



APNIC at WTPF

World Telecommunications and ICT Policy Forum

In preparation for the WTPF held from 14 to 17 May 2013, APNIC participated in preparations as part of the Informal Expert Group (IEG). The IEG was convened by the Secretary-General of the ITU to prepare for the WTPF. Paul Wilson contributed an [article](#) to accompany a [document from the NRO](#). All [IEG contributions](#) are available online.

Below are some references and short extracts from APNIC's own contributions in collaboration with other organizations:

1. [Comments from ARIN, on behalf of the NRO](#), to the first draft of the Secretary General's report:
 - "A discussion on Internet-related public policy issues, in particular those issues raised in Resolutions 101, 102, and 133, should be discussed in a multilateral, transparent, and democratic manner. A multistakeholder approach, where full participation of relevant organizations is welcomed, could be a key for success of the 5th WTPF."
 - We note that the Secretary General's report for WTPF does not contain any reference to the only common resolve of Resolutions 101, 102 and 133 which respond to changes negotiated at the last Plenipotentiary Conference in Guadalajara in 2010:
 - To explore ways and means for greater collaboration and coordination between the ITU and relevant organizations (*) involved in the development of IP-based networks and the future Internet, through cooperation agreements, as appropriate, in order to increase the role of the ITU in Internet governance so as to ensure maximum benefits to the global community. (*) Including, but not limited to, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), the Regional Internet Registries (RIRs), the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), the Internet Society (ISOC) and the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), on the basis of reciprocity.
2. Comments from ISOC, ICANN, and the NRO to the [Third Draft of the ITU SG report](#):
 - "We respectfully ask [the Chair of the IEG] to support the general sense of the Group to re-structure the debate, and the report itself, around suggested themes. The next meeting of the IEG in October will be an opportunity to discuss these themes, and, in this context, the Opinions which will be an expected outcome of WTPF. These themes will allow a forward-looking and constructive WTPF process, which will not reopen past debates on the already established Resolutions 101, 102, and 133; but take them a step further into more constructive areas."
 - "In the Third Draft of the Secretary-General's Report there are numerous instances in which the views of "some" are contrasted with those of "others". For example, there are contrasting views on whether the ITU and/or the current management of the Internet are "sufficiently multistakeholder". It is suggested that some think the Internet architecture can withstand current and future demands for security, quality of service, identity management or multilingualism; while others are described as thinking that the underlying technical architecture must change. There are different views expressed about IPv6 deployment and ways to promote its adoption, the role of policymakers and whether reform is needed of the existing structures and processes. The draft also references concerns about RPKI, the magnitude and scale of the gTLD expansion, the delegation and administration of ccTLDs, the process towards multilingualism in the DNS and the composition of the GAC of ICANN. Future drafts of the Secretary-General's report could consider simple factual accounts of what is taking place on these subjects without any conjecture on whether these are beneficial or not. We think that plurality of competing views is important for deliberations, as much as all relevant parties can participate in the debate on an equal footing. This plurality needs to be reflected in the draft report. Finally, we strongly suggest finding an agreement on a main theme first, and then structuring the next Draft Report and deliberations around this subject."

3. Comments from ICANN and the NRO to the [Fourth Draft of the ITU SG report](#):
 - "We propose to change the title of section 2.3.1 to: "The Growth of the Internet as a Global Infrastructure". This section has overlooked one critically important observation: The Internet has managed to connect more than 2.3 billion people. This was achieved thanks to the open and innovative nature of the multistakeholder institutions, distributed structures and the technology itself."
 - "In addition to the endorsement of the "multi-stakeholder model", the first phase of WSIS triggered a process to develop a working definition of Internet Governance. The Working Group on Internet Governance debated whether the definition should refer to the management of Internet naming and addressing, or to a broader agenda, including, for example, network security, access to infrastructure, privacy, consumer protection, etc. The second phase of WSIS concluded (see p. 58 of the Tunis Agenda) that the working definition of Internet governance should recognize the broader agenda rather than just Internet naming and addressing. The divergence of opinion that is suggested in c) fails to recognize the difference between the narrow and the broad agenda of Internet governance. Paragraph i) refers to the successful implementation of the multistakeholder model in the remit of Internet addresses and numbers; however flags that in the broader agenda (i.e. exploitation of children, security, cyber-crime and spam), there is additional work to be done to accomplish a multistakeholder model. There is in fact no divergence of views, as the proven success in the implementation of the multistakeholder model in the addressing space should not exclude the possibility of successful implementation in the broader subjects."
 - Paragraph iii) documents very well the wide-ranging nature of ITU's "membership", however, it fails to mention whether the ITU "processes" are compatible with the multistakeholder principles which require stakeholder participation to be on an "equal footing".
4. APNIC submitted an information document authored by Chief Scientist Geoff Huston, entitled "[An End-to-End View of Telecommunications Policy Frameworks](#)".
 - "The Internet is a highly diverse and flexible amalgam of many components, and when we consider the policy matters related to its governance now and in the future it's clear that this topic is one that necessarily directly engages many stakeholders, of which the actors in the telecommunications sector form one part of many. The calls for continuation of representative-based meeting of national delegations within the narrow confines of telecommunications sector to subsume the public policy agenda of the Internet suffer from a limited perspective of the Internet itself. Addressing this limitation of perspective in such considerations of public policies entails far more than making working documents publicly available, or calling for national delegations to consult their national communities within the confines of telecommunications practices and policies. It calls for open multi-stakeholder participation in an open dialogue about such topics of Internet governance that directly reflect the diversity of interests and activities that collectively form the Internet itself."