

---

# Presentation of the Report of the Working Group on Internet Governance\*

18 July 2005

*[morning session]*

## Note

The following is the output of the real-time captioning taken during the morning session of the WGIG open Consultations held 14 June in Geneva, Switzerland. Although it is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the session, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Chairman Desai:

If people could start settling down. May I have your attention for a moment, please. I'm sorry for the delay, but the fact is, there is a terrible traffic jam at the registration, and the -- there were a whole lot of people coming in the van here with me, and I don't see that a single one of them has made it here so far. And I came here an hour ago. So I suggest we give it another ten minutes before we start. Ten minutes, we start, just to give people who are stuck in registration time to get here. I thought I'd let you know so that you can relax, have your coffee. Ten minutes from now, we start.

(Pause.)

Chairman Desai:

Good morning. Let me first apologize for this late start. The practice that there was a rather long queue at the entrance, and a lot of people who were planning to be here could not make it in time. And I thought it would be but fair to wait for them since many of them had been waiting in that queue from long before 10:00.

I suspect there are still some more who will come in. But we do need to start. So, anyway, I apologize for this delayed start. But it's not an unknown problem in Geneva on the first day of a meeting.

So I am here today basically to present to you the report of the working group on Internet governance which was set up at the request of the Geneva phase of the Summit. The working group had submitted its report to the Secretary General, and the Secretary General has forwarded that report for consideration by the WSIS process. And the report has been sent to the chairman of the Preparatory Committee for WSIS and to the Secretary General of the WSIS process, Mr. Utsumi.

---

\* This document is a reformatted version of the official transcript available at:

<http://www.wgig.org/July-scriptmorning.html>

*The all-uppercase format has been changed to sentence case. A lot of the paragraph breaks after single sentences have been removed. The speakers' words have been indented from the speaker's name to make it more readable. Where one speaker's name wasn't included, "[New speaker]" has been added for clarity. No spelling or transcription errors have been corrected.*

Mr. Utsumi, unfortunately, cannot be here, but I'm happy that Charles Geiger, who is leading the substantive process for the preparations for the Tunis phase of the summit, is here. Charles has to leave for an essential reason. And with your permission, I will come by and say a few words later. But perhaps it will be useful if Charles Geiger will say a few words on behalf of ITU, which has received the report now from the Secretary General.

Charles.

[New speaker]

Thank you, Nitin. Ladies and gentlemen, distinguished delegates, first of all, I would confirm that Mr. Utsumi has received the report, as well as also our president of the PrepCom, Janis Karklins. The report is on both web sites, on the WGIG web site, on the WSIS web site.

And, first of all, I would like to thank, Nitin, you, and Markus, your crew, and all the members of the working group on Internet governance for all the work you have done. This is a very important report. It will be the basis for us to continue working.

And, in fact, what happens today is somehow we are taking over, the WSIS process is taking over from the WGIG. And I will just announce it once again. But you know that already we have on Wednesday a first informal consultation meeting. It will be here in the same room. And it'll be chaired by the ambassador of Pakistan, who is with us this morning, Ambassador Khan, to hear first reactions to the report. And it meeting is open to all stakeholders, like the meeting of today. So let me thank you once again.

All of you also, because there have also been contributions from outside to the WGIG report, very happy to have this report. And, Nitin, give back to you.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you very much. Thank you, Charles.

Let me now turn to the report itself. The report now is in the public domain. The report itself is quite short. It's -- the substantive part of the report is about 15 pages. And there are, of course, a few more pages of membership, et cetera, which are usually necessary.

But there is a longer background report which is also available. This report -- the background report essentially puts together in a more extended form the material on the basis of which this report of the working group was written.

The background report is not, in that sense, a full consensus report, but it is a report which was prepared on the basis of the contributions of the members of the group for the different working papers, as well as the contributions which were received from outside.

So that instead of you people having to look at bits and pieces of separate papers, there is a consolidated, synthesized document which we call the background report, which we believe includes a great deal of what came out of the preparatory process for the working group, the work done by the members of the group, the consultations, as well as the various contributions which came in.

And I would urge that those who are interested in greater detail may wish to look at that simply to see what is it that the group had before it finalized its 15-page report, which is the report -- which is really the main report of the working group.

Let me also stress that this report is unanimous. All of the members of the group who are present have agreed with the contents of this report.

And I really want to say a few words about the process before I -- we get into the content. I believe that the process, which was in some ways innovative, has worked.

The fact that 40 people from very diverse backgrounds, from many different parts of the world, with very different concerns and preoccupations, could agree on a report is a very positive sign and basically shows that a multistakeholder process in many ways does help to bring people together.

And one of the reasons I think we came together was that, as chair, I could see how people's views evolved over the space of the discussions that we had, all four meetings.

The second thing which I think made a huge difference to the working of the group was something which you -- many of you present here were very insistent on at the beginning, and that is to keep the process open.

Now that the report is done, I must -- I may confess that I was a little apprehensive about combining a working group with an open consultation process. But I would say that my judgment at the end of it is that open consultation process was extremely useful and very positive, because I could also see how that open consultation process was reminding many of the group members of what sentiment and opinions were outside.

And I think it played a huge role in helping us to come to this type of conclusion.

I just wanted to mention these two aspects, that a multistakeholder process and a process that is open in terms of listening to every possible point of view, of making sure that what it is looking at is available to everybody for comment, is something which can work and is, in fact, something which works sometimes a little better than a more closed process.

And I really have to thank you, many of you for insisting on keeping the process very open, because I believe that is something which has helped enormously.

Let me turn to the report itself. We were asked to develop a working definition of Internet governance, identify the public-policy issues that are relevant to Internet governance, develop a common understanding of the respective roles and responsibilities of governments, existing international organizations, and other forums, as well as private sector and civil society, and to make recommendations as appropriate. We have done that in our report.

You have a working definition of Internet governance, something which came up rather frequently in our open consultations.

You have in section III not just a listing of public-policy issues, which is what we had started with, which is what you had seen in earlier open consultations, but out of that list, some notion of what are the most important ones which need to be tackled as public-policy

issues in whatever process we have for Internet governance. This is what you will see in section III.

Section IV is -- talks of the common understanding of the respective roles and responsibilities, so that for each of the sectors that we normally refer to -- government, private sector, and civil society -- there is in the form of bullet points our understanding of what their functions are in the context of Internet governance.

One small point that I would make here is, we did feel in some ways that there is one particular community, the community of what I will describe as scientists, academics and others who are involved in Internet technology itself, and even to some extent in the management of the Internet, who don't fit neatly into just a single one of these three categories.

Because, to some extent, they may be part of a governmental process. To some extent, they may be part of the private sector. To some extent, they may be part of what we would call the NGO civil society sector. A lot of them have that characteristic.

If you were to go to a typical Internet meeting, it would be very difficult to categorize that meeting as falling into just one of these three categories. But we left it at that. We have not tried to invent a new category for these purposes.

The proposals for action are contained in section V. These proposals are there as proposals which, in the judgment of the group as a whole, are proposals which may be considered by the preparatory committee for the Tunis phase of WSIS.

Let me stress to you that the working group that I chaired was not a negotiating group. Our effort was not to try and negotiate a compromise amongst different points of view. Our effort was for each group, everybody, to understand different points of view, and then to try and agree that this is the range of options which needs to be looked at by the preparatory process.

And I think it's very important to see the group report as a whole, not in parts. These are the judgments of the group as to the matter, as to the ideas, are options which need to be considered by the preparatory process for the Tunis phase of the Summit.

I hope that a little later when Markus will go into the depth of some of the report, some of these issues will come out more clearly.

I would say that, basically, in many ways, the whole of the outcome of the group, when it comes to recommendations, is built on the foundation of two basic agreements.

And the basic agreements are, one, the idea of a multistakeholder forum to provide a space for a dialogue amongst different stakeholders on Internet public-policy issues; and, two, the feeling that oversight arrangements as presently exercised are -- need to be modified. And I would stress this.

Every one of the four options that you have, I'm sure, heard about do require a change in the status quo. Not a single one of the four options is actually a continuation of the situation as it exists.

All of them require some change, though the nature of the change which arises from these two basic points of agreement among all members of the group varies.

I would also like to stress one thing which is quite important. The way the group functioned, it's not possible for me, for instance, to be able to daresay that such-and-such option is the one preferred by these members; such-and-such by those members; such-and-such by these, and so on.

Because we did not vote on any of these things. We did not have any sort of process by which members, so to speak, declared for one or the other option.

Yes, when it came to the actual drafting, some members have taken the lead in drafting certain parts of the chapters. But for that matter, it happened with everything else.

But simply because those members took a certain lead in drafting that particular part, I don't think it should be treated in any way as a collection of diverse views. I would argue that, basically, I would like you to treat the four options as the collective judgment of the group on the range of options which you need to consider.

It is true that as individuals, members of the groups will have their views. Many of them are going to be part of country delegations and who I'm sure will assert their views as members of country delegations.

Many of them are people who are involved in nongovernmental organizations and separately, not in their capacity as working group members. They, of course, will have their views.

But as a group, these are a range of views that we have presented to you. A particular simile which I used some time back, maybe something I can share with you.

Somebody asked me, "Mr. Chairman, which is your -- what is your choice?" And my reaction was that I am the marriage broker. And as far as I'm concerned, all four brides are equally beautiful. And they have been presented for a choice by you. And, of course, you will have to decide, because you can't say "yes" to all four brides. But then that's your problem.

(Laughter.)

Chairman Desai:

It's not ours. And so you will have to decide one way or the other.

But as far as we are concerned, these are four options, four brides, equally beautiful, placed before you for -- how shall I say -- for the decision-making.

And that is something I wanted to stress, that -- because there has been maybe a slight confusion on this point, a, that none of the four options with regard to the oversight functions, the relationship between governments and the management of the Internet, require -- are a continuation of the present system. All of them require some change.

Second, that these are a range of options which are there for your consideration and should not -- and it's not necessary or desirable to identify and try and group the 40 members of the

working group as people falling into different -- as individuals that have their views, but as a group, this is the totality.

And there's a third point that I would like to stress. And the third point that I want to stress is that there was an agreement in the group that what we are concerned with is certain public-policy functions, and that we did not envisage or have not proposed any significant modification or change in the technical and operational management of the Internet.

In fact, there is some language to that effect, saying what we are not concerned with the technical and operational management of the Internet; what we are concerned with is the interface between that and public-policy issues.

And what we are looking for is a system of governance which is capable of addressing those public-policy issues. I would stress these things as the foundation on the basis of which the report has been formulated.

I focused on the recommendations related to Internet governance, but that, of course, is not the only area. There are other areas which are dealt with here, particularly with regard to coordination, and with regard to the strengthening of national arrangements for governments. I would stress the third aspect.

Though we may do what we like on the global level, but unless there is a counterpart system at the national level, which is also addressing similar issues, it's going to be very difficult to make that global system work.

And therefore I'm particularly happy that tomorrow, immediately after this, there will be a workshop which will be looking at the whole issue of capacity-building for Internet governance at the national level.

There are a host of other Internet-related issues which have been addressed. Towards the end, you will see this at pages 13, 14, and 15.

And there are a large number of recommendations there which are more specific, substantive recommendations on issues of public policy and are not necessarily issues about institutional arrangements for governance.

So I finally end by saying that I believe that we have done our work sincerely, fairly, honestly, and in an open fashion.

I believe we have given the preparatory committee a certain basis on the -- for it to work and develop its proposals for consideration at the Tunis Summit.

Now, it's also very clear to me as I look at this that the policy discussions on Internet governance are not going to be over all that soon. This is a very dynamic and changing medium. If we had asked the questions which we have asked in this working group five years ago, I'm almost certain we would have come up with the wrong answers, because the world then was so different.

The Internet that we were looking at five years ago in the year 2000, towards the end of the Dot Com boom, was so different from what we are looking at now. I have no idea what it's going to look like five years from now in 2010.

So I think the one final message that I would always give to those -- for you, when you consider this issue in the PrepCom, is, be flexible. Because we have no idea what we are going to cope with in the next five years.

And I believe that flexibility is perhaps the most important single requirement of any arrangement that we may make for Internet governance, precisely because it's a very young medium, a very evolving medium, and we have no idea what are the challenges that we will have to confront over the next five years.

So I conclude with these words. I thank you for all the support. I want to thank particularly the members of the working group, many of whom are here, and who are looking surprisingly relaxed, no doubt because they have done the hard work. Which is good. They deserve it, because you all worked very hard for this process.

The imprisonment at Chateau de Bossey at the end I think helped, not so much out there because it was an imprisonment, but because the wonderful surroundings of Chateau de Bossey perhaps encouraged a certain feeling of camaraderie which may have helped in getting the results.

So I really want to thank all of the members of the working group who are here. I got to know them well over the course of the year that we spent together working on this.

I've learned an enormous amount during that year, and I must say that in my long experience of international work, this has been one of the most interesting and pleasurable ones that I have had.

I also wanted to really put in a strong word of thanks to Markus Kummer and his team. They have been very quiet, working away diligently in supporting our work.

And, quite frankly, had it not been for the objectivity and neutrality and the commitment with which they supported the work, both of the working group as well as of these consultations, as well as for the broader outreach, it would have been very difficult. Markus is in some ways responsible for this working group. He was the one who led the negotiations in the Geneva Summit which led to the foundation of this working group. To some extent, he had a certain moral responsibility for ensuring that this whole process would function. But he went well beyond that moral responsibility into a genuine and sincere, deep interest in the issue itself. And really, I think, I'm deeply grateful for the help that he has provided.

And, of course, to our host government of Switzerland, which made the services available, as well as many other facilities, which allowed us to function effectively.

These are some of the words of thanks that I wanted to end with. And I really want to thank all of you. And with your permission, perhaps at this point, turn to Markus to maybe walk you through the actual text of the report. So with that, may I turn to you, Markus?

Secretary Kummer:

Thank you, Nitin, and thank you for your kind words. Little did I know when I chaired this working group that it would backfire and pee put me in the hot spot. I thought then it was the easy way out to create a working group, but here we are.

As our chairman said, the report was released last Thursday, and also our colleagues in New York worked very hard and made it available in all U.N. languages.

But the hard work may have led to some mistakes. Our Spanish-speaking colleagues have already pointed out there is a fairly serious mistake in the language as it equates governance and government. So that obviously will need to be corrected.

Also, one of our Arabic speaking members signaled there may be some mistakes in the Arabic versions, and I would not be surprised maybe if other language versions will have to be adapted. But that should be no problem.

The background report will be translated into French, courtesy to the organisation Internationale de la Francophonie. It will also be made available on our respective web sites -- WSIS web site, the WGIG web site -- in due course.

Let me start, before going into more details, at the outset that the working group clearly put the report in a development perspective, and the working group identified one cross-cutting priority, and that is development. And there are two aspects to this perspective. On the one hand, the effective and meaningful participation in Internet governance arrangements, and on the other hand, the building of capacity in developing countries to address Internet governance issues.

Having said that, I think the reaction to the report so far proved that what I said before, the report contains no surprises. It reflects the discussions we had so far, and also the online consultations and the content was developed in an open process and was available on our web site.

Let me go through the report now chapter by chapter.

The introduction deals with the usual issues dealt with in an introduction. It recalls the mandate, the history, and the composition of the working group. But it also goes a little bit beyond that. It recognizes some guiding principles and factors; in particular, the WSIS principle relate to go the stable and secure functioning of the Internet is seen as of paramount importance.

And also, the open and decentralized nature of its architecture and the underlying technological development of its core standards.

The background report goes a little bit further in developing these guiding principle and factors, and also mentions more technical principles, such as the distributed decentralized open architecture, the Internet as a network of networks, the open nonproprietary nature of the core Internet standards, as well as the end-to-end principle.

The background report also explains why the WGIG decided not to include a separate chapter on the evolution of the Internet. The group held the view that by now, the Internet was so widely used and its history so well documented that there would be little value added by including a separate chapter on this subject. Instead, it points interested readers to the excellent document on this subject available on the web site of the Internet society.

But the report, as our chairman said, is very concise and limits itself in essence to the core mandate given to the group by the first phase of the summit in Geneva.



The working definition of Internet governance, there, group agreed on a short and clear definition and we will have a session in the afternoon where one WGIG member will explain how we got there, and explains it more in detail.

I'm limiting myself here to highlighting two elements that are essential. One is a quote from the report. Internet governance is not just Internet names and addresses. And as we have already stated in our preliminary report to PrepCom 2, governance means more than governance and includes all stakeholders.

These, I think, are the essential ingredients to our definition, which, in the end, turned out to be very elegant and short.

Chart 3 identifies public policy issues that are relevant to Internet governance, and assesses the adequacy of existing governance arrangements. Here the WGIG took a broad approach and excluded no potentially relevant issue. The issues were grouped into four key public policy areas, and these areas have been with us since February. "a," issues relating to infrastructure and the management of critical Internet resources; "b," issues relating to the use of the Internet, including spam, network security, cybercrime; "c," issues that are relevant to the Internet but have an impact much wider than the Internet and for which existing organizations are responsible, such as intellectual property rights or international trade; and "d," issues relating to development aspects of Internet governance; in particular, capacity building.

The report managed to grow on a list of highest priority issues that are brought to the attention of the WSIS, and later on we will have a panel of several WGIG members who will go more into the detail of these issues and of the recommendations emanating from this chapter.

With regard to chapter 4, developing a common understanding of the respective roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders, from both developed and developing countries, the report states that each group will have different interests, roles, and participation, which in some cases will overlap. And Nitin already mentioned that the report recognizes the particular contribution by the academic and technical communities, which are somewhat outside the categories established by the WSIS.

The report is not conclusive. It does not give definitive roles here. That is what government do and hear, this is what private sector does and hear, that is what civil society should do. It recognizes that the situation is complex and evolving and the background report contains further reflections on this issue, and it also describes this as an emerging tri-stakeholderism. Whether the neologism is a well-coined phrase I'm not too sure of, but I think it does convey that it is a fluid situation where we are developing new ideas and concepts.

The background report also includes input from not-for-profit, private sector institutions. They made the point that their mission is also to work for a public purpose. And last but not least, in this section the WGIG also noted there is coordination between intergovernmental organizations and other institutions.

I don't think at this stage there is any need for me to dwell any longer on proposals for actions. Our chairman explained the ideas behind our various options. Maybe just one word to put the forum function again clearly in a development perspective.

The forum function would allow for effective participation of developing countries and at the same time it is intended to contribute to capacity building in developing countries.

The starting point of this proposal was that we identified a vacuum in the context of existing structures insofar as there's no global, universal forum which includes all stakeholders and where Internet-related public policy issues can be addressed.

So the forum would have a different dimension. It would address issues that are cross-cutting and multidimensional as well as emerging issues, either effect more than one institution or are not dealt with by any institution, or are not addressed in a coordinated manner.

And also, a new idea that came up with regard to the forum was that it will be very much developed and underpinned by cooperation with academic and scientific institutions, but I take it that we can come back to this in the course of our discussion.

The recommendations have a section also on the institutional coordination. The report says efforts shall be made to further improve coordination between existing institution at all levels, on the one hand intergovernmental organization such as the ITU, WIPO or UNESCO, and on the other hand Internet institutions such as ICANN, ISOC, IETF, W3C. The NROs, RIRs, are also center, and I think are representative of all these institutions in this room.

The regional and national coordination, already our chairman pointed to the importance of this. And the WGIG recognized the need for cooperation and coordination among all stakeholders at all levels.

And apart from the international level we are at, there are also the regional, subregional, and national levels.

And the report notes that international coordination needs to build on policy coherence at national and regional level and recommends that the multistakeholder approach should be implemented at all levels. This includes the shaping of Internet-friendly policies, and it includes also the relationship between ccTLDs and governments.

Methods for improving national policies clearly would not be imposed top-down from some kind of international body in this thinking but it would be based on the sharing of best practices, looking at models that worked, looking at models for national Internet governance arrangements, such as national Internet steering committees. And tomorrow's workshop is devoted to this team, and we will look at different models from various regions. In the morning, it's more the relationship between ccTLDs and governments and how ccTLDs work, and the afternoon is devoted to broader policy aspects.

The final section includes recommendations to address Internet-related priority issues. It makes priorities, and as I already said, we will have a panel going into more depth in these - - in the afternoon. Some of these recommendations are addressed to various mechanisms while others are not attributed to any specific institutions, but they are identified as issues that need to be addressed.

Let me reach a conclusion with your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, and you, ladies and gentlemen. After having spent a year and a half dealing with this issue, I'm happy to see that WGIG has fulfilled its mandate. It has produced the report the summit asked it to produce.

And as our chairman already pointed out, the report should not be looked at as an isolated product of our work. Producing the report and the background report was part of a process, and you were very much part of this process. It was conceived right from the beginning as an open process with continuous interaction with all stakeholders.

I had the honor and the privilege of addressing WSIS PrepCom 1 in Hammamed a year ago, and I remember we had some frank and open discussions there. And when explaining this concept as an essential ingredient of the mandate of the WGIG, with alteration between open and closed meetings.

As Nitin explained, this method was refined in the course of the WGIG work, and I think in the course of this work, we got more open and more transparent from meeting to meeting.

The April meeting for the first time introduced this lifetime -- real-time transcription which I think also greatly enhances the transparency of meetings.

At Hammamed I concluded with saying that it seems clear that the WGIG can only be successful if all stakeholders will recognize themselves in its composition and ultimately in its final report. And I think we succeeded in this endeavor. Irrespective of whether everybody agrees with everything in the report, and I presume this will not be the case, all stakeholders bought into the process. Thus, WGIG has succeeded in creating a space for an issue-oriented policy dialogue on Internet governance, and it has succeeded in creating a climate of trust among all parties concerned, and it has also set a successful example of multistakeholder partnership.

And in doing so, WGIG has contributed to an evolution of the debate since WSIS 2, and I open to think that it will help the PrepCom in having a debate in a more serene climate of a better understanding of the policies related to Internet governance.

And with this, I would like to thank you for your attention, and back to you, Chairman.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you. So what I propose we do is this, that we spend the morning -- I'm sure you have comments, questions, which we will try and respond, to some extent myself but I will call on individual members of the working group to contribute more specifically.

The proposal is that in the afternoon, we begin by a somewhat fuller explanation by some of the members of the working group who have been requested in advance on some of the features of the group's work. And that at about 4:00, we have a multistakeholder forum moderated by Wolfgang Kleinwaechter, which apart from anything else will give me a little time to catch up with other things which I need to do for the WSIS. But which will also serve a different purpose, which is where the questions and comments could be addressed not just through me as a chair and Markus as executive coordinator but to the stakeholders who are also a part of this whole exercise.

So this is basically the -- an outline of the process over the course of the day that we intend to follow.

An open process until lunchtime, with listening, commenting, et cetera. A more focused description of some of the key aspects of the report by the members of the group -- some of

the members of the group, not all, in the afternoon. And a multistakeholder forum moderated by Wolfgang Kleinwaechter from 4:00 onwards.

Is that fine? Of course these things can be adjusted depending on how the times goes. So the floor is open. I invite Brazil, Pakistan -- who is that? John m. I don't know what -- Syracuse? Syracuse, yes. Ambassador of U.C. I have four now. Let's start with that. Brazil and then India.

Brazil:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I think we have to begin by saying congratulations to you. You manage to find common grounds in this controversial matter of Internet governance. Brazil is sure that the Secretary-General Kofi Annan must be very proud of your work and the work being done by Mr. Markus Kummer also.

As we are preparing ourselves to go to Tunisia in November, maybe some reference to the book of one thousand and one nights would be appropriate.

Your ordeals, Mr. Chairman, and that of your 40 colleagues have come to an end. And different from the adventures of Ali Baba, the group of 40 specialists that you have chaired managed to work together and together succeed in accomplishing what the first phase of the WSIS had requested.

This report will open the gates for a common understanding on Internet governance as the magic words of "open sesame" used to allow passage to the cave of treasures.

The central question we were unable to answer during the November 2003 summit here in Geneva is how the international community should run the Internet. We knew and we agreed upon that the international management of the Internet should be multilateral, transparent and democratic. We also were able to declare that this international management should be done with the full involvement of governments, the private sector, civil society and international organizations. What we did not know is how to do it. That is why we have asked the Secretary-General of the United Nations to give us a help.

Fortunately, with the Geneva declaration of principles, we have managed to leave behind the debate on basic and fundamental principles. We came to an agreement on that. Discussions nowadays are around more practical as well as economic related, but not less complex themes, such as: How to increase competition in the \$1 billion business of registering domain names and assigning new ones; how to increase -- no, how to decrease Internet international interconnection costs; how to give governments a say on the decision-making of public policy issues; how to build a multistakeholder approach that does not exclude, at the outset, small and medium-sized enterprises in favor of big corporations; how to build a multistakeholder approach that does not exclude at the outset lDCs, developing countries, and most of the developed nations in favor of a paternalistic and discriminatory approach; how to inject more accountability in the decision-making process of creating new top-level generic domain names which affects public opinion; how to address cybersecurity matters in a less patronizing play-it-alone policy; how to avert stereotyped propaganda which divided the world into two manichaeism blocs of those in charge of defending the freedom of the Internet and those in favor of suppressing it; and last but not least, how to give legitimacy to a governance system viewed as efficient, stable and reliable.

Mr. Chairman, our society is heavily dependent on communication networks, and the Internet is the centerpiece symbol of it. The Internet is the symbol of a new world, a world

where physical distance should disappear and knowledge should be shared. A world where there should be no constraints to access information, and even the poor members of the community should have the means to benefit from this new tool.

Unfortunately, reality is much more complex. Prices are high; legitimacy is low; and security is lacking. Let's address each one of them.

First one, even though physical distances are disappearing, interconnection costs are still very high for most of us who have to pay the full cost of the international circuits. Tier 1 backbone providers keep saying that this market is competitive. There is no way to confirm this information due to a simple reason, Mr. Chairman. And I quote, "no publicly available data exists to allow a precise economic evaluation of the competitiveness of the Internet backbone market," unquote.

I'm quoting from an United States government accountability office report entitled "characteristics and competitiveness of the Internet backbone market." this report also states that there is no public available information on such items as, and I quote, "the geographic scope of backbone networks, the number of backbone providers' customers, the number of IP addresses assigned to providers, traffic flows, and outage. In the absence of adequate information, it is difficult to fully ascertain the quality of the service, the reasons for problems when they occur, and the extent of market concentration and competition in the Internet backbone market," end of quote.

Second, even though the network is seen to be stable, efficient, and reliable, the decision-making process is not seen as a legitimate one. There is a lack of legitimacy whenever taxes are decided without representation. If one thing is clear from the past three years, it is that a purely private entity that must depend on voluntary cooperation of many other entities is not likely to be able to coordinate anything globally without significant governmental support. And be sure that one government support is not enough.

I said governmental support, not governmental advice. What is known as the GAC of ICANN, for example, is pure fiction. In our environment here, we call science fiction.

GAC is not a governmental body, nor an advisory council; neither a real committee. If delegates think here that Brazil is making an overstatement, just ask ICANN board to explain which substantial role GAC played on the decision to create this new, brand-new triple-x top-level generic domain name.

Brazil has done so last Monday in Luxembourg, Mr. Chairman. The answer is none. Third, even though those few in charge of running the network insist that the Internet is stable, efficient and reliable, be sure that security is lacking. We are exposed to threats ranging from technology failures to malicious attacks. Businesses and public services need secure environments in their daily operations. Any doubts on that, just consult the United States government accountability office report entitled "information security," which deals with cybersecurity issues and was published last may.

Mr. Chairman, since the beginning of the discussions on Internet governance, Brazil has insisted on the lack of legitimacy of the decision-making system in place. Brazil emphasized the unjust distribution of interconnection costs which punishes developing countries. Brazil has defended the internationalization of the core resources of the Internet. And Brazil has stressed that Internet related public policy issues shall be dealt with by governments.

Public opinion has agreed with us. These topics are reflected in the WGIG report. The overwhelming majority of the delegations here today favors more legitimacy, less cost, more internationalization, and greater participation of governments when dealing with public policy matters.

Nevertheless, and that is an important point, nevertheless, there are a few that tend to see reality through just one angle, one perspective: that of security. They do not have -- they do have, they do have their reasons, and we cannot blame them for that.

The point I am trying to make is that even if we narrow our analysis to the reality and subordinate all topics to one priority issue -- that of security -- we need to work together.

Mr. Chairman, security is only as good as the weakest link. Security matters are a good example on the importance of cooperation to deal with Internet problems.

Cybersecurity is complex, and national security initiatives will not suffice. In a global world, threats have no geographical boundaries, and international cooperation is essential in order to address the problem properly.

Brazil agrees with the European Union commissioner for information society and media, ms. Viviane Reding, when she stated last July 8 that, and I quote, "for Europe, it is crucial that the future approach to Internet governance is led by principles of efficiency and openness, and not by considerations of internal policy," unquote.

Those responsible for September 11, March 11, and now for July 7, are following our discussions here. They are going to pay attention to our deliberations at the third PrepCom and are going to take note of our decisions at the Tunis summit. They only want to know one thing. If we are able to come to an agreement to cooperate, to create a place, a forum, as proposed by the report, Mr. Chairman. A forum where we can write down public policies, binding agreements to protect ourselves, to protect the net, to protect our people.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I know that we are transmitting live our discussions here today. Let's profit from this technology in order to send two simple message to those outside this room.

First one, we are going to work together to the benefit and protection of our people. Second one, we are going to do it in one forum, one global multistakeholder forum, where Internet-related public policy issues can be dealt with in a coherent, rational, time-saving, cost effectiveness, multilateral, transparent, democratic, and above all, legitimate manner.

Brazil hopes that this is not a one thousand and one nights foolish dream. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you very much. It's nice we call Ali Baba, but the --

(Laughter.)

Chairman Desai:

I'm not sure my 40 colleagues want to be equated with a tease, but that's their problem. In any case....

I'm going to call the ambassador of Pakistan, Ambassador Masood Khan.

Amb Masood Khan:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Nitin Desai, Mr. Markus Kummer, members of the working group on Internet governance, we congratulate you on the completion and release of the WGIG report in accordance with the mandate given by the WSIS plan of action and the U.N. Secretary General.

We know that it was a difficult balancing act for members of the working group to address the issues of definition, public policy, and common understanding. You have done a good job in handling a delicate issues and in putting the pieces of this puzzle together.

As all stakeholders move toward the November summit, your analysis will be a good compass and your recommendations an important input into the overall deliberative process.

The WGIG has hopefully removed many conceptual cobwebs surrounding the subject of Internet governance. The group has also acted as a catalyst. Experts representing all stakeholders, governments, private sector, civil society, and international organizations held intense and frequent discussions on Internet governance.

At the same time, because of the highly agile medium of the Internet, you initiated a global dialogue and indirectly provided education on the subject to the world citizenry. Your discussions were observed and monitored closely around the world.

We are on the cusp of a new era of communication and commerce. Our quest for a frame of reference for Internet governance has begun now, though we are not starting from scratch.

With wisdom, we can combine our hippocratic oaths with a vision for the fast-evolving Internet, witnessing exponential growth in quantity and quality in developed and developing countries.

We have to look for a synthesis that is flexible, resilient, and sustainable. This vision cannot be static in time and space. And, yet, it cannot be so amorphous that we do not know where we are headed.

The Internet itself requires interoperability and a broader vision. We have to move beyond our traditional divides to comprehend the impact of the Internet on global society and to handle it in all its aspects.

It is not an either/or, a black-and-white paradigm. The choices involved are more -- are much more complex and sophisticated. We will consolidate and develop, quote, unquote, rainbow coalitions across nations forced by the Internet. This is a challenge for our diplomacy, multistakeholder diplomacy, in the 21st century, in the post-modern world.

I have been designated as the chair of the subcommittee on Internet governance.

We will do our best to look for a new synergy, keeping in mind the current realities, the principles of equity and transparency, the future development of the Internet, the interrelated

issues of socioeconomic development, national and international laws, and the overarching concerns for a more secure and prosperous global society.

We will have an approach that is inclusive and cooperative. Based on that approach, we should be looking for a framework for Internet governance that is authentic, mutually supportive, sustainable, stable, and secure.

As announced by Mr. Charles Geiger, I have convened open-ended and formal consultations on Internet governance on Wednesday, July the 20th, 2005, here in this room, room XVIII. The consultations are open to all stakeholders. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you, ambassador Khan. And I, as the person who is handing over the four brides to you, I wish you well in getting the member states to take the next step of choosing.

But I now have John Mathiason from the Syracuse Project, Ambassador Nick Thome from U.K., India, Raul Echeberria, a member of our working group and also head of LACNIC, the latin registry. John.

John Mathiason:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As the first nongovernmental speaker, let me add to the congratulations to you, to the working group itself, and to its secretariat.

To an academic observer, its work in terms of international relations, in terms of process of deliberation, sets a new standard and model for global governance. And we salute you.

The pants in the Internet governance project, which is a consortium of academic institutions concerned with the subject, have reviewed with great interest the report of the working group.

Our conclusion is that the report helps move forward the process of deciding how to govern the Internet in a number of key respects. We also conclude that it has not answered the question of where to go from here.

Quo vadis.

That question will now have to be answered in the WSIS negotiations. We first note those elements of the report with which we agree.

We agree with the consensus view of WGIG that there are a number of Internet issues where new thinking and possibly new structures for governance may be required, either now or in the future.

As WGIG notes, this is either because these novel Internet governance issues are not being dealt with at all, or they are being dealt with in a fragmented or inconsistent way in different forums.

We agree with the premise that a primary goal of Internet governance is to ensure the stability, security, and openness of the Internet as a critical communications channel for the 21st century.



We agree with the definition of Internet governance provided, especially because it clearly distinguishes the elements of governance that have to be agreed and shared, the principles, the norms, the rules, and the procedures by which stakeholders can ensure stability, security, and openness.

And we agree that a multistakeholder forum to follow-up work is desirable, although we note that the shape and organization of the forum is to be determined.

However, with regard to the four models of institutional arrangements suggested by the WGIG, if we were asked to choose, we would have to say, "none of the above."

Let us explain. In the four models, there are really only two positions. One, reflected in model 2, essentially says that things are fine and existing institutions can adapt to solve any remaining problems.

Clearly, the WGIG report identifies many issues where everything is not fine. But talking about problems alone will not solve them, nor will unreformed institutions.

The second position, reflected in models 1, 3, and 4, is that some new formal institution to provide governance is necessary, although the models differ on the details. We suggest that those models may be premature.

Setting up powerful intergovernmental institutions without a clear understanding of what they are doing and an agreement about what they are -- or how they are to do it would not produce either effective institutions or resolve the policy issues.

So if not models 1 through 4, the possible four husbands in the analogy, we would like to suggest an intermediate path.

First, let us examine the implications of the definition of Internet governance. How do we obtain shared principles, norms, and rules? The currency of international regimes is multilateral treaties.

We would not suggest a comprehensive Internet convention. There is not enough consensus or even knowledge for that right now.

We suggest, instead, that there be a consensus to negotiate a framework convention that would agree on three key elements that are necessary for governance.

The principles, what is the Internet.

The norms, what do stability, security, and openness mean in terms of obligations?

And what are the roles of respective stakeholders, governments, the private sector, and civil society?

And international institutions?

There are precedents for this in other areas where geographical boundaries have been ineffective for governance, such as climate change. If WSIS can set a concrete objective to

reach these agreements by a certain date, this will give purpose and focus to the work of the forum to be created.

It will continue the kind of reflection, research, analysis, and dialogue that has characterized the work of WGIG and can lead to the kind of institutional innovation, both conceptual and practical, that the Internet itself has enabled.

The recently released declaration of principles by the u.s. department of commerce, in our view, highlights the need for such analytic clarity and consensus. Wherever we are going in Internet governance, we are not there yet. But we should get there.

We have posted a more detailed paper on the Internet governance project web site, which is conveniently [www.Internetgovernance.org](http://www.Internetgovernance.org). And we are making it available to the secretariat. And we, as academics, look forward to a continued and very lively dialogue. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you, John. The reason my four brides became four grooms in John's presentation is that we were both together in the United Nations, John was looking after the division for the advancement of women. So he thought he had to put in a plea for greater gender equality, even in metaphors. But that is perhaps the explanation for that.

Ambassador of the U.K., ambassador Nick Thome.

United Kingdom:

On behalf of the European Union and the acceding, Romanian and Bulgaria, I would like to thank the members of the working group on Internet governance for the work they have carried out over the last nine months.

I am not going to get into the business of your likeness to Ali Baba, your influence over brides or, indeed, now grooms, but clearly it's under your very special guidance that the group has fulfilled its mandate to investigate and make proposals for action.

We welcome the report as a framework to inform the preparatory discussions for the Tunis phase of the world summit on the information society.

The European Union's position on Internet governance was outlined by the council of ministers last month during its June 2005 meeting. The question of internationalization of the management of the Internet's core resources, namely, the domain name system, I.P. addresses, and the root server system, are the main issues in this debate.

The European Union advocates a new cooperation model in order to concretize the provisions in the WSIS declaration of principles regarding the crucial role of all actors within Internet governance, including governments, the private sector, civil society, and international organizations.

The existing Internet governance mechanisms should be founded on a more solid, democratic, transparent, and multilateral basis, with a stronger emphasis on the public-policy interest of all governments.

The respective roles of the international and intergovernmental organizations within the field of Internet governance should be clarified.

In this respect, the European Union recognizes the contribution made by international and intergovernmental organizations and encourages cooperation in this field.

The new cooperation model should be based on the current bottom-up public/private partnership. It should also provide a platform for policy dialogue in the interest of all governments in a light, fast-reacting, and flexible approach.

The new model should be based on the following principles: it should not replace existing mechanisms or institutions, but should build on the existing structures of Internet governance, with a special emphasis on the complementarity between all the actors involved in this process, including governments, the private sector, civil society, and international organizations.

The new public/private cooperation model should contribute to the sustainable stability and robustness of the Internet by addressing appropriately public-policy issues related to key elements of Internet governance.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to stress five points.

First, that governments have a specific mission and responsibility vis-a-vis their citizens and their role within this new cooperation model should be mainly focused on principal issues of public policy, excluding any involvement in the day-to-day operations.

Second, the importance of respecting the architectural principles of the Internet, including interoperability, openness, and the end-to-end principle.

Third, that stability, dependability, and robustness of the Internet remain a high priority. Security and spam are important issues in this field. A global, common understanding of the issue of Internet security must be developed. This includes the use of security policies in general at all relevant levels.

With regard to spam, there is a need to adopt common principles of action concerning cooperation in this field. Anti-spam efforts should not be based only on legislation and cross-border enforcement, but also on industry self-regulation, technical solutions, partnerships between governments and the Internet community, as well as awareness-raising.

Fourth, the importance of ICT for the competitiveness of industry. We therefore encourage active involvement of the private sector in the Internet governance discussions during the second phase of WSIS.

And fifth and finally, Mr. Chairman, the European Union will work towards a positive outcome of the Internet governance discussions in the WSIS framework.

We will also encourage the implementation of the Tunis results in a way that enables multistakeholder involvement.

In this context, the European Union will take into account the future development of the Internet, including technological and usage aspects. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you. I call on India.

India:

Mr. Chairman, we have been closely following with deep interest the deliberations of this working group which has made excellent progress over the past few months leading to the formulation of this report.

May I take this opportunity to compliment you, sir, and members of the working group, as well as Mr. Markus Kummer, for the good work done in this important area. I am confident that the report will pave the ground for us to move towards a consensus at the forthcoming PrepCom 3 meeting.

The report of the working group on Internet governance gives us a useful definition of the Internet governance. It provides us with four models for dealing with the issues of global public policy and oversight relating to the Internet.

We have carefully gone through the four models. All of these will require detailed examination and involve consultations between member states and other stakeholders. But we think the models provide a useful point of departure.

We have consistently maintained that in the knowledge society, the Internet has a very important and vital role to play. There is clearly a consensus on issues like spam, wireless, cybercrimes, et cetera.

There's also a consensus that nothing should be done that could adversely affect reliability, stability, and security of the Internet.

At the same time, we feel that all governments should have an effective say at the policy level. The deliberations should not only be transparent, inclusive, and democratic, but also be seen and perceived as such through full involvement of governments, the private sector, civil society, and international organizations.

The United States has played a preeminent and pioneering role in the development of Internet. Its contributions can hardly be overstated.

We have read with interest the recent statement of the U.S. government that it would maintain its historic role in authorizing changes or modifications to the authoritative root zone files and its reiteration of support for the ongoing work of ICANN as the technical manager of the DNS and related technical operations.

Against this background, the question we have to address is how other countries can be included in decision-making on these and other issues relating to this shared global medium.

The rapid growth in the use of the Internet in countries outside the U.S., including in countries like India, makes this a matter of priority. The question of the participation in decision-making clearly cannot be put off indefinitely.

Indeed, the WSIS provides the best opportunity for us to begin seriously addressing this question. We need to proceed with an open mind.

An outcome acceptable to all governments, acting as the representatives of the global community that has a common interest in this matter, and all other stakeholders must be found.

I once again thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me this opportunity to share some of our concerns and long-felt needs. Thank you.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you very much. And I must thank the delegation of India, particularly Mr. Sah for the assistance he has taken with regard to the group, which I said at the beginning has been most helpful and constructive and really changed the way in which the work group functioned.

We now turn to a member of our group, Mr. Raul Echeberria., who is also the head of LACNIC.

Raul Echeberria:

-- Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have surprised us once again with your very interesting examples. And now I have to think about what my role is in the story of Ali Baba. And I think this is something that I can reflect upon. The only thing I want to say is that you can be even more indulgent than were you with Ali Baba in that we will not have to suffer the same fate.

Speaking seriously, I'd like to point out that the process of the working group in itself was a very important one. I believe that beyond all innovations and the experience we had in working in this multistakeholder approach, many of us who do not represent governments are able to be here in the room and to observe things such as scripts online and the comments made publicly, and all of these new features are very positive.

In addition, it seems to me that as a result of the WGIG -- as a result of WGIG's work, we all have a clear understanding, there are more organizations, and, fundamentally, more governments involved in the process.

Even if we do not have all of the answers in the report of WGIG, we have many answers and points that are quite interesting. Independently of decisions taken at the summit in Tunis, I think that the entire process carried out in WGIG places us in a situation where we have improved understanding of the interests of all parties, thus affording very good opportunities for cooperation in the future, regarding of the decisions taken.

And I think that the work at this group has not been in vain. Our situation is much more positive and promising than before this group was set up, whatever be the concrete recommendations contained in the reports.

And, finally, I'd like to make a comment on something that was mentioned by a previous speaker. If I'm not mistaken, it was the representative of Internet governance project who commented that, basically, everything is fine.

But that's not the spirit of those who supported this proposal.

I'd like to point out that the group, by consensus, made two very important statements.

One, the oversight should not just be by one government.

And the second, the recommendation of the establishment of a global forum, a response to the acknowledgment that greater coordination is needed.

There are many themes that are not being handled by those involved in Internet governance. These are very strong recommendations, I believe.

We should not underestimate what is being said in the group through consensus. We know that the group was very diverse, and is quite heterogeneous.

There are the agreements that comprise the four models that are being proposed. None of them states that things are working well.

In addition to the changes that are being proposed in concrete terms, an oversight over the set of things that are in connection with the key central resources of Internet by an organization, it's not a matter of stating that there's no need for oversight, but, rather, that there's no need of a specific organization for oversight.

Another matter that's very important that we should not underestimate and that was mentioned here several times is the importance of the principles agreed upon at the summit in 2003.

The implementation of these principles in all bodies involved in Internet governance, together with the implementation of the recommendations in these reports, in addition to those contained in other reports during the process from now up until the summit means that active participation of all parties, from the more developed world and the developing world, enables the community to establish a type of oversight without the creation of specific organizations.

Many things have to be improved. So I think that this statement that was made does not reflect the spirit of those who supported this model. Thank you.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you, Raul. As I have stressed in the beginning, all of the models involve a change. And I think it would be not correct to describe any of the -- any one of them as having -- saying that this is for the status quo, which is a point which has been stressed also by Raul.

I now have Janet Hoffman of the Civil Society Caucus, Norway, and Switzerland.  
Can I have Janet.

Janet Hoffman:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I speak on behalf of the WSIS Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus.

The caucus has been formed a bit more than two years ago during PrepCom 2 in February 2003. Its task is to provide civil society with expert opinion and to represent civil society's view on Internet governance in WSIS. We work mainly online, and we have no more than 230 subscribers to our list. Many of them are subscribed to civil society to WSIS.

We have begun to develop a response to the WGIG report. We will now present our first initial reaction, and it's up to me to present our general remarks. We hope to make more specific comments later today.

The WSIS civil society Internet governance caucus expresses its support and appreciation for the process and outcome of WGIG.

We believe that the high quality of the report is the result of both the multistakeholder collaboration and the open and inclusive consultation with the wider WSIS community.

We thank ambassador Desai and Mr. Kummer for their commitment and dedication to this approach, pioneering new ways of collaboration across sectors and communities, demonstrating the shift from principle to practice.

There are several aspects of the WGIG report we welcome and support, including the broad working definition of Internet governance, the comprehensive nature of issues outlined and prioritized for action in the background and the final report; the emphasis on values fundamental to civil society, including freedom of expression, data protection and privacy rights, consumer rights, multilingualism, capacity building, and meaningful participation in the Internet governance processes.

The overarching goal of enhancing the legitimacy of Internet governance arrangements and aligning of the public policy recommendations.

We agree with WGIG that no single government should have a preeminent role in governance of the larger infrastructure of the Internet.

We also commend the report on acknowledging the capacity building in developing areas, and the effective and meaningful participation of all stakeholders around the world are the most essential steps in reaching this goal.

On this last point we share the observation that there are significant barriers to the participation of all stakeholders and governance mechanisms.

Further, that international and intergovernmental organizations, including private sector or self-regulatory bodies that establish governance mechanisms impacting stakeholders outside the business community should take measures to enable effective participation from developing countries and from civil society.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Desai:

And I want to thank the strong commitment of civil society caucus and many of your partners to this whole process. You have consistently participated, always been here and of course many people from civil society were also part of our working group.

I have now Norway, and then Switzerland.

Norway:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to join the other delegations in thanking the working group for the report. I'd also congratulate you, Mr. Desai and Mr. Kummer, as well as the individual members of the working group for their outstanding efforts during the nine months of intensive work.

We welcome that the working group has fulfilled its mandate and that the group has produced a state-of-the-art report. It is short, concise, and it includes operational recommendations.

We note with pleasure that the WGIG has made a user-friendly product. The group has not fallen into the trap of overloading the report with technical terminology and thus invites the inclusion of the non-experts.

We therefore believe that the report from the working group can serve as a solid basis for further discussions and negotiations in the process ahead, both for PrepCom 3 in September and as a means to finding solutions at the summit in Tunis in November.

Mr. Chairman, Norway believes that Internet governance should be regarded within the broader vision of the information society, which includes democracy, sustainable development, respect for human rights, and fundamental freedoms, as well as good governance.

We believe that Internet governance and democratic governance are interrelated issues.

Mr. Chairman, let me now turn to some of the elements in the report. Some general remarks only.

First, we note with satisfaction that the working group has, indeed, reached a consensus on a definition of -- on Internet governance. In our opinion, this definition is operational, inclusive and useful for the purposes of the World Summit.

We appreciate that the group has reached consensus in identifying a range of public policy issues that are relevant to Internet governance. And we welcome the fact that this list includes not only the critical question of root zone administration but also a number of vital other issues, including security, cybercrime, spam, capacity building, and freedom of expression.

Furthermore, we note that the group puts forward proposals for action both related to Internet governance mechanisms and recommendations to address Internet-related issues.

We will study with great interest the different organizational models which the working group has proposed.

Mr. Chairman, finally, we believe that the working group has provided the WSIS process with a substantial report which deserves careful consideration. In the process ahead, we would like to underscore that all stakeholders should be given an equal opportunity to express their views and to comment on the report. This should indeed be an inclusive



process. We therefore look forward to a constructive discussion with a view to ensure a successful outcome of the Tunis summit.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Desai:

Switzerland.

Switzerland:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Bear with me if I also take this opportunity along with others to thank you, congratulate you, and Mr. Kummer, the secretariat, and the working group for this excellent work in how you have discharged your difficult task given to you by the WSIS process with giving us this excellent and comprehensive report.

I think you did ground-breaking work, as many others have already told us, in helping us to focus and provide us the basis for a more rational and perhaps more serene working conditions that we have before us in the weeks and months to come.

I think as much as the content is important, I think also the process was very important. And you have been mentioning that, rightly so. And I think this could really be a model how, in the future, the multilateral system, multilateral organizations and processes could work. And we would hope that this example that you have demonstrated could already flow into the discussions in New York on how the U.N. could improve its workings. And maybe yourself and others could help make that point.

I have a few questions I would like to ask. When you describe in your report the role of the various stakeholders, I don't see the international organizations. Maybe there is a good reason for that, but I don't see it yet. I think that these organizations have already -- when you look at the issues that you have decided, have put forward for your work, have responsibilities. So I would think that they would have to be included in your list of stakeholders and the roles assigned to them, along with governments, civil society and others.

So I would think that would be something that I would like to see to be addressed.

Secondly, on the forum proposal, I wonder whether it is helping and strengthening the proposal when it introduces a broader concept of addressing the issues emerging and future issues emanating from the discussion of the Millenium Summit and the development goals. I wonder whether or not, if it focuses on these very clear issues related to Internet governance, it would enhance its strength and relevance. Now we are looking to very important discussions, as Mr. Charles Geiger said today, and we are looking very much forward to work with Ambassador Kahn from Pakistan, and to work with him in the weeks and months to come to bring these issues to a conclusion.

We believe that together with financing issues, the Internet governance will be the key issue and will be the highlight of the Tunis summit, and we are looking forward to that success. So thanks again to you and all your colleagues for this excellent work. Thank you.

Chairman Desai:

In response to your question, para 34. Para 34 does say a word on international organizations. But what I will say is this, international organizations are associations of member states and, in certain other cases, other actors. And in that sense they represent, in a legal personality sense, they are really represent -- represent the collective view of their members.

The notion that secretariats of international organizations have an independent standing is something which I think perhaps is a little open to question. Because it's the -- the international organizations are really associations of member states.

Or member states plus other actors. And in that sense, they're represented. But there is some reference in para 34 to the international organizations as well as the need for greater and improved coordination of secretariats of international organizations.

I have now Canada and Australia.

Canada:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First, Canada would like to congratulate you personally, Mr. Chairman, and all members of the working group on this very difficult work that you have accomplished and on the excellent report that you have provided us. We see this as providing a very strong basis for discussion in the WSIS process, and we look forward to examining it in greater detail in the days ahead.

We see this, as I said, as the first step in a very long process and a very positive contribution.

We believe that you have done much to increase international understanding and the knowledge of all participants of the issues around Internet governance, and provided a very fine, strong foundation for discussions.

I particularly would like to congratulate you on the emphasis you have put on the issue of capacity building. Canada believes that it's going to be very important for all countries and all stakeholders, both from the north and the south, to play a role in this issue as it moves forward.

Canada will be consulting domestically with interest groups and we will certainly put forward a substantive contribution before the mid-august deadline set by the WSIS PrepCom.

So just to conclude, Mr. Chairman, we look forward very much to participating in the negotiations at PrepCom and in the years ahead as this young medium develops. Thank you.

Chairman Desai:

Australia.

Australia:

Mr. Chairman, members of the working group, excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, Australia thanks and congratulates the working group on Internet governance and the secretariat for their efforts over the past months and for this report. As we move increasingly towards an

information society, it is clear that the issues that the report covers are fundamentally important to the people of the world now and into the future. As we look to the future, we cannot assume that old models will meet our needs, but rather that new ones will be required. As has been said, the working group has strongly signaled during its work the direction in which it was heading. As such, there are few surprises in the report. On an initial rating, we understand why the report says what it says, even though we may not agree with all its findings and proposals. This is to the credit of the WGIG process. As many have said, the WGIG process has done a considerable service in enhancing the understanding of the issues and the perspectives of the stakeholders on those issues. Australia has certainly benefited from this process.

There are some key themes in the report which are important, which Australia supports and which we would like to reiterate. These include the importance of Internet security and stability, the need for all governments to have a voice, the role of industry and the marketplace, the importance of the multistakeholder approach, the role for multiple fora, the breadth of Internet governance and the need for flexibility.

Mr. Chairman, like other governments and stakeholders, the Australian government will examine the report closely over the coming weeks leading up to PrepCom 3 and ultimately the Tunis summit; however, I would like to share with others some of the questions we will be asking ourselves when we do this.

At first glance, Australia is fairly comfortable with the definition of Internet governance. We would query, however, whether we should distinguish here between international and national arrangements.

We would also query the appropriateness of including programs as a government's mechanism in the definition. In relation to the roles of stakeholders, we will be examining whether appropriate recognition is, in fact, given to the role of the private sector as an investor, innovator, and operator in the proposals for Internet governance.

We see some merit in the proposal for a forum. There are areas -- for example, issues of Internet use and misuse -- where there is greater scope for action and coordination. However, we must ask, how would such a forum for discussion and coordination achieve concrete outcomes where these are required? Would such a forum distract from day-to-day Internet governance? How would such a forum best operate? Might a periodic conference be a better model? And should such a forum be limited in duration? There may also be benefit in us considering what implication such a forum would have for wider WSIS issues, such as implementation and WSIS follow-up.

I do not propose to comment on each of the priority issues identified, but there are some key questions to be asked. In relation to the management of critical Internet resources, Australia is on the record as supporting an ICANN-oriented model. Key to our support of the ICANN model is its strong interweaving with the Internet industry and the wider community, which in turn fosters innovation. Our support is on the basis that ICANN continues to evolve so that it is a truly internationalized entity. A key question for us is how this now can be best achieved. We also note that Australia sees significant scope for reform of ICANN itself, including in the area of government participation.

On international interconnection charging, we need to ask how these concerns can be best addressed by greater investment in infrastructure and the promotion of more effective competition in the international marketplace.

Australia is pleased to see Internet use and misuse issues such as spam, e-security, and cybercrime receive the priority they warrant. We welcome the anticipated conclusion of an agreement on spam, a matter on which Australia has been deeply involved. We are disappointed, however, that WGIG has not proposed more concrete options for moving forward in this area. These are issues that need to be addressed to ensure users, both the citizens and consumers, are protected. It is therefore an area that we will be doing more thinking on, and we encourage other stakeholders to do the same in the lead-up to PrepCom 3.

We need to ask, therefore, whether there are practical measures which we can include in the WSIS text in this area.

On the issue of governance and development, we need to consider closely what -- to what extent these are really governance issues as opposed to ICT or development issues of the kind covered by chapter 2 of the draft text for the Tunis summit.

Turning to future institutional arrangements, we need to consider amongst other things which models provide the appropriate voice for government, which models provide an appropriate voice for other stakeholders, including civil society and those with the technical expertise to design and operate these complex technologies.

Which models lend themselves to dynamism in responding to Internet governance issues and which models may stifle process? Whether benefits of models are proportional to the resources they will consume. How the proposed models interact with the proposed fora and existing bodies, including reformed ICANN. In relation to national coordination, Australia commends WGIG on its breadth of vision on including this issue. Stakeholders need to ask, however, how proscriptive WSIS guidance in this area needs to be. In our view, any guidance should be general and leave to individual countries the flexibility to decide how they will organize international Internet governance nationally.

To conclude, I would again like to thank WGIG for its process and its report. It has moved the discussion forward. Thank you.

Chairman Desai:

I now have the Internet governance task force of Japan.

Japan:

Thank you, chairman. First and foremost, Internet governance task force of Japan would like to join all the others to congratulate a successful outcome of the WGIG.

We believe that your hard work, patience, and devotion, spirit of cooperation among multi-sectoral and diverse regional members are the essential parts of your success.

With that, we would like to express our sincere thanks to all the members of the group, but in particular Mr. Nitin Desai, our humorist chair, and Mr. Markus Kummer, our earnest chief working officer, for your dedication and innovative approach.

In September last year at the preparatory consultation meeting here, we asked to concentrate only on core and/or urgent issues that require international cooperative activities. And to be objective, rational and transparent.

We think we have responded to those requests very well. Perhaps much more so than we had originally expected. We also suggested employing the realtime capturing and displaying to help non-English native speakers. We are very, very grateful that was adopted.

As for the substance of the report, we had only a few days between its release last week and today's meeting, and thus we need more time to carefully read and analyze them, consult with our members of the task force and interested public. And we will develop our response hopefully to meet the next deadline of August 15th.

However, we can make some of the following observations today, taking mostly from our previous comments and contributions.

The IGTF would like to welcome the assessment of current governance practices, in particular that of IP numbers, domain names and root servers and zone files which we consider very well balanced and objectively written in the background report. We understand national governments have much interest in Internet governance issues, including IP address allocations, and that they want to protect these resources on the national sovereignty perspectives as Internet is becoming a kind of (inaudible) these days. However, we strongly believe that the conditions required for address management, for example, should not be constrained or limited by the interest of the national sovereignties, but they should be kept in order to preserve the functions of the Internet to be used among all the people of the world for the distribution of information communication.

As for the proposal for creating a new global forum, IGTF made a reservation in our statement in June. We said there will be additional costs associated with creating and maintaining such a new forum, and we will have to bear these costs. Therefore, if we establish a new forum, we need to consider a framework of cost distribution and the forum's cost effectiveness.

Our conclusion, then, was that such a forum might not achieve success when we take those cost factors into consideration, but to put it positively now, if we are to create a forum, we really need to be careful and creative in making the forum work and work meaningfully.

As for the oversight, in particular that of the post-2006 governmental oversight around the DNS and IP address management, we think the government oversight should take the form of a simple audit only which can be exercised under the U.N. framework. In an emergency situation, for example, say if ICANN goes into bankruptcy, it should have the role of providing financial support protection. In other words, we would like to interpret oversight as a lightweight form of cooperative protection, not control of functions carried out under the ICANN framework.

As for the ICANN GAC, we still find it great value in the current position of GAC in the bottom-up policy development process of ICANN. Therefore, it should not be transformed to take on any oversight functions.

Again, we will come back to our observation on four models or options more specifically before the August 15 deadline. Thank you very much.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you very much. Is there anybody else who wants to comment? Because before we conclude I want to call on ambassador Karklins, the Chair of our PrepCom, to perhaps comment on this. Mr. Pisanty. Anybody else before I -- okay. Renate Blom followed by Alejandro Pisanty, and that will be that, and after that Marilyn Cade. Wave your flag around so we will see. Okay. That's it. Then after that, Ambassador Karklins. So can I turn to Renate.

Renate Blom:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. As the conference of NGOs, CONGO, we join all previous speakers to thank you, Mr. Chair, and Mr. Kummer and all members of the working group for really presenting today this forward looking report.

On the substance, we associate ourselves with the statement which was made by the Internet caucus previous. But as CONGO we would like to say you have created a precedence here. Not only in the model of the working group but now you have written history. And we would very much like to support what Switzerland has said, that we ask for your help. That it will be mainstreamed from here, from Geneva to New York. In particular, also, to the outcome document for the summit in September in New York. We would like to see this really as a whole.

The follow-up of the Summit in September with the Summit in Tunis is the way forward, and I think if we can merge these two forward-looking processes, we will have really created history today. Thank you very much.

Chairman Desai:

I have no doubt that you are asking us to project this as a suitable model for Security Council reform in New York?

(Laughter.)

Chairman Desai:

I just wanted to know.

Renate Blom:

For the outcome document in September, it is not only on security reform.

Chairman Desai:

Alejandro.

Alejandro Pisanty:

Thank you, chair. I think, chair, first of all, speaking as a member of the working group, your work and that of Markus Kummer has not been praised enough during this session. The clarity of process, what people have once said about coordinating the Internet, which is like herding cats, was certainly very close to the job that you had to do, and I would like to say

that this does not mean to reflect negatively on any of my fellow working group members, but altogether probably we were a little bit of an unruly crowd that was very well assisted in producing something by your efforts, both during the sessions and enormously between them.

I'm very glad to see that there's a broad recognition of the -- of groups' work in one specific - - in many, but I will mention one specifically, which is the multistakeholder approach. What we have brought from other organizations and experiences on the Internet through the working group, and now it seems through you to the U.N. system, is the recognition of the complexities and difficulties of working in a multistakeholder approach.

Even for our group where there would not be decisions made that would cost money, cause changes in public policy or anything as complex as that, already the composition of the group, the balancing of its membership, the rules for -- the ground rules for discussion and engagement and so forth, were already quite complex to establish. And as we experienced, for example, in ICANN and other organizations, the IETF exemplarily, bringing multistakeholders together is really a combination of art and science and foresight in order that you get the rules right.

The people that will work on this for the PrepCom, the WSIS and probably after that for things like the proposed forum or anything else that emerges, will have a daunting challenge in my view for bringing the stakeholders together in anything that goes beyond a chat club.

If you want to go beyond conversations, if you actually want to make sure you are listening to sufficiently different and diverse points of view, that you are merging opinions in a structured, well-timed way, et cetera, this will be a daunting task and it should not be engaged in lightly.

Deciding upon -- embarking on the position of establishing a forum or an even more complex arrangement should not be done without very deep exploration of the way it will actually work; otherwise, there will be a shell to be filled, and filling it in the wrong way is liable to cause several serious difficulties.

One of them would be, of course, that a system is established that works imperfectly and damages the working of the perfect in many ways. It makes them slower, it makes it harder to move, it makes it difficult for actors from the private sector, from the public sector, from the academic sector, from many ways the civil society acts. It may lead to technical impracticable decisions. And of course the other way it can go wrong is that it becomes so dysfunctional that it is actually ignored by the real players on the ground. And this is something that will also be a huge waste and the cause of enormous confusion and delays in the development of further services on the Internet.

On our report, I think that we should caution -- personally, I think that we should caution the readers and the people who are going to apply this work in being extremely careful in what they need as oversight. I think that time, more than lack of consensus, impeded fleshing out better this concept of oversight.

The concept of oversight came into the report first probably through the discussion of the oversight function that is widely discussed, which the -- an entity of the u.s. government exerts on the authorization of changes to the root zone file in the domain name system and which is mostly a process, vigilance function.

However, it is also common to hear in these discussions speech and discourse about oversight which tends to be much more overarching, much more broadly reaching.

This is something that must, again, be approached with enormous care during the PrepCom and later on in the WSIS plenary, because getting confusing ideas about oversight together in a proposed new organization or institutional arrangement can again cause some very significant difficulties.

In model 2, in particular, as one of the proponents, we have clearly stated that there is no need for an increased oversight over the present evolving -- the presently more established innovation in institutional arrangements, because it has a large amount of its own oversight, while, of course, stating that the increased multilateralism and several other adjustments of significant impact are, of course, to be considered.

But, again, the reach, the scope of oversight has to be very well-defined in any use that is made of this report.

I would finally like to mention that since some of the comments, especially for this model, are related to the functioning of the ICANN GAC, the -- there has already been mentioned and discussion of their possible role or absence of a role of the GAC in the process of creating new gTLDs.

There's an interesting perspective here that it may be useful to share in order, again, to serve as a warning in things that will happen in the future.

A large number of governments, of rational, well-informed, well-placed representatives of governments are members of the GAC.

They have been there for a long time, some of them even, though not officially appointed by their governments, are accepted, and as I understand, are present in all discussions and take part in many of them.

There are two ways in which government people have told us that you have to communicate with governments.

One of them is governments -- and this is the official -- the open statement. You do not communicate with governments by saying, "we are starting a process and we will be glad to take your comments from a web site."

And it may be true, it truly may be that we have to be increasingly formal in communications to governments when one wants to flag issues for them. However, the other way that many people in the world see the action of governments is a proactive, preventive action on things that government officials or the government as a whole consider necessary to deal with.

There is no need, for example, to communicate a forest fire officially through a signed and sealed telegram to the government. In Mexico, at least, there's a unit that's watching out, and when they see some smoke coming up in the mountains, they suspect there's a mountain fire. If there's no report on the phone, they will basically go out there, find if there is one, and send the firefighters, if needed.



It's very similar with things that can cause public-policy attention in governments in the GAC.

If an issue is sitting out there for a year and a half and it is important for a government, one will expect that government officials there will flag it up to their governments, be able to have an official position, have it clear, base it on facts or statistics, excluding other sources of opinion, and otherwise, I mean, if you are a citizen of a country where you see a government that has been sitting in front of a policy issue for a year and a half and not reacted in any way, official or extraofficial, would you probably in many countries consider this a gross dereliction of duty, and maybe actually call the official to account.

So I think that this is a very, very, very healthy mechanism that the GAC has for helping ICANN not to overstep its boundaries and to be extremely attentive to actual public-policy issues. And I think that a construct like this will be very useful in forthcoming arrangements.

Of course, in my personal opinion and in the view of many in the Internet community, a single body encompassing all Internet governance issues will not be practicable, it's not about to be built.

But issue-specific arrangements, let's say fighting spam becomes a high priority for many countries at the same time and the common views of how to deal with it emerge, then a natural ISP/law enforcement/legislative, et cetera, multistakeholder group should emerge and it should be fostered and enhanced by something like the forum that is proposed in the report.

And it would have exactly these same kind of things. There would be government officials who will be seeing, for example, that one way to fight spam that is proposed in that kind of specific organization is going to have public-policy issues, like, for example, impingement on freedom of speech in countries where it is important.

And even though they are not formally warned, they will be there to be signaling and flagging this issue to their capitals and asking the capitals for a way to react.

And I think that this is a perspective of, really, very constructive and productive environment that can emerge from the WGIG report itself and the way it will be dealt with in the PrepCom and in the WSIS plenary. Thank you, chair.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you.

Marilyn Cade:

I will speak today as the chair of the global public-policy committee for the -- for ITAA, an information and ICT association that has over 500 members, many of which do business in the countries that are here today.

And many of our comments will be preliminary, because we have not had sufficient time for a perfect consultation with our members. But we will take advantage of the opportunity to provide more detailed comments.

I must join with others in expressing our appreciation to the leadership of the WGIG and also to the individual members for their hard work, their personal commitment, and their efforts to fulfill their mandate.

I will also say that while we welcome the report, we have many questions about the report and some concerns as well as some aspects of the report that we can really applaud.

And so I will just speak briefly about a couple of concerns that we see. we start from the premise that all of the listing organizations engaged in Internet governance should first do better and do more before any new entities in any area are created.

So the idea of creating a new forum which may in fact primarily be engaged in discussion but have no responsibilities for the implementation of these discussions is troublesome to us, and we do not feel that it has been adequately explored to the degree that we can feel comfortable with it.

We do believe, however, in more discussion, in more participation, and in broader participation within the existing forums.

And we believe that through increasing and improving the participation in these forums by also stakeholders, in essence, we will be improving and increasing a form of oversight, of participatory oversight and of responsible oversight.

Thus we do not, in any way, support spending time and resources on an entity that is a coordinator of the work of others.

This will duplicate, and as we have historically seen, lead to a competition for resources, for personnel, and for time with existing organizations.

And in the end, it will divert the work of the existing organizations into a focus on survival or competition among organizations, diverting funds and resources and thinking and creative solutions away from the challenges that we face.

We support the working definition of Internet governance that has been proposed, but we note that there is a need to think further about the importance of work at the national level.

In fact, in many cases, we believe that the answers to Internet governance lie at the national level and that many issues have not yet really matured to the need for international activities.

We believe that the work of the WGIG paper has perhaps focused a bit heavily on the technical coordination of the Internet and not, perhaps, enough on some of the broader issues.

Like others who have spoken before, we are extremely interested in further examination of the issues of cybersecurity and spam.

And we do believe that a single forum cannot be addressing the complexity of all of the Internet issues, all of the Internet governance issues.

We are caution about the four brides or the four models presented. In fact, we believe that ICANN is itself already evolving and taking steps to address many of the questions that have been raised.

And we would urge for those who have questions that they come to ICANN and join us in working within a multistakeholder forum to achieve the improvements that they seek.

We note a particular suggestion that gives us pause, and we think that perhaps we have misunderstood one of the recommendations of the working group. In paragraph 73b, there is a suggestion that to us reads as though all countries should follow a single path in Internet governance coordination. This is not something that we feel comfortable with.

We believe that, in fact, there is no one size fits all and that governments should seek to develop a form of advancing Internet governance in a way that suits their citizens and their characteristics, embracing the principles of the WSIS, but not necessarily doing things exactly like a neighboring country does.

We see that, for instance, countries like New Zealand, Canada, Australia, the U.S., and others have all adopted approaches that seem suitable to their country, yet none of these approaches are exactly alike.

We do agree that the enhancement of legitimacy of Internet governance processes can, indeed, benefit from broader participation by those who are interested and want to participate. And we believe that this includes governments.

But we think that governments perhaps have a challenge as great as the challenge of the private sector and civil society. And that is that in embracing the call for multistakeholder participation, they must join us in changing their behavior.

And in understanding that we will not always come to them and ask their permission, but we will welcome their joining us in dialogue and debate, and in creating an environment where we do truly participate in developing Internet governance in a bottom-up, consensus-based process that can be advised and supported by governments as well as by the rest of the participants.

Overall, we believe there must be a pragmatic and realistic assessment of how to encourage existing organizations to continue their improvement, to focus on their core missions, and to coexist with other groups to avoid overlap and competition between entities.

We do not think it takes a new entity to do that, but believe that mature and productive behavior should be expected from those entities as they seek to assist in meeting the objectives of improving access to ICTs for all.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you. Good. Ambassador Karklins.

Amb. Janis Karklins:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, I should be very innovative, being the last speaker, and to find the different words to express gratitude for the work done.

So, therefore, it is very difficult for me to really find the new expressions, and therefore I will restrain myself saying, thank you, thank you working group, thank you Nitin Desai, thank you Markus Kummer for the work you have done.

The report which you presented today and we are discussing right now in my view is a very rich and substantive report, both in view of facts as well as recommendations.

In the process, we have made halfway. I don't know whether that is the biggest half or the smallest half. But certainly that is -- or was not the most difficult half, because one thing is to discuss together facts and to produce recommendations.

Another thing is to find a consensus among 191 governments on the issues which influence our daily lives all around the world.

I also noticed that the nature of the exercise will change, and we will enter an intergovernmental negotiation process, which is guided by very clear rules of procedure.

And I hope that the voices and opinions of other stakeholders will be heard throughout the process, as it was the case in the past, once the negotiation process will evolve.

We are facing a number of challenges, and I would like to outline a very few of them.

First of all, the Internet is a dynamic system, dynamically changing system. And as you, Mr. Chairman, indicated, that if this exercise would have taken place in year 2000, maybe the outcome would be completely different from the one we read in the report.

But we are not discussing about Internet of 2005. We are looking to the Internet in the future. And realistically, we don't know how Internet will look like in two years' or three years' time from now.

Therefore, we should find the dynamic answer to this dynamic equation. And we know that it is sometimes difficult to find even a static answer among 191 governments.

Another issue, another challenge is that the outcome of our exercise should benefit all Internet users around the world. And I think that we should not lose sight that we are working for each and every Internet user around the world. And this is our responsibility, to ensure that he will benefit from our decisions.

Another challenge that I see is that WGIG has identified four clusters of public-policy issues. And institutional arrangements is only one of them.

And I would wish and I would hope that in discussing issues related to Internet governance, we would address the whole range of public-policy issues and would not exclusively concentrate on one of them.

I would like to remind ourselves on the way forward, we have agreed in second PrepCom that the formal way would be, after presentation of the report until August 15th, all stakeholders, government, private sector, civil society, intergovernmental organizations, would be invited to present written comments on the report.

These comments would be placed on the web site. They would be compiled in a structured way in a document which then would be submitted, together with the report, to the PrepCom 3 and would serve as a source of information for our future work.

As we heard today, there is also informal process. Informal process, governments are talking to each other bilaterally, there will be organized multilateral consultations in formal consultation process by chair designate of the subcommittee dealing with Internet governance issues, ambassador of Pakistan, Mr. Masood Khan.

And these informal processes should bring us closer to the common understanding, which would certainly facilitate the process of negotiations during third PrepCom.

The third PrepCom, Mr. Chairman, has many issues on the table. We have issues on implementation of Geneva plan of action and follow-up to WSIS in general.

We have -- we are facing negotiations of political (inaudible) as well as some outstanding paragraphs from chapter 2 on financial mechanisms, and not to mention chapter 3 on Internet governance.

We have to be aware that without agreement which would be seen as a satisfactory for all governments, we should not claim -- on Internet governance, we should not claim the Tunis phase as a successful, and therefore the PrepCom 3, which is the last PrepCom before the summit, is very important, and I would hope that with the collective wisdom, we will be able to reach satisfactory conclusions not only on issues of Internet governance, but of all other issues which are in front of us. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you very much. This has been a very satisfying morning for us, with the frequent expressions of congratulations to me, to Mr. Kummer, and to the members of the group. I thank you for that, for this recognition.

This report has been well-received here, and it was also well-received, not the report itself, but the ideas in the report, when it was presented last week in ICANN. So, obviously, we got something right.

So I hope we've got some things right in terms of providing you with a basis for starting on your work.

I do believe the fact that we did not make a -- what I believe would have been a misguided effort to present you with a single set of ideas has been helpful, because it's unrealistic to believe that just because -- let's -- somehow we had succeeded, the 40 of us, in finding common ground.

It's unrealistic to believe that this would just simply be endorsed by everybody in governments. Because we were not an intergovernmental group; we were a group of experts. And I think it has been helpful, perhaps, that we have put a range of options for consideration by governments. It does mean that there's a lot of work which still has to be done. But I'm sure that it will get done under the very able leadership of Ambassador Karklins and Ambassador Masood Khan.

I would say that there are some lessons, several people have mentioned, lessons to be learned from this process for other processes. I'm sure this is something we will do in a broader context. But this is not the challenge of the WSIS PrepCom.

But I take the point that has been made, and certainly as somebody who is more broadly involved in U.N. reform processes, I would have certain interest in seeing what are the lessons we can learn from this.

If I had to pick on one lesson which has come across very clearly from all of these exercises and all of the things that we have seen, I would say it's the absolute vital importance of transparency in governance, of people knowing why certain things are being done.

And as closely linked to that transparency is the issue of participation, and, of course, that of accountability.

And if I had to make a judgment of all of the things that we have looked at, a personal judgment, not a judgment necessarily of the group, I would say that perhaps this is the issue which links together not just the institutional issues we have talked of, but also a lot of the other issues that we have dealt with. For instance, people have talked a lot about interconnection costs. And in many ways, some people have also said is this a governance issue or is this something different?

But if you look at what we have said in our report, we have really focused attention quite strongly on the issue of transparency here. The fact that we don't know how the system of interconnection costs works, why we are being charged what we are being charged. And that is the issue which has been strongly emphasized.

I find this -- every time I stay in a hotel, I have a problem with transparency on -- I was charged \$127 for a ten-minute phone call from New York to India, \$127 is what I was charged. And, of course, when I went down to pay the bill, I waved my arms and shouted so they promptly reduced it by \$50.

And then I protested and said, you know, why I have -- I said I want an explanation on how you derived the charges, et cetera, and they reduced it by another \$32. So maybe that's the answer to the interconnection charges, wave our arms and shout and maybe something will happen.

So part of the function of a political process and a forum is this, it allows people to wave their arms around and shout. And that sometimes has some effect, you see. So -- but these are just personal observations.

This has been a most useful exercise for us, those of us who have come to this process from outside. My suggestion is that in the afternoon we go a little more deeply into one or two areas.

And I am going to request don mills to say a little bit about the forum, and then I am going to request four people to say a little bit more about the four clusters. That will be -- I think Bill Drake is going to talk about the definitions issue. Raul Echeberria will speak a little on how our thinking evolved on issues under cluster 1. Jovan Kurbalija will speak on cluster 2. Am I right?

And then on -- Bill is going to under cluster 3, where we actually have not said a great deal. And on cluster 4, is it Karen? Karen and Waudu, the two of them will speak a little bit.

Just to give you a sense of how these various proposals have come from so that you get a sense of how the group came to these conclusions. With this, I close the session. We meet -- but before we do that, there's an announcement from Markus that we reassemble at 3:00 here. And as I said, at 4:00, there will be a multistakeholder forum moderated by Mr. Kleinwachter.

Secretary Kummer:

Maybe an explanation first. Because Bill is surprised we called on him to explain cluster 3. But we had originally Juan Carlos Solines Moreno who agreed to present cluster 3, but he informed us yesterday that he is now in charge of ICT in Ecuador and he was not able to make it on this section. So we now count on Bill to explain a bit our approach to cluster 3.

May I at this stage just ask, those panelists who are already present who agreed to take part in the workshop, just a little bit together here so we can discuss how to proceed tomorrow, just right now, and then we will take it from there.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you. We reassemble at 3:00.

(Break.)