsibilities and I wondered whether that is also shared accountability by any chance?
- Vint Cerf: That's a very interesting question. Let me tell you that of late I have been reading a lot about quantum physics. One of the weirdest things about quantum physics is entanglement. The more I read about it the more I scratch my head but the more I recognize that this ensemble of organizations and even individuals has a kind of entangled responsibility for what happens to the internet. Governance is not strictly a function of institutions. It's what you and I chose to do. I think your point about entangled or shared accountability is a good one. I think our task in the panel is to try to characterize some of these ideas in a way that can be used to do something with as opposed to simply observe. I don't know how that accountability would work but it reminds me a little bit of checks and balances in the American constitutional system where you have parties who cannot dominate the other two because of the sort of -- what is that children's game? Paper, rock, and scissors? I think your idea of shared accountability might fall into that category of checks and balances.
- We're hearing some background chat from someone who's probably not asking a question. Can you please mute if you're not actually on the call? Thank you. I see. Okay. Yes. Taylor? I see. That's fine. The preliminary report is expected at the end of the month. We will undoubtedly have to go through a few iterations after that. Olivier appears to be the spokesperson for the otherwise silent crowd. Olivier?
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much. I'm starting to think it's Christmas. I just wonder looking at the questions of interest which are on the -- I was wondering with regards to the relationships, the ICANN relationships with other organizations, you mentioned other organizations per say. Were you going to focus specifically on specific organizations? Or I mentioned civil societies for example on the chat. Of course there are hundreds out there, big and small, that are in civil society. The internet as a group was not grown by just a handful of very large organizations but in fact many smaller organizations in their own part of the world built the internet we have today. I see the governance taking a similar path and that's generally by people for people. So, are you going to hone in on some smaller organizations as well? To what extent are you going to determine what kind of organizations ICANN can develop relationships with?
- Vint Cerf: I want to remind you first that that activity is looking at participation at civil society within the context of policy making. So, our major activity at ICANN is development of policy for the management that these unique parameters and in that case, I think the interaction among organizations will be colored by how that works. In terms of other organizations that have responsibility in the internet governance space, some of them having to do with technical matters, some of them having to do with law enforcement, some having to do with regulatory matters and the like, all of those will have to be taken into account as we ask ourselves what relationships do we have now, how should they evolve, and what milestones are there for them, what relationships do we not yet have or which relationships are essentially undocumented, should they be documented, and how? So, your point about civil society is almost likely to be heavily influenced by the outcome of the participation panel.

I would like to mention one other speculation which we've had. That is that the way we have done policy at ICANN historically has tended to be very much organizationally structured. In other words we set up the supporting organizations and we assign certain policy development responsibility to those supporting organizations. Some of us are looking at the IETF activity which has a somewhat different structure. An issue arises and a birds of a feather session is undertaken to determine if there's interest in dealing with that issue. If there's enough interest than a working group is formed and parties who are interested in the problem participate. So, it's much less a question of organizational representation than it is a question of bringing ideas to the table. It is entirely possible that that mode of operation will be feasible for at least some of the policy issues that ICANN faces.

I see that Gregory has his hand up also. Gregory? Gregory? Are you there? Your hand is up. Maybe he's talking to himself. Thank you. We're looking at Gregory typing for those of you who might not be on the chat list. This is certainly an interesting way of interacting, isn't it? So many different modalities all at the same time. Gregory asks what kind of relationship do you see with governmental organizations? I think the answer is several, Gregory. The obvious one for ICANN of course is the Governmental Advisory Committee. But that's clearly not the only one because we also have as the picture that we showed earlier with the three bubbles showing cooperation, coordination, and participation, there are other government organizations that have influence on internet governance in one way or another. A good example of this would be the discussion about the WHOIS system which has all kinds of implications for privacy and business operations and law enforcement and the like. So, we are almost certain to have a lot of other interactions with many others.

I've been reminded that if you're looking at the Adobe Connect website you should be seeing these five questions we brought up. These are not the only ones we're looking for answers to. They're just some we're interested in hearing your reactions to. Okay, Gregory, I see that you said on the local level -- you mean inside of countries, not on a global level. This is an interesting question with regards to ICANN because it's responsibility is essentially global in scope. To the extent that there are local interactions, they are often a consequence of the hierarchically structured relationships. For example the IRR will treat with countries at the local level. I'm less clear that there are specific interactions at the ICANN level that are country specific interactions inside of countries other than those that occur through the GAC. But perhaps you have some ideas and we should pursue that I'm not thinking about?

I see that Evan has raised his hand. Evan, Gregory was typing an answer. Let's see if we can get that from him and then we'll go on to you, Evan. This is Evan Leibovitch. Gregory says the best way to involve ICANN structures in the internet -- okay. We'll have to take that at another time. Evan? Please, you have the floor.

Evan Leibovitch:

Thanks a lot. Vint, I want to go back to something you were saying a couple minutes ago when you were saying interested parties will show up at the table. One of the challenges that I found through my time in at-large is trying to get to the table people who would not otherwise know about what's going on or are effective by what's going on but don't necessarily have money in the game. They don't have reputation in the game. And really if they didn't know about it, they wouldn't even -- the challenge sometimes is even getting the word out. In at-large which I happen to think is probably one of ICANN's best inventions in terms of bottom up and multi-stakeholder but we have a massive challenge in trying to do our task which is trying to give the perspective of internet end users. End users that don't have a financial stake, that don't have a reputational stake, that don't have governments paying for them to be there or whatever.

What do you see ongoing in terms of trying to deal with a situation where you say -- Yes, we want to have interested people at the table. But what do you do what you have a

massive community of end users that are impacted by what is going on but they don't even know what they don't know in terms of they don't -- trying to educate the public, trying to get feedback from the public, trying to find out what's in the public interest. People who have money in the game, people who have other things in the game have a reason to be here. So, they're self-motivated. How do you deal with the challenge of trying to properly get the point of view of internet end users that are impacted by everything that's going on here without actually -- while they don't actually have enough of a financial stake or the time availability or whatever to bring them to the table.

Vint Cerf:

It's a good question. Let me try to respond in two different ways. One is the only way we've ever been able to deal with this kind of scaling, three to five billion users, it's not possible to have a obvious and straight forward conference call with five billion people on the call. I think there are a couple of answers. The at-large answer has been to build these hierarchical structures and then hope you can get feedback in both directions. You get information to the edges about what's going on and why it's important and then information coming back up the other way. There's a good example in the IETF making us notice that there are people who have never physically been at a IETF meeting and yet they're very important contributors to it.

So, part of the process in the IETF for standardizing involves a last call which is online. Of course there's lots of interaction online as well leading up to any particular proposal but it's always intended that the final outcome is not to be dictated by who could afford to fly to a place and be physically in that location. So, that's one kind of answer. I think though that it's a really hard question to deal with the scaling. And here I think that Beth Novak's group might help us a little bit because she's looking at that kind of problem as well. But I hope online is going to help us. The thing that does not respond to adequately are the people who are not online yet. Yet they are influencing and effected by plans, futures, incentives, motivations, investment, and everything else. There I think we have a big challenge ahead of us. I think we must try to find a way to draw attention to people who have not been part of this discussion and need to be.

Evan Leibovitch:

Just a quick follow up. ICANN has a ways to go in dealing with that. I've already been at meetings where everybody's standing up in the queue in the public forum gets essentially the same treatment as statements that have had to take months to consult and get online feedback and conference calls and yet someone stands up at the queue in the public forum and they get everyone's attention. There's a real -- I mean that as a start needs to be tackled in order to balance things out. When you have a situation where showing up at the meetings gets you heard better than the people who have to participate through virtual means, that puts the public interest at a real disadvantage.

Vint Cerf:

There's an interesting technique which is used in the legal world -- be careful, I'm an engineer pretending to be a lawyer for a moment. This is called standing. And in certain legal situations you're unable to engage unless you can demonstrate standing. It may very well be that what you described might be a metric, not necessarily absolute numbers but more a question of how the input is produced. Is it one person's opinion? Or is it an attempt at producing a consensus view on some point? I think that it's a really intriguing idea to try to establish this notion of standing. I'm not even sure it's the right one. But I thank you for bringing this up. It's clearly a challenge we have to address.

I have -- I'm sorry, I have a question from -- or is it a statement? It's a statement from Desiree. You know what? It's Vint again. I realize if I just shut up, this conversation will continue very, very well online. I do have a question for the people who are typing at each other. Does it look to you as if we ought to maintain some ongoing discussion like this for awhile? I know the chat is a way at the end of the call. I wonder if we should have a long-standing chat room of some sort. I don't know if that's possible. Maybe that's where the blog would come in?

Evan Leibovitch:

Or Skype chat.

- Vint Cerf: Yes. I'm just noticing that it's a lot easier for people to use this typed input than it is to wait your turn in the queue. I see the ubiquitous Mr. Crepin-Leblond is back with his hand up. Or is it your finger that's up, Olivier?
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I'm thinking I can't type. I'm terrible at typing. I can talk though. Just to ask one more question. When you mentioned the relationship that ICANN has with stakeholders, governments, the US government, et cetera, do you mean ICANN as in ICANN the organization led by its staff or ICANN including all of its stakeholder groups and various components? Because when one looks at the wider ICANN if you want, the supporting organizations and the advisory committees, there's a lot more networking of ICANN to the outside world than there is just by the official channel that Fadi Chehade might be opening or the global stakeholders might be openings. I wonder whether there has been any actually mapping of such engagements. To me it doesn't look as though that's been the case so far.
- Vint Cerf: That's a really interesting question. I hadn't even thought about the fact that there could be other relationships. Yes, Alejandro? Do you want to respond to this point?
- Alejandro Pisanty: Actually, you go on.
- Vint Cerf: I think it's actually very interesting point to be made here that ICANN policy making process may very well need to have ways of engaging with other institutions while the process is underway as opposed to being totally confined to ICANN. So, I actually think this is worth examining. Please, go ahead, Alejandro.
- Alejandro Pisanty: During the final discussions, we covered always this question, it's a recurring question, asking about ICANN in the broader sense or ICANN staff. What we'll use for the final report, it's very clear what we did on the sub committee or the DNS review, what works well. If you look at ICANN in three circle, the first core circle where it's essentially a command line and working staff receiving instructions from the CEO, a second layer where you have the support and members, where you have everybody that has some form of participation and commitment. There ICANN cannot command but it's part of the policy development and the cooperation you have in the community. The third layer is everything else that's out there where ICANN can mostly comment on contingency planning or very low working outreach in the community. We hope our selection of how to enroll people who are not participating there would consist of principles and make ICANN in places like the at-large more attractive, also working on the point of view of people who are moved by their interests, people who are defending interests, which might be contrary to or typical of a democracy function. So, we are very familiar with this question.
- Vint Cerf: Thank you. It occurs to be that we have other deficits in terms of participation. For example, I think that the operating community, people who actually run pieces of the internet, are less engaged than I think they could be. And we also have the problem that in the developing world where internet is still emerging and penetrating, that we don't get as much insight as I think we need in order to understand their situations and what problems they have to solve in order to become part of this community. I think looking for ways of engaging not only in the at-large sense but also in the technical and other academic communities for example might turn out to be important for ICANN as well.
- This is a comment from Mikey -- do you want to jump in a little further there? You said operating people can't understand why they're assigned to participate in ICANN. I'd suggest one answer to that may very well be that as the internet governance process begins to mature that ICANN and others may become important elements in policy development that would have an impact on operators. That should probably stimulate their participation. Do you have a different view of that?

- Mikey O'Connor: No, I don't disagree with that at all. The problem I run into all the time with operating folks which is the people I hang out with a lot is that investment to really get up to speed in ICANN and really be an effective participant is vastly larger than the kinds of issues that they see us resolving. I think one of the things that -- it does indeed -- a fair amount on this panel but also on this one, I think we need to get better in the outreach, in describing what's in it for them. Why should they care? What's the pay off for participating in ICANN and to let -- to Evan's point, how can we reduce the cost of that participation to a point where the costs and benefits are about equal. That's all I was trying to get at.
- Vint Cerf: Those are all perfectly good points. Let me -- I have Abdu -- I hope I said that right. Your hand is up. You have the floor. Abdu? Are you there? Are you muted? We're not hearing you. If we're not hearing you, perhaps the alternative is to type something, Abdu? His hand is back down again. Let's assume he's going to type something. We should have an anthropologist participating in this because I'm seeing a shift away from spoken dialogue towards typing because you apparently don't have to wait to type something. This is quite interesting.
- Alejandro Pisanty: I wanted to say also on the Adobe chat, the conversation is now going not so much. Can we -- but we must remember the final -- the role of ICANN in the intergovernmental -- together with things that we know or we'll hear that perhaps will be -- we will find it's very relevant to read and hear things people think are important for the global ecosystem. I am in a position to kick start that one -- he's seeking permission and avoiding the group to deal with things that are not ICANN proper and deal with things the way ICANN for example needs to experience on things like multi-stakeholder review may need to figure all them and how to balance that with the community mission. That would be very important.
- Vint Cerf: For those of you who are multitasking and also looking at the chat room, I'm reaching the conclusion that on Wednesday what we should do is make our oral presentation, allow for oral questions, but in fact encourage the conversation to take place in type form. Abdu, your hand is up. Are you able to speak now? We are not hearing you. That didn't work for some reason. Abdu, I don't know if you can hear me but maybe you can type something instead. Olivier, I see your hand is up.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much. Another question then. I'm looking at the questions of interest you have on the page here. I wonder whether there has been any question asked within the working group as to whether it is an ICANN remit to expand its relationships with other organizations and so on or whether it actually is exceeding its remit which in the view of some people is just to coordinate the internet identifiers. I'm asking this question not because I believe that myself but because I get asked this question quite often and quite a few people out there think ICANN is doing a lot more than what it should be doing and doing it using a lot more money than what it should be spending for doing it.
- Vint Cerf: Let me say that the panel discussion in my view has trended towards avoiding mission creep and avoiding expanding of the remit of ICANN. And I think that some people wish that ICANN's responsibilities could be very confined to the most technical aspects of what we do. Unfortunately that's turning out to be impossible because there are side effects of choices that are made in several dimensions whether it's which top level domains are executed or what the registry-registrar agreements look like or what the IP address allocations, what form the take and what rules apply, all have potential economic and sometimes political ramifications. So, it's inescapable that ICANN needs to interact with parties that are beyond the purely technical aspect of its job. I think that the big issue here and the way I would respond to this is that speaking just for myself is that ICANN would be well advised to stay confined to its primary responsibility but to build relationships with parties who are effected by its decisions even if those decisions are only about the unique parameters of the internet environment.

I just want to remind you that we will close the conference call at 3.30 which is about nine minutes from now whatever time you happen to be in. So, if you have something to say you probably should either plan to say it quickly or please send it either through the survey monkey to the email address. We appreciate the comments being made about how to organize this sort of online interaction. It's a tricky topic.

Now we can hear -- can you hear me when I'm typing? It sounds like shotguns going off. Perhaps, I don't know if we're able to reorganize ourselves for Wednesday necessarily but I think on Wednesday perhaps we will lean more heavily on the chat room for interaction after we've made our presentations because that seems to be a comfortable way for people to express themselves. Mikey, I see your point about multiple chat rooms. I don't know whether the Adobe Connect system would permit that. We'd have to look into that. Gregory, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead. We're not hearing you, Gregory.

I don't know about the rest of you, but I find this amazingly amusing. It's almost as if I'm sitting here, headset on, watching everybody type.

Alejandro Pisanty: It's the typing channel. Maybe you could ask again if there are questions from people who are typing? Otherwise you could end commenting on the call. I'm sorry you're not able to hear Gregory.

Vint Cerf: Yes. I don't understand why that didn't work.

Alejandro Pisanty: I'm signing off the chat now.

Vint Cerf: Okay. I think the chat has now gone completely off topic. So --

Alejandro Pisanty: Are you able to speak to Gregory?

Vint Cerf: Gregory was saying he typed his suggestion. I have his suggestion. He sent it to me. He says my suggestion is to start a process where ICANN local structures will become participants of the local governmental organizations.

So, a very interesting idea. Gregory, I'm going to insert this into the general chat so we can hold on to that if that's okay.

Alejandro Pisanty: I've lost the meeting, the Adobe meeting.

Vint Cerf: You've lost it?

Alejandro Pisanty: Yes. I went offline.

Vint Cerf: Okay. It's still going on. Ladies and gentlemen, I think that we need to call this to a close and in point of fact this is a lot of fun but we've gotten way off topic. Let me just mention again that we're very eager for you to submit other comments at the close of this conference. Alice, would you please put the slide up again that shows the email address and the survey monkey? Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, here's where we'd love to have further input from you. We will have the same call again on Wednesday although possibly different participants. If you haven't had enough already to join us again on Wednesday, we look forward to that and of course we look forward very much to your reaction to our preliminary reports that we will provide to you at the end of the month.

So, Alice, I think that we can now call this conference call to a close. Thanks, everybody.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, bye-bye.

Vint Cerf: Bye, everybody.