
Open consultations of the Fourth Meeting of the Working Group on Internet Governance*

14 June 2005

[afternoon 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:

Can the members of the working group settle down. Welcome back. I'm glad not too many of you got lost in this building, which is the most unintuitive building I have ever been in. But the -- you have no idea if you have -- I have no idea if I have to get out of this building, which way to go right now. But whatever it is, I'm glad you're all back. Let's continue.

I'm not at this stage going to try and summarize, but just remind you once again that I think at this stage, it would be most helpful if people focused around the questions, not because those questions are the only ones which need to be asked, but because I think in the pre-lunch session, quite a few people did address that, did address the issues posed in the questions.

And there is a range of views which have been expressed. And it will be very helpful for the working group if we heard views expressed around that so it's easy for us to see what the range of opinion is. But do feel free to talk about other issues also.

I'm going to first call on (inaudible) from Nominet, and then I think Brazil. I have two to start the discussion off with. Then we'll see how it goes. And then Ambassador Karklins, the chair of Prepcorn, who has the easy job of getting an agreement on the recommendations of the working group after we finish our work. So I'll take -- we'll take more names as we go along. Start with Emily Taylor from Nominet.

Nominet:

Thank you, Mr. Desai, and congratulations to you and Mr. Kummer on the work of the working group to date. Lots of progress has been made. And that is a benefit to the entire community. For those of you who may not be aware of Nominet, Nominet is the registry for dot uk domain names. We are the second largest ccTLD after Germany, and we have over 4 million domain names in the registry.

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

<http://www.WGIG.org/June-scriptafternoon.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. No spelling or transcription errors have been corrected.

Mr. Desai, we have submitted our responses to your questionnaire, and I don't propose to reiterate those responses here and now. But I just would draw your attention to the fact that we have done a written submission. All I wanted to do was to draw out two or three broad comments on the question of the way forward. Like others who have spoken this morning, we do not feel convinced of the need for a new institution.

However, I'm not going to be the thousandth person to say, "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Clearly, if there are stakeholders in this process who feel that the current systems and processes aren't perfect, then we should all listen to that and do what we can to address those concerns.

The question is how you go about it and whether you throw out the baby with the bath water, so to speak. Although I think everyone would acknowledge that the present mechanisms are far from perfect, generally speaking, they work well and provide a lightweight, enabling environment for innovation and growth.

Yes, there is informality, but there is also great flexibility, which is essential in a market that has not yet stabilized. Existing institutions such as ICANN or the IETF allow for a multistakeholder participation on an equal footing. And I think we all acknowledge that that is very important. And I think it's also striking that participants from developing nations are able to successfully engage in those processes at present.

Any new institution would have to be funded. There will be a cost. And, ultimately, that cost may be borne by the end user. And I think in an environment where we're trying to encourage capacity-building and developing nations to engage and join in this wonderful net, it would be an unfortunate outcome for the -- for there to be a large cost for us all to bear. And I think that might defeat some of the WSIS's objectives. So that concludes my comments. Thank you.

Chairman Desai:

Okay.

Brazil:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have here a two-page statement which will summarize the Brazilian position. But before that, I think we have to tackle once and for all this argument which says that if it's not broken, don't fix it.

I think let's give you, I think, a simple example. I know that you are an historian. You know very well the Indian history. And you know that the way the British used to rule and govern India as a colony used to be very efficient, stable, reliable, and with well-written bylaws. You have to agree on that. Nevertheless, the Indian population, the Indian people, were not in agreement with that status quo at that time. And that's why you fought for independence.

What I'm trying to say, Mr. Chairman, is that there is a lack of legitimacy in the system. Even though the system is running in a very efficient, stable, reliable way, it's not legitimate, because people are not there to express -- they cannot express their (inaudible). They cannot vote. They have to pay taxes and they are not being represented. It's very similar to another

example that we have in other British colony, the United States of America. When the British tried to tax them, and the Americans said that, "no taxation without representation."

We are in the same position. I think this is a very good example of -- that this argument makes no sense. It's useless for our discretion here. And I think we can refrain from using it again and again, as we are doing.

Having said that, let me read to you the Brazilian statement. Despite the success in ensuring high availability and greatest ability to the operation of the network, the current structure for global governance of the Internet presents significant limitations, and as I said, a lack of legitimacy.

The governance issue involves challenges that go beyond ICANN's mandate. Several topics are not treated by it, not contemplated in any other existing forum. For example, interconnection costs, spam, cybercrimes. This points to the need to create an international structure for Internet global governance that involves adequate representation from governments and other segments of the civil society, such as the third sector, the private sector, the academic community.

A global Internet governance coordination forum ought to be created. This forum should be autonomous, independent, and based on an international treaty that guarantees the required legitimacy and established in conformance with the principles of multilateralism, democracy, transparency, and multistakeholder.

Basic assumptions for the creation of the forum. Let me read a few of them.

- a, Existing institutions which are (inaudible) with the Internet governance process should adapt to the principles established by WSIS, which are those of multilateralism, democracy, transparency, and multistakeholder.
- b, The agenda of the forum structure should be brought and encompass all aspects related to Internet governance.
- c, This structure should include an exclusively governmental decision-making instance to deal with issues pertaining to the nations' sovereignty.
- d, The forum should be established in such a way that the stability and continued expansion of the Internet are assured.
- e, The governance model adopted in brazil through the formal constitution of the brazilian Internet steering committee could serve -- and we are willing to provide information on that -- could serve as a basis for the building up of dimension structure.
- f, The governance model adopted in brazil could serve as a basis for establishing exchange of experiences and cooperation process for structuring national governance models in search of ways to facilitate participation of countries, communities in the global forum.

Let me talk about some essential requirements for the forum.

- a, It should coordinate a broad set of governance issues.
- b, It should be multistakeholder.
- c, It should include an intergovernmental mechanism in which governments exert their responsibilities through a specific set of public-policy issues.
- d, It should not be under the jurisdiction of a single country.
- e, It should work for the global public interest.

- f, It should abide by the criteria of transparency, democracy, and multilateralism.
- g, Each of the representatives of the four interest groups, which are governments, business association, nonprofit civil society organization, and scientific and technical community, must have a clear form of accountability regarding its or their corresponding constituencies.
- h, It should coordinate the diverse existing organizations, instead of replacing them.
- i, It should be efficient and practical to speed up decision-making.
- j, It should be flexible and adaptable to adjust its agenda to the evolution of the Internet.
- k, It should be capable of correcting issues from the interested groups and disperse them to the different organizations.
- l, It should have the capability of resolving conflicts as well as coordinating the work among the diverse organizations. and
- m, the last one, it should be self-sustained.

I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Desai:

Ambassador Karklins.

Janis Karklins:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have any prepared remarks. I asked for the floor a little bit spontaneously, because listening to this morning's debate, I have a feeling we are trying to concentrate on one specific issue, namely, an institutional arrangement.

And I haven't heard many interventions, if at all, on other issues, which in previous consultations, we defined as being important, and just now, the delegate from Brazil mentioned the issue of interconnection costs, which are important for developing countries, for the growing markets.

And I hope that the group, in discussions, will address the broad range of issues and the final recommendations will not reflect only the subject or focus of discussions of these consultations, but will address also issues much broader. And I want also to remind ourselves that one of the purpose or one of the tasks of the working group is to come out with the working definition of Internet governance.

And so though we have a very rich discussion, personally, I haven't seen a written definition, and I haven't heard that we would discuss it. So I believe that that would be very helpful to understand what we're talking about and that our understanding of the subject matter is similar, not that I am talking about mother and somebody else is talking about daughter.

So, therefore, I would simply call on representatives of government to -- also to address other issues that the working group could get a broader sense of what we are thinking and what we understand with the Internet governance.

Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, I think that the working group is doing a marvelous job, and I really hope that July 18th will be the beginning of very intensive reflection in consultations, which will lead us to successful outcome of our discussions during third Prepcom. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you very much. I can assure you (inaudible) the group will say something on the question of definitions. Because we have discussed it earlier. And that's why perhaps it has not come up that frequently in the discussions today, because it had figured quite prominently in earlier consultations. Ambassador Hill, South Centre. Then I have Mr. Pisanty. And the worldwide -- the W3 Consortium.

Anthony Hill:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The South Centre has been working with a number of developing countries throughout the process and has prepared a number of papers for discussions with those countries. We hope to be in a position to enlarge the consultations with a wider number of developing countries and stakeholders in those countries as well.

Our understanding of the process is that within a few weeks, this report from WGIG will go to the secretary general, and then there will be an opportunity for further discussion in open consultations on the 18th of July in Geneva.

It has also been suggested that the report will be posted on the Internet to elicit comments from interested parties, including those who may not have followed the process closely. This will give nongovernmental actors, especially in developing countries, an opportunity to make known their views in the range of policy -- public-policy issues that are important for affordable access both nationally and internationally.

The recommendation made by WGIG will therefore be most important to the individual user grappling with Internet connection, its affordability, and the availability of search engines and directories to make navigation or surfing of value. Broadband is an important part of the convergence brought by Internet technologies.

For these reasons, the recommendations of WGIG should address these key issues.

The consultations to date in the open session perhaps have not given sufficient attention to interconnection charges and broadband connectivity and the key roles of Internet service providers.

It is hoped that these issues will be more fully addressed and be included in the priority recommendations. The issues that have been addressed in some depth include the logical infrastructure of the DNS and the root server system, both key technical systems that have functioned well to scale the Internet to include exponential growth in the numbers of users and industries over decades into what is now a global information and communication utility facility and services.

From this morning's presentations, based on the questionnaire, a number of points are offered for consideration in WGIG's preparation of its report. That's the domain name system, to start with. Its continued successful operation must be safeguarded inter alia in light of, one, the security challenges from denial of service; the anycast server deployment already being done should be pursued, along with the diversification of the root name servers.

Two, universal open standards and innovation at the edges should be re-emphasized. As part of this exercise, the comments regarding the unique stewardship, the stewardship function of

the United States over the DNS made this morning should be discussed within the framework of the WSIS summit principles.

Over the previous few years, a number of alternatives have been proposed. ICANN has acted on some of the management prospects. Further improvements are clearly needed in light of the representations being made.

As recognized, governance of the DNS, the domain name system, is but one part of Internet governance. It is not all-embracing of Internet governance.

And the question arises whether ICANN's role should then be more narrowly defined to deal with the names and naming system and the navigation over the Internet through the DNS technical system. Would this narrow scope definition give legitimacy to ICANN? From the discussions, it does not seem to be the case, given the insistent demand for the inclusion of WSIS principles to the ICANN functioning.

Regarding the root server, the root name server operators, a presentation made this morning was not clear to me whether that organization, which is one of the ICANN Internet communities, was arguing for greater autonomy with respect to the naming functions. Whether that is so or not, I think one of the issues considered important is the need for more formal coordination of the root name server operators, given their rather informal but critically important role in the stability of the Internet.

The generic top-level domain registries have been another main focus of concern. ICANN has responded, but perhaps not fast enough and not far enough. The recommendations from the WGIG should address possible mechanisms, processes, and criteria for creating top-level domain names and redelegation so that they are clear and consistent with the principles of WSIS.

The commercial challenges facing the Internet should not be overlooked. These include ICANN's contractual arrangements with top-level domain operators regarding their services being consistent with ensuring the stability and integrity of the Internet.

If the line of thought expressed in the open consultations is a guide to those in the WGIG, there is a strong likelihood that a role is to be retained for ICANN post-2006, that the u.s. government's stewardship of the DNS will be further internationalized with multilateral safeguards against political and commercial pressures from all sides. This will be the challenge.

It will not be enough to speak generally, however, of the private sector. There will need to be specificity to the private sectors as important stakeholders in developing countries.

The sharp distinction between technical and policy issues does not reflect what the questionnaire considers to be -- and I quote -- "politically and financially realistic proposals," unquote.

The technical systems, of which the DNS is one, and the institutional framework of organizations, of which ICANN is one, work together in complementary ways. The institutional framework and policies are engaged continuously to enable the technical systems to be constructed, operated, controlled, regulated, and improved.

And this is true for both the private and public sectors. And so we believe that to try to distinguish too sharply technical from policy would denude the direction of the Internet and the importance that it has for publics across the world.

The WGIG report and recommendations will take another path through the WSIS Prepcom process leading up to and beyond Tunis.

And there is much to be gained from clarity and inclusive processes. We have one of our discussion notes, the latest one in April, a few copies, so that we have set out some of the arguments regarding Internet connectivity, ISPs, broadband, and the like. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you, Ambassador Hill. Alejandro Pisanty, a member of our working group.

Alejandro Pisanty:

Hank you, chair. Good afternoon, everybody.

I think that the -- the esteemed representative of Brazil has made some extremely important and -- statements which can have very broad consequences and should be considered carefully by all present, and certainly will be considered in extreme care by the working group.

Especially the call for all organizations with a claim to involvement in Internet governance at the present, to have to fulfill the criteria of the world summit on the information society on transparency, accountability, and so forth. This is a sweeping statement, has sweeping consequences. We have already witnessed during this session, for example, and in the papers that are published as an advance of the report, of the WGIG, how deep the scrutiny can be, for example, of ICANN, which comes out in our view, in large scale, a fulfillment of these values. Looking at many other organizations may probably be a massive reform process for the international system, which certainly will take some time and will require something to stand up in the meantime.

What is called in these discussions the present arrangements or even the status quo is actually one step in an evolution process in which new governance arrangements are being made, explored, experimented with, and continuously corrected according to the needs and principles of the participants. Among other members of the working group, professor Kleinwachter, has been very insistent in an excellent and brief article in German on the fact that the evolution of governance in this form will be a measure of how much people and organizations are really adapting their governance to the 21st century.

The arrangements that are called the present ones, as I said, are a step in this evolution. They appeared as a function and as a response to specific needs. The IETF way of working, for example, for technical standards appeared and adapted as the standards were being developed, and there's a need for global governance in the way they were set and revised was necessary.

Same thing can be said, then, for protocol parameters which engender things like the IANA function. The other uniquely valued identifiers like IP addresses and DNS, the domain name

system, all of them gave rise to specific arrangements, specific ways of working, not only the organizations but the ways they work, as the need appeared.

The relevant stakeholders met. In most cases they called on the governments of the world and their own countries, because they were law-abiding actors in their own countries and though they were sure they wanted a free Internet they didn't want a lawless or certainly a law-breaking Internet.

And what I see here, and I will submit as an idea to the group in the following days, is that more than a proven need for a single all-encompassing forum, what appears in the landscape in the future is the need for specific forums for issue-specific development. I won't say even mechanisms or organizations but ways of dealing with spam, ways of dealing with cybercrime, ways of dealing with the many other public policy related issues that we have already looked at in the group.

It should be remembered that in our latest session in April we spent a full session on spam and could not propose global arrangement for global governance that have any promise of happening soon and dealing a blow to spam.

This kind of exploration will appear again on many other issues. The existing organizations, many of the existing mechanisms, and some new innovations that I have to foresee and we can look at during the WGIG process, will probably be useful for each of these issues.

So this is to explain that there is not only a very well-expressed resistance to an all-encompassing new forum coming from organizations that want to conserve their space or coming from organizations that don't want to see more change because they are at the forefront of change, but of thinking clearly that the all-encompassing forum is not bound to be as useful as more focused specific mechanisms.

In these new mechanisms or forums, the experience of the recent past will certainly be taken into account, so questions, for example, of what has to be the governmental presence in them will build on the experience of ICANN, which as Dr. Twomey has expressed earlier in this session, is also being looked at again.

We will also see how much these arrangements are amenable to global governments, how much they're amenable to regional arrangements or to arrangements between countries with similar legal traditions and so forth.

Of course this will not preclude the perfecting and the continued evolution of the organizations that are already at work. And as a final point, which I think is a reminder to all WGIG members and the commitment that I think all WGIG members make to this consultation audience, I think that there will be a huge waste of effort and enormous and unforgivable waste of energy and of money of the peoples of the world that pays for these meetings and as Marilyn Cade has said for all the indirect costs of attending them if we do not move past the obsession with fixing, refixing, reestablishing or giving a new legal framework to something that's already working pretty well.

Our accountability as a WGIG, the accountability of the arrangements that are created will have to be on a par or superior to the accountability that each of us expects to demand from our governments when we go back home, for the fulfillment of their commitments in the WSIS plan of action.

And the benefit of users, of all stakeholders from private sector, from academic sector, research, innovation, civil society and future users will have to prevail in our minds for this test.

Chairman Desai:

I have Daniel Dardailler from the W3C consortium.

Daniel Dardailler:

Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. What I wanted to mention is that it's important that there is more synergy in this area because I hear people saying that if it's not broken, don't fix it. But as w3c and the provider of important technology, such as html or xml or accessibility guidelines, we see a need for more legitimacy, because people and government, sometimes they don't understand the work that we do or they don't even know we exist, and they look for the technology that we provide in more official standard body like ITU or ISO where they can find them.

So it's important that there is more education toward united nation and the government of the planet to the understanding that the work that we do is the thing that they used and that they should participate in the consortium and also in the understanding of what this technology bring them.

Chairman Desai:

Heather Shaw, ICC.

ICC:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. As this is ICC's second intervention today, I'll remind you that ICC has posted a detailed response to each question as it was phrased on the web site. In addressing the need for an oversight function now, I wish to offer some further explanation of ICC's response as it deals with both the need for oversight over organizations that deal with issues related to the Internet and oversight over the technical management of the Internet specifically.

The ICC matrix identifying the many organizations that deal with issues related to the Internet was highlighted this morning. Indeed, as it was also pointed out, there are many. As we stated in our first intervention, while some of these organizations could be brought more in line with the Geneva principles, and we encourage the WGIG in its report to consider and make practical suggestions for where such changes may be made, oversight is not needed.

Rather, discussion and information exchange on cross-cutting issues between and among these organizations should be promoted.

Such discussion will naturally aid in the coordination of existing institutions and help to avoid duplication of efforts. In this regard, ICC responded with a conditional yes to the need for discussion forum. We believe that this need is distinct from the need for oversight and should be considered separately by the working group, as should be each of the other questions.

The questionnaire also specifically raises oversight related to ICANN's governmental advisory committee, and that, too, ICC has answered with the intent of constructively searching for options to address the concerns that are the basis for this question being asked. Paul Twomey discussed the many changes that ICANN has made to reflect the interests of its international stakeholders. Indeed, the GAC, too, has been in discussions regarding its role within ICANN. ICC supports this effort.

Furthermore, we believe that the GAC should be retained and strengthened by more active, broader, and higher level participation. Full advantage of existing mechanisms must be exploited before creating new ones. Thank you.

Chairman Desai:

I have Abdullah al-Darrab, and then (inaudible) working group.

Abdullah al-Darrab:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, my statement would come as a comment to the statement that we have heard from Mr. Pisanty, Mr. Alejandro pisanty is one of the members of the group who are very much respected and highly commended by everybody. All of us, we are very proud that he is one of the members of the group.

When he spoke, truly, sir, I was not aware whether he was speaking in his personal capacity as a member of the group or was he speaking as one of the members of the board of directors of the ICANN or his vice-chairman or on behalf of Mexico. I was a little bit confused in this respect. And, therefore, sir, I would like to reiterate to everybody once again here that the working group does not have for a mission to defend one circle or one organ or the other. Rather, the objective and the aim of the working group is to consider all alternatives and to choose the best amongst these in order for us to reach the solution that we hope would be satisfactory to all parties concerned when these solutions find their way to being submitted during the upcoming summit.

I wanted to only make this comment because there was the statement that we have heard first from the representative of Brazil, and it is important for everybody in this meeting room to emerge with -- they must -- nobody must leave the room with the impression that the group is taking a side to that party or to the other. That is the one thing that I wanted to explain, sir. I thank you.

Chairman Desai:

No, I think this is widely understood here, that the group has not -- and I just want to give this assurance that the group really has not come to conclusions on any of these issues. They're all open. This is why we are -- they are being imprisoned for three days so they have to come to a conclusion. And it's totally open.

But at the same time, members of the group are expressing their views as they should as this is an open consultation. There's nothing that we need to hide or anything, so all of the views expressed by members of the group here are views as individuals. And the group is -- still has to consider these issues in depth, and we start doing that from 9:

00 tonight when we get back to our chateau. Are there any further reflections, comments? Yes, ambassador Syria.

Syrian Arab Republic:

Thank you, chairman. I am not the ambassador of Syria, I am just representing the Syrian delegation here in this room.

I would ask you kindly, chairman, by the end of the day if you could give us a short resume of the interventions, if possible; those by member states sitting in this room, those by private and other stakeholders, whether they are civil society or chamber of commerce and so on. And just to help us, chairman, we who will not be imprisoned, luckily, would like to know exactly, chairman, where we stand.

And I am in total agreement that the intervention by the chairperson of the preparation is very, very useful. We should look also to the other issues, not limited only to the answers of the questionnaire, if possible and if time permits, chairman. And we hope that you would be able to, without any -- going into the details, chairman, to see what was the panorama.

I would not be -- I would not hope to be in your position because -- but we would like to hear that, chairman. So that if there would be any need for any refinement of your conclusions, we could give you that at the end of the day. Thank you.

Chairman Desai:

First, fortunately for me the members of the group are here, and they're not dependent on my conclusions; they're forming their conclusions on where the discussion has moved. So my conclusion in that sense is simply that of one individual out of 40 who are in the group. Because all the members of the group are here.

Second, the full text of the interventions comes up here and is available, and will be available on the web site. So all of it is available. I think it will be foolhardy of me to try to summarize a discussion and say that there is some common point of view that is emerging. There is no such thing.

And so please forgive me, but just as you would not like to be in my position, I would say that at this point it is my job is to get the group members together to come to a conclusion, and I will not do anything which makes that more complicated.

All the members of the group are here. They have been listening carefully. They are forming their own judgments on what the range of views here is on the different issues. And we're grateful to the people participating here that they have focused on these issues.

It is true, as Ambassador Karklins has pointed out that our focus has been very much on the structural institutional issues. Partly the reason for this is we did cover a lot of the other ground in the previous consultations and this is the part which we did not really discuss earlier. We had not discussed this extensively in that earlier consultations. And so it's understandable that a great deal of the focus in today's consultation has been on these areas. So I'm in the going to try to summarize the discussions, but I think the range of views is fairly clear. And I can best give a personal assessment of where we stand on some of these.

But if we see there are more interventions which people want to make at this point on any of the issues, or the question which has been raised by Ambassador Karklins about the need to look beyond simply the institution issues into other matters at that time. Mr. Bertola.

Vittorio Bertola:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I didn't think I would have taken the floor today, actually because I was really here to listen. And I really want to thank all the people who took the floor today and gave us a different perspectives.

I think I just want to say one thing. I think that this is really an historical opportunity of breaking new grounds in terms of global governance. The Internet is -- well, it is amazing. I guess everyone by now has got to know all the changes that the Internet has brought in our lives. And it's really making the world united in peace. I think this is an historical advancement in the history of mankind, maybe.

And so I think that if we can actually build this inclusive and open system of governance, we can maybe ensure wellness and development for many years to the entire world. And so I think what we are doing here today is really important.

I think that the members of the working group are doing their best to get to an agreement, to get to a proposal that can make everyone happy. And I just wanted to say that I hope all the stakeholders, all the people that are in this room and maybe are watching us, will do the same to try to find an agreement and get this process to a successful conclusion. Thank you.

Chairman Desai:

No more? Anybody else? Like an auction, I shall ask three times

(Laughter.)

Chairman Desai:

Before I close. Okay. I think basically this has been a useful discussion, because people have focused their remarks -- sorry. Raul Echeberria.

Raul Echeberria:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So everything is clear, we are all wearing several hats here. Here I'm speaking under my personal hat. But of course, that doesn't stop me being a member of the working group on Internet governance.

So I'd like to share with you simply some considerations and comment a little on these open meetings, open to everybody, because I think it would be interesting for the participants to know what the repercussions are of their statements.

On the personal level I would say -- I would like to state how I see this mission on the basis of everything I've heard, and then I'll consider, since this is the last public meeting, I'll consider this as the last opportunity I have currently to speak to everybody. I'm the executive director of the registry of IP addresses for Latin America and the Caribbean, and this is quite a new thing.

Its impact has been positive in our region. We are now the main promoter for the adoption and promotion of the sys protocol that we've spoken about so much and we put a good deal of effort into training in many countries, working with the public sector and with all

interested parties as well as with decision-makers, creating a friend with organizations such as the international society of global knowledge partnership and put a lot of money into financing training in our countries.

We have developed models for self-regulation, very successful ones, with a high level of participation, participatory policies, SMEs taking place and Internet participation in a region with developing countries. So this is to say at the international level there are lots of examples of things that are working well, not only at the operational level but also in terms of benefits for the community.

So these are positive experiences and we should emphasize that this is in developing regions. So when we come here, we listen to proposals, a lot of proposals for creating a new forum, countries such as Japan, Argentina have existing forums, and they think that's probably sufficient, that there's no need for new ones. Other countries are in favor of an intergovernmental forum; others think a forum should be discussion coordination, simply. So it's clear there's no consensus throughout the world in terms of the proposal to be applied.

So having heard all the speakers, I'll state a personal opinion. I commit myself to continuing to offer possibilities which could perhaps satisfy the requirements of certain governments which would like to have more participation. But this is what protecting very carefully all of the experiences that -- the experience that has been gathered already, because it's important that this works well in the operational level, and it will be of great benefit for everybody.

There's been mention several times of pressure in March 2003, of the fact that better is the enemy of good and what's broken shouldn't be fixed, but I intend not to change anything in many ways. I think the problem is not the use of the expression itself; it's, rather, the concept.

We should not seek solutions to problems that don't exist; otherwise, we'll have to look for the problems afterwards, once we've found the solutions.

So what we have to do is see what the real problems are and once we've found those, we should look for solutions. That doesn't mean that we are not committed to innovation and to appropriate forms of work in this framework. Simply we should be committed to technology and science and have an innovatory profile, working within the framework of governance in that spirit. But certainly we should not destroy what exists and what is shown as benefits already. Simply, I repeat, we should improve; we should add aspects that provide added value. But identifying clearly the problems that need to be solved now.

So that is my contribution as member of the working group and as Raul Echeberria. And for the next few days, I hope you'll recall that.

In conclusion I'd like to say that it seems to me the process in itself is very interesting. It's quite extraordinary today with the ITU. But under the United Nations framework, and I think it's quite extraordinary that we're together with representatives of all countries taking the floor, replying, listening, speaking. We're hearing each other's opinions. We have simultaneous interpretation with the script on the screen as well. And for many of us working on the Internet, these are normal things, quite customary. This public commentary on Internet is -- this is a final reflection I'm making now. This process is teaching us a lot, all of us, and governments should also learn through this to move forward while deepening the multi-actor work that they're carrying out.

We should always seek common points and NGOs and intergovernmental organizations should make an effort, as they are doing, in fact. I thank you for letting me participate in the working group and I thank the governmental representatives who have made it possible for us to work together in seeking solutions for the benefit of the whole of humanity. Thank you.

Bertrand de la Chapelle:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I didn't want to extend the duration of this meeting. I just wanted to bring a very concrete question at the point where we are at, which is the end of the open process. And at the moment where the working group is going to go in a secluded place to find the difficult question of how to design a multistakeholder framework to address Internet governance issues.

The problem is the following. At the beginning of Prepcom 3 it would be difficult to see a proper process if there is no document at all apart from a lengthy report, and very valuable report, but it is hard to start a discussion on something that could be adopted in Tunis from 80 or 60 pages report.

So I suppose that there is discussion going on on the possibility of producing, as part or in addition to the report itself, of the production of smaller elements that could form a draft or a template or something that could form the basis for discussion at the Prepcom 3.

I want to ask very concrete questions about, is this something that would -- isn't this something that would help the discussion at Prepcom 3? And if so, if such a draft document is included in the report, would there be a possibility for an open phase of comments between the 18th of July and Prepcom 3 for all stakeholders on an online basis. And lastly, if such a process for commenting on the draft document, even very preliminary, is put in place, could there be a possibility to aggregate the different contributions before Prepcom 3 in a similar way as what the groups of friends of the chair has done for different contributions on implementation and follow-up mechanisms. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Desai:

I think -- if I can respond to that question, there is a clear distinction, there's a clear distinction between the working group and the preparatory process. The working group is a group of experts which is advising, and it is in that spirit that we are doing our work. And certainly to the extent possible, we will present a unanimous point of view, but it is possible in certain areas it will be a range of options.

In that sense I would definitely say this, that do not expect from the working group something which is simply a cut-and-dried thing for negotiations. That is not the desire or the intention. That's the job of the preparatory process, and it's the preparatory process which would have to do this.

You're right that in the very nature of things because of the sheer volume of work which has been done, the report of the group itself will be somewhat lengthy and -- but we would certainly hope to attach the report and executive summary, which would be a much more compact document and that will be used.

The process of using the report beyond the 18th of July is not really the responsibility of the group or its chairman. It's the responsibility of the preparatory process. And I wish either

Ambassador Karklins or ambassador (inaudible) were here to respond to your question because I frankly cannot respond on their behalf. But unfortunately, neither of them is here in this room so I can't turn to them to see how they hope to handle it. What we can do from our side is to make sure that the report is available as fast and as soon as possible so that there is enough time available for people to look at it, study it, comment on it and so on.

But I frankly do not have a local standard for the group beyond the submission of its report, but we can help matters by certainly having an executive summary which would be part of the report, so there is a much more compact document available. There were a couple of hands. One from there and professor Kleinwachter, and the representative of (inaudible).

Adam Peake:

Good afternoon. Thank you very much. It's Adam Peake from Glocom in Tokyo. I'm speaking on my own behalf. But to follow on from those comments, I'd just like to reiterate a comment that the civil society Internet governance caucus made during the consultations around Prepcom 2, and that was namely regarding the follow-up on WGIG's final report. We hope that negotiations will be conducted in an open and inclusive process that ensures a mechanism for the full and active participation of governments, the private sector, civil society from both developing and developed countries, as stated in the Geneva declaration of principles.

The final negotiated document must reflect and honor the multistakeholder process that produced it and that means really that we continue in negotiations from Prepcom 3 onwards to -- with this multistakeholder process as we discuss the report that you will produce and deliver to the Prepcom.

And we very much hope that this will be possible. Something slightly and completely different is an opportunity, perhaps, for people to participate directly in the processes of Internet governance.

At the moment, the ICANN nominating committee is actively seeking candidates for various positions of leadership in ICANN, including two positions for the ICANN board. The committee, of which I'm a member, actually selects eight of the ICANN 15 board members. We are drawn from all the councils and supporting organizations of ICANN.

We are not a construct of the board. We're quite independent in that way. And the candidate process, the selection process, or the taking of candidates who wish to be considered, is ongoing until July 20th. I have left some papers at the back of the room about that.

So this is an opportunity to perhaps do some governance, and not just talk about some governance. And we really do want some good candidates. And I'm sure there are many in this room. So please look at the papers at the back. Thank you.

Chairman Desai:

Wolfgang.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter:

Wolfgang kleinwachter, Mr. Chairman.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter:

You know, we had next to the five one-day consultations, we had around 100 hours in face-to-face consultations among the members of the group. And then I look to my mailbox, and I realized that there were around 8,000 e-mails, you know, from November last year until today, probably even more, though, because I deleted a lot of them.

(Laughter.)

Wolfgang Kleinwachter:

Anyhow, you know, my contribution is not that I want to report to you as a bookkeeper of the working group, but I want to say some of my observations and conclusions from the debate in the last eight months. And what I see as a very important point is that in this eight months, you know, we have learned more and understood more about the nature of the core resources we are talking about.

And I think it's really important to understand that the resource of the information age, the core resources, are different from the resources of the industrial age. In the industrial age, if you talk about resources, like oil or coal or other things, then you know you can use it and others cannot use it. You can use oil or I can use oil. And it means you have to share these resources in a way which is balanced.

You have to balance interests, because, you know, normally, this is -- and the whole diplomacy is a zero-sum game, you win and I lose or I win and you lose. And the diplomacy is to make it fair, not only free but fair, and to find the balance.

The resource for the information age is different. If it works for you, it works for me. If it doesn't work for you, it doesn't work for me. That means if I use an I.P. address, you can use an I.P. address. If I use a domain name, you can use a domain name. That it means this is not a zero sum game. It is a win-win situation.

And more or less, you know, it's this translated into the end-to-end principle of the Internet. So it means this is one, really, very interesting process to see that the power has shifted from the center to the periphery.

And insofar as this is an important observation, because if you come to the conclusions we cannot introduce and propose a management system for the resources which comes from the industrial age and reflects to the, let's say, zero-sum game.

That means we have to find another, more innovative, more creative mechanism, you know, which will take into account this win-win situation, that if it works for you, it works for me. And if it doesn't, it doesn't work for me as well. So and I think this is really the big challenge.

And we have to understand that the core resources of the Internet are common resources of mankind. They are, to a certain degree, unlimited resources. And if it's a common resource, then we have a common responsibility.

And if it comes down to a very concrete questions, for instance, the sovereignty of a nation state, I think governments have to understand although that in the cyberspace, they have to

share the sovereignty with others, while national sovereignty will remain a basic principle for the next 100 years in the majority of the issues of the day-to-day policy, I think in cyberspace, we have to go beyond the traditional understanding of national sovereignty, because this is not a zero-sum game.

This is a win-win situation. And it's the responsibility of the group to make that recommendation which will look forward into the information age and not look backward into industrial age. Thank you very much.

Chairman Desai:

You're very right. This has been a learning experience. Actually, my first tutorial on Internet governance came from Wolfgang Kleinwachter at the Geneva summit. I just wanted to thank him for that. That was my first tutorial on Internet governance, if you remember, way back.

But first I have the representative of Syria, then ILO. Somebody there? Yes, and -- yes. First the representative from Syria.

Syrian Arab Republic:

Thank you, chairman, for giving me the floor again. Chairman, I was about to state something in general when I heard the last speaker speaking about win-win situation. It's not a win-win situation.

My administration could not go to the United States. We could not have visas to enter into the United States. So I don't believe with him stating today that it's a win-win solution, chairman.

Second, the main root server is in the hands of a company in the United States and the jurisdiction of the state department for commerce. So these are known facts. We are state members here stating that, clearly, we don't agree with the existing system for many, many reasons.

We would like to ask you, chairman, kindly, with the help of your group, to answer those questions Brazil has raised, my administration has raised, as public issues. And how these could be answered.

When we spoke about cybercrime, we need an answer from your group. You can tell us no existing services, existing organization, the 41. If you ask me to attend 41 organization, chairman, to understand what's going on, you -- we would expect from you, chairman, after you say that the conclusions, you don't want to get into the conclusions. We have heard today three views:

Status quo by majority; we have heard people asking for a forum; and we have heard some people supporting the existing U.N. specialized organizations. But we need answers from you, chairman. We hope that in your report we will get an answer.

Privacy, how this should be protected. This is a U.N. official (phonetic) to protect the consumers.

Second, we have heard the issue raised by our colleague from Brazil, cost. Who is going to pay the cost, chairman?

So we would like from you kindly, chairman, to tell us what would be the solutions to the public issues, how your group would think, for instance, cybercrime, law enforcement.

We have heard today our colleague from Japan saying that they have signed MoUs in Asia against -- but could you tell me how I could protect my own users of the Internet from spam? Just to go and buy technical equipment, chairman, and pay again double? Why? I am not a spam distributor. There should be someone who could stop spam distributing, chairman. The system has such difficulty because we could not identify who is sending spam. This is one of the most difficult issues.

In the whole history of ITU, nobody could disturb somebody else. By calling him. He could be identified immediately. But unfortunately, with the system we have today, anybody could send anything to anyone, even crimes.

We have heard today the ambassador, or our colleague from Brazil telling us about this x. Chairman, in my country, this is against morals. It's not allowed. So we don't understand how that becomes an issue now. And we say let's have it.

We have heard now, again, ICANN giving a new ccTLDs to a language, chairman. We are not against Catalan but are they going to give all linguistic groups an address, chairman? This we have heard recently. We have heard that this was supposed to be done by governments. It's not to be done by a group. Maybe some linguistic group will be disappointed. So we should be very, very careful.

And we ask you, kindly, chairman, tell us what do you consider public and what do you consider nonpublic, so at least you would help us in the future to look at this at the third Prepcum. Thank you.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you. I have ILO, followed by the WSIS executive secretariat and the Internet Governance Task Force of Japan.

ILO:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The importance of participation in existing or new instances is clearly a function of existing human resources and institutions at the national level. Those vary significantly from country to country.

The improvement of governance, therefore, passes through development of local rather than international instances and resources. For example, training specific Internet users on the ways of intervening in pertinent fora and/or the technical virtual meetings taking decisions relating to their work. Or setting policy fora to address local issues.

However, two issues do remain at the international sphere. One is the oversight function needed to strengthen accountability of most institutions. The second is the mechanism to identify issues and mobilize the pertinent actors to solve them. Thank you, chair.

WSIS:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Because there is the question about preparatory process for the Prepcom 3 to be held here in Geneva in September, I would like to introduce a paragraph from the decision of the Prepcom 2, which was held in Geneva in February.

"The report of the working group on Internet governance will be presented in mid-July 2005, most probably on July 18th. All governments and other stakeholders are invited to submit written comments on the proposals for chapter 3 by August 15. Thereafter, a compilation of these contributions will be forwarded to Prepcom 3, together with the report of the WGIG."

Thank you very much.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you.

IGTF:

May I?

Chairman Desai:

Yes.

IGTF:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. As we are approaching to almost the end of this open consultation meeting today, as well as the process from September last year, when we started preparation, I have some sort of question and request concerning the process or the way forward for the remaining work.

I hear that there already exists some parts of the draft for the report being written, while it's very early stage, I assume. And while I know that it's very much strictly for the WGIG members. But being outside the WGIG members, but have been involved, as are all the other colleagues here, my question, first, is, are you going to just produce a report once and all at one date, that's all? Or will there be some process that you can provide some of the earlier drafts or whatever between now and July the 18th so that we can make or continue some consultation?

Of course, we know the task is very difficult. So I'm not demanding too much. But if you can find some kind of creative methodology or solution where we can cooperate to finalize, that would be very, very appreciated.

Similarly, we were discussing yesterday amongst the civil society caucus members and others that it might be very helpful if the WGIG being the member and the secretariat could kindly make some extra efforts to include certain, say, description or commentaries to the 8,000 e-mails or 10,000-page inputs how you received these and how you sort of incorporated or not included with some, you know, very concise language that might be very helpful so that we can digest them in a better sort of productive, open, transparent manner.

I understand that the work that the members of WGIG are facing is enormous, that you have to really deal with these difficult issues. And I sense that you are very much sort of willing to do so.

But sometimes for us from outside the process or, you know, only one-day consultation and making one or two or three interventions, it's a little bit more helpful if you could really indicate how you responded to -- within your group and for us.

Then it will be very helpful for the productive negotiation or process afterwards. If you could consider that, it would be very much appreciated. Thank you very much.

Chairman Desai:

Mr. Qazi.

Khalilullah Qazi:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. This is -- while I am wearing my national hat at the moment, a question was raised as to what would happen after the WGIG report is launched, whether there will be an effort on the comments and what will happen to those comments.

I also wanted to refer to the decision of Prepcom 2, which has already been quoted. So I will not repeat it. However, I would just like to say that ambassador Masood Khan will be chairing the subcommittee on Internet governance of Prepcom 3, and he does intend to consult with all stakeholders.

But the timing and the nature of these consultations would depend on what different stakeholders want. And I would like to say that this issue has yet to be decided. Thank you.

Chairman Desai:

Any more? On the question which has been raised by the -- from the Internet governance task force of Japan, we have to complete our work. If we have a continuous process, actually, we will never complete our work. And our job is to complete our work this Friday.

The time between this Friday and next -- and July 18th is essentially for the -- if you like, the cleaning up of the report and the process of translation and those types of things. And, no, if you are clear on ways of staying in contact with the group of people, you are most welcome.

But the fact is, we have to do our work. But it's not the end of the process. After all, this report is going to be discussed in the Prepcom and in Tunis. So there is a much more continuous process as far as the decision-making is concerned. So I would invite you to look at it in those terms. This is -- the group may complete its work.

But that's not the end of the process. As has been explained, there are subsequent processes where there will be comments on the group's report and on the basis of which the Prepcom consultations will take place. And as has been requested by Mr. Peake, certainly a request which has been heard by people, of participation by civil society in that process. India.

India:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am taking the floor for the second time only to sort of get some sort of a sense of what we have said in the past few months and since morning. We started with a lot of, if I may be permitted to say so, some divergent views about some key issues, whether it is a forum, whether it is somebody trying to dictate terms, and things like that.

And after these consultations end, and on the eve of the imprisonment of the people, along with the chairman, I presume, I would like to get some sense, if you permit, of some key areas which, in your view, based on the consultation process, have emerged as having not reached, but at least tending towards some sort of a consensus so that we are -- we cannot communicate with our -- the group of 40, obviously.

The second issue, sir, was the issue of legitimacy. As I mentioned in the morning and our colleague from Brazil explicitly indicated, any mechanism, however good, if lacking legitimacy, or I will say possible legitimacy, I will not even say legitimacy per se, because that also is a concept different to different people, probably is -- could be considered to be supplanted with the concept of a forum or a body or a mechanism which is presumed to be legitimate.

So in that sense, and in some sense, you feel that some consensus -- or we are heading toward a consensus or we have been -- we are happy where we are and probably the decision would be made either in Prepcom 3 or in the final meeting of the summit. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairman Desai:

You are putting me on the spot, aren't you? But let me say this, that I would not argue that there is a consensus. But I do believe that over the course of the past year, particularly since the Geneva summit, there has been a certain process of convergence of views in terms of where people were.

The differences were far greater at the time of the Geneva summit than they are now. I can't say that there is, therefore, a complete consensus on what needs to be done. And perhaps this is something which will remain a little open right through to Tunis, perhaps even a little beyond Tunis, for all I know.

As far as the group is concerned, what I can assure you is that there has been a very constructive dialogue, a conversation. People have listened to one another, tried to understand each other's points of view. And certainly within the group I sense a great sort of probably slightly greater sense of convergence than what you may have had in the larger group.

I cannot tell you now where we -- because we -- I am not being coy. We really have not discussed the issues that we have discussed in this consultation in the group. This has not been discussed.

We have intentionally and deliberately focused the first phase of our work on the assessment side, without getting too enmeshed into a discussion or an argument about answers. So I wish I could tell you more than what I am able to now.

And in many ways, you know, let me just say that this process of open consultation has been very positive, very constructive, and very helpful. The number of times that in the group people have referred to the discussions which have taken place here is very substantial.

It's been -- because, after all, to some extent, the group is guided not just by personal opinions, but also by its sense of what the broader constituency would like also. When this whole process began, and when we had the initial discussions, it was pretty clear that a standard, orthodox group of experts was not the answer.

In fact, if you remember, the initial discussion was for a completely open-ended process. That was the sense of a lot of people, saying, no, it should not be a group; it should be a completely open-ended process.

And then there was a certain compromise by which a group was constituted, but with the understanding that the group would work with these consultation processes. I think we've quite wisely decided at an early stage that we were going to make these consultations a constructive part of the process by always scheduling them at the beginning.

One was scheduled in the middle, but otherwise always scheduling them in the beginning. So I think in that sense, this process itself has played a very constructive role. In some ways, what have you had here? What you have had here is essentially a forum talking about Internet governance. What you have had here over these, it has been, for me, a very important exercise, this open consultation.

And I, frankly, feel that if I were to look at this process, this has in some ways been the most important part of the whole exercise. Not because this is the group which has been empowered to produce a group, no. It's the group of 40 which is going to produce the report. But the way in which this process has been run, the freedom with which people have talked, the level of participation that we have had, the degree of conversation that we have had in this has been very positive.

And certainly the group has benefited enormously. And my hope is that the others who participated in this have also benefited by being able to listen to other points of view, including those who are today, you know, involved in the management of the Internet.

And in some ways, this group has functioned like a forum on Internet governance, where a lot of views have been expressed. But, of course, it's an ad hoc exercise for a specific purpose, which is guiding the work of the working group.

So my sense is that the process has helped, that at the end of these four rounds of consultation, we are probably closer together than we were when we began the whole process. Whether this means that we are going to get a nice, cut-and-dried report from the group, whether that report is also something which will fly in the preparatory process, I do not know.

But I am certain -- I believe the process has been of value in -- if nothing else, as a learning process for everybody who is involved in this. So with that somewhat vague reply, you will have to be satisfied at this point.

I have a few more speakers. UNESCO and China.

UNESCO:

Thank you very much, chair. Completely agree about the positive nature of the dialogue that we've had here. It's extremely worthwhile. And it indicates what can be gained from having

a forum where you can bring different actors together and really develop the issues and the understanding of the issues.

And I want to just go back to a couple of speakers before and move from the technical -- the technological analogy and apply it to the political realm and the human rights realm. There have been many, many interventions today that have explained the reality of how the technology currently works and how the Internet works and the distributive nature of the Internet, which has the result of being inherently participatory, inherently democratic.

And I'm thinking of the grass roots democracy and the ability of users to participate. And there was some expert information that we were given -- I'm just referring to professor Kleinwachter's intervention a moment ago, and the Internet society, where they talked about how individuals can participate. So I think that is a reality check on how we design -- I was looking --

Chairman Desai:

(Inaudible).

UNESCO:

I was looking at it this morning and thinking, "gosh, I hope it doesn't happen to me."

(Laughter.)

UNESCO:

But at least I can be sure that everybody's listening now. So thank you, chair. It was a reality check hearing about how the technology operates, because it's a warning that we have to design solutions that are not based on the model of the centralized way of technology controls. And we have to be very careful how this gets applied at the political level. And I think professor Kleinwachter put that very, very neatly.

The difficulty is that some of the interventions are still assuming that the national sovereignty should prevail on many of the issues that are of global concern, and the difficulty there is that I would like to remind all the participants that there are international commitments that have already been made where there are some issues and some values where the international value and the international commitment is paramount. And I'm thinking here of the universal declaration of human rights. And as we are UNESCO and I've been listening today and it hasn't been raised yet, I feel I really must put it in front of people again. It's very appropriate that this is coming down now. About the importance of the freedom of expression and the free flow of information in whatever we design.

And the reason I want to issue the caution is because that inherent openness that is absolutely essentially to maintain may be difficult to preserve, depending on what type of political institutions and political responses are designed. We need to ensure that whatever processes or mechanisms are designed, they are ones that are not vulnerable to censorship and that do not undermine the importance of the freedom of information and the freedom of expression.

So I think there's -- we need to extrapolate from the decentralized models and apply it to the political realm. And I would ask, if in the next few days in the retreat, the working group

when they're thinking about the political environment, that they keep this paramount, and they are very mindful that whatever is designed has to protect those fundamental rights for the flow of information and the ability of people to express themselves irrespective of what those individual value systems might be back at the national sovereign level.

There is a correlation here, and there's an interdependency that has to be borne in mind. It's a pity we didn't have the drum roll, but I'll be satisfied with the visual emphasis. Thank you, chair.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you. China, and then (inaudible).

China:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My delegation appreciate the working group for the excellent work it has done in the past eight months. I'd like to take this opportunity to make a brief introduction of the reform of the Internet governance of the Chinese side.

First of all, I'd like to mention the status and roles of the different stakeholders. In our view, Internet governance is the process of joint participation by the different stakeholders, which include sovereign state, intergovernmental organizations, international organizations, private sector and the civil society.

In the Internet governance system, the stakeholders generally have -- play a very important role, and they are indispensable, one from the other. However, due to the fact that the Internet governance system is very complicated, it has multiple dimensions. For instance, we have policy dimension, technology dimension, operational dimension and business dimension.

According to article 49 of WSIS declaration of principle, at different levels at governance, stakeholders play different roles. At some dimension, the government should play a leading role. And at some dimension, the private sector should play an important role. At some dimension, the civil society should play an important role.

The stakeholders should have a division of labor at different dimensions and they should cooperate and complement with each other rather than mixing up their roles. Article 49 of WSIS principle, declaration of principle, states, and I quote, "policy authority for Internet-related public policy issues is the sovereign right of states. They have rights and responsibility for international Internet-related public policy issues."

The governments formulating the policy, public policy on Internet, should listen to the views of private sector and the civil society. In such operation areas as market development and Internet core resources distribution, the private sector should continue to play a leading role. However, this should be in keeping with the provisions of international law and seek authorization from the governments in operation, the private sector should implement the public policies of the governments so as to protect the public interest and promote the secure, stable development of the Internet.

I'd like to talk about the public policy system of the international governance of Internet. Based on the understanding of the above different roles to be played by the multiple stakeholders, we feel that the public policy issue of Internet should be solved jointly by the

sovereign states in the U.N. framework based on the full public policy areas of Internet governance that have been worked out by the working group.

Currently the system of Internet governance needs necessary reform and improvement. In the design of such an agency, we feel that it is difficult for one U.N. agency to manage all the public policy issues of the Internet. Therefore, to the issues of management which, under the mandate of existing IGOs -- for instance, the intellectual property -- this should be continued to be managed by the existing agency.

What is urgent at present, two issues. One is that in such public policy areas where there is no intergovernmental management -- intergovernmental agency mandate -- for instance, spam, network security, and cyberspace -- we should look for an appropriate specialized agency of the United Nations as a competent body.

Secondly, as the Internet resource is very significant to the Internet development and security, and it concerns the sovereignty and public interest of all states, which solved the problem of deficiency of a competent body of Internet management, which is authoritative and legitimate and recognized by the governments.

To such -- to the situation where Internet resources now is managed by one government, in future it should be jointly managed by all governments in terms of its public policy. We suggest that the working group consider the establishment under the U.N. framework, new specialized intergovernmental lightweight Internet resources policy management agency as highest level of decision-making body of Internet resources. It should have three functions:

Policy management, supervision and authorization, and international coordination. On the composition of such an agency, each state should, based on its own condition, designate a stakeholder as its representative; however, in decision-making, each state should have one vote. Private sector and the civil society and other stakeholders could widely participate in the discussion and express their advisory role.

However, based on the above-mentioned principle of division of labor by different stakeholders, they should have no decision-making power and right to vote on public policy issues.

Secondly, the supervision and authorization by ICANN should be transferred to this agency. The specific operation of Internet resources, in principle, could be mandated to ICANN; however, ICANN should be supervised and managed by the agency under the United Nations. The relevant public policy issues should be approved by this agency.

Thirdly, this agency should hold periodic general assembly, and the general assembly shall be in a position to decide on major public policy issues. This agency should establish a standing committee, and based on the mandate of the general assembly, manage the public policy issues of the Internet.

Fourthly, the budget of this agency should be provided mainly by the United Nations. It can also receive funds from the member governments or other Internet -- Internet organizations. Considering the operational budget of this agency, at the initial stage of this agency the office and secretariat resources of this agency could be provided by the existing subsidiary bodies of the united nations; for instance, ITU.

However, its management and decision-making should be fully independent. We also noted that a proposal has been made on the establishment of forum with participation of multiple stakeholder to discuss the Internet governance. We understand and agree with this proposal. At present, WGIG assumes such a role to a certain extent; however, we view that merely a forum is not sufficient.

Such state sovereignty, Internet security, and issues that concern public interest and the public policies of Internet should be solved by intergovernmental mechanism and should be mandatory. Concerning other key public policy issues in the Internet governance -- for instance, spam, network security and inferior content management and cybercrime -- we are also very concerned with these issues. We feel that this should be solved under the U.N. mechanism.

As to the question of whether it should be subsumed with the aforementioned Internet resources management issue or whether it should be established separately, we feel this is a question of operation, of specific operation, and we hope that the working group can engage in thorough discussion on this issue. Thank you.

Chairman Desai:

(Inaudible).

Syrian Arab Republic:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Please allow me to take this opportunity just before the end of this meeting to thank you and to thank mister -- his excellency, ambassador Markus, and to thank all of those who have assisted you sitting at the rostrum as well as all the experts who have sent -- or given us very useful information. I must not forget, sir, to say that you are always smiling and you always gave us an opportunity to express our views. Therefore, we greatly appreciate your work and your efforts. We wish you well in the future work.

You have listened to us with great patience and I thank you for that once again. And I took the floor now to thank you, sir, because it seems that I am the oldest in this room. Thank you, sir.

Chairman Desai:

Thank you very much. I'm not much younger than you, actually.

(Laughter.)

Chairman Desai:

Thank you very much for your kind words. I appreciate the enthusiasm with which you have always participated in our discussions. It has helped a great deal in the process of dialogue. You compliment me on the fact that I am always smiling. I must tell you there's a nice saying, that the man who is smiling is the man who has worked out who he is going to pass the buck on to

(Laughter.)

(Applause.)

Chairman Desai:

So that's probably the reason why. But El Salvador.

El Salvador:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My delegation, would just like on one hand to thank you, sir, and the working group for your work and for the work you are still going to be doing in the next few days.

I would also like to highlight the fact that I second china's statement regarding the need to respect the principles of 48 to 50 regarding Internet governance and remind everybody, and particularly the group, that the solutions that you put forward, or, rather, the sole proposal, if that's the case, the point is we should respect article 1 of the Geneva convention. Thank you, sir.

Chairman Desai:

I think that brings us -- once more. Any further comments?

That brings us to the close of our discussions. I've already said, I think, that the whole process of these open consultations has really turned out to be particularly productive and constructive.

I was actually perhaps a little skeptical initially as to how this would work, but I think it has worked because of the high level of participation by not just the member states but a high level of participation by all of the key actors from the Internet community. And I really want to thank them for the strong interest they've taken in the work of this working group. And I couldn't list all of them, but I would at least mention the team from ICANN which has always been there, from ISOC which has always been there, IETF, the W3 Consortium, Nominet which has been a regular at these meetings, Net Dialogue which has always been there. There are many other institutions from this group which is involved today in Internet management which has taken this process seriously, participated in it constructively, and I think that has helped to make this particular exercise very valuable.

There are also many other organizations from civil society who have really put in great deal of effort into this exercise. The gentleman from the Internet governance task force from Japan is not there but he has always been there in these meetings and not only that, he has always been there often in the corridors outside the closed meetings, which is good. That's his job. And I'm glad that he was there. And that's an example of how seriously they took this process.

But there are others. I mentioned net dialogue. Bertrand de la Chapelle has always been there; he's run this process. The group from Syracuse, I see John Madison is here from that group. They have been very keen participants. ICC, of course. We of course have Ayesha Hassan from ICC in our group, but she is there as Ayesha Hassan. So I'm glad that ICC is here as ICC, fully involved and engaged. Madam Cade now from ITAA -- how shall I put it? And I think that also has helped a great deal.

I'm also very grateful because of the fact that so many member states have considered this process of sufficient importance to bring senior people from capitols to participate in this

process. And having been a former finance secretary, I know it's not always easy to get financial approvals for going for a one-day meeting somewhere. But the very fact that they thought it sufficiently important to come from their capitols all this distance to participate in these meetings has also helped to raise the relevance, the salience, the importance, the weight, if you like, of this -- the conversation that we have had here.

And in many ways what we have been running over these four meetings that we have had is something like an Internet governance discussion forum. It has not been a meeting with a formal responsibility for decisions, but it has been very influential, certainly, in shaping the work of the group.

But more than that, I think it has been an educative experience, and I hope that most of the people who participated in this process, and many of you participated in all four meetings, that you come away from these four meetings perhaps with a mindset about these issues which is a little different from what you started with in the beginning. And that's partly the function of a process like this.

And in many of these exercises, it's not just the product; it's the process which is as important. It's not just the product that comes out, the report or the resolution or the decision. That's certainly important. But how you get to that, the degree of satisfaction that people have with how you got to that end result is as important as what the end result itself is going to be.

So I think in many ways this has worked. This has been an experiment for the U.N. itself. We have not in the past, when we have had working groups like this, combined the working group with this type of open consultation process. This is the first time we have done it, and as the person who is the chair of this group, I can say that it has been a success, this whole exercise.

And beyond this open consultation, I think the process that was run of consultations through the Internet, the fact that we had your comments, we even now have your comments in writing on the questionnaire, which is going to be the basis of our discussion over the next four days. And those are available to us. They are available to all the members, which is valuable.

So I think what we have sought to demonstrate in this is that the process of consultation is not just pro forma. It's not just something we do because some resolution requires us to do this. That it's a meaningful process; it has been undertaken in a manner by which the consultations can influence the outcome. And I believe this has certainly happened in the case of this process.

So I really have to thank all of the participants in this process. I would also like to thank the members of the working group who have -- they're all very talkative people but they all sat very patiently, listening to all of you, which is good, which is their job. Their job here was to listen and take in what comes out. And I can assure you that they do, and that they will refer -- in the process they will refer to what's been said here and I'm sure over the next three days many of them are also going to refer.

Of course it is understandable that they will refer to what they agree with, not necessarily what they disagree with. But there will always be somebody who will remind them about another point of view which has been expressed here.

But they do, they do go back and refer to this. And I think in a certain subtle way it also changes the way they approach the issue and how they look for common ground. I think I really also have to thank enormously the Secretariat, Markus Kummer, and his team. They have put in a huge amount of work in managing this whole process; particularly the open consultations. And I know a little bit more about it than perhaps you do, because whenever he has had difficulties in trying to get something organized, which has been very seldom and very rarely, I've come to know about it. But I really think we all owe a great debt of gratitude to Markus Kummer and all of his team sitting out there, because they do put in a lot of work, very quietly, which has made it possible for us to have this process here. And I want to thank Markus

(Applause.)

Chairman Desai:

We, of course, have, since this meeting and previous meeting, we have also had this great advantage of our words of wisdom being recorded and engraved in stone, which is -- which I was hoping would be a certain discipline, didn't always work, but still, it's been very valuable. And we have had these two exceptional people who have been doing this for us over the last meeting and this meeting. And so you will have all your words of wisdom permanently reflected in the record of the work of this working group.

The whole process -- Wolfgang referred to the large number of contributions which have come in, and certainly one of the things that I would wish to do is to see how we can preserve that in some form for future. It's not that all of it is -- remember, the fact is a great deal of work was done by people outside, and we have to find some way of ensuring that it's continued access to all of that hard work which has gone in from a lot of people in preparing for this meeting, the 8,000 e-mails that were received and 10,000 pages.

I'm sure with the use of information technology, it should be possible to keep all of that available for future researchers. So thank you very much. We now go off into our hard work of coming up with a report which will be of -- which will -- phrase which has been much used in this discussion, which will add value to your process. This is basically the bottom line.

I really want to conclude with what we really, in some ways, how our discussion began, and the discussion began with a contribution from Mr. Carpenter, and one thing which struck me at the end of what he was saying when he spoke, and that is that we should always keep in mind that whatever we do, one question that we should always ask is, is this going to help that small user sitting out there in some remote corner in an underserved continent like Africa? Let's ask that question. Because if we do something which is going to help that person, then we are surely going to help a lot of others also in that process.

And I think that was a valuable point that he had made; that we must not become prisoners of our own end games, if you like; that we should never lose sight of the fact that the fundamental objective of the whole WSIS process has been to make this technology available for progress, for democracy, for -- and that the real test of this is, is it going to make a difference to the life of a very ordinary person who has the potential to use the Internet but perhaps today not the capacity to do so.

And that is a test that I hope we will continue to apply over the next three days when we are doing all our work. So thank you very much. You've been wonderful. You've really helped

to make this process what it is. And I look forward to your continued interaction with you in Tunis and beyond. So we do have a last word from our host, Switzerland.

Switzerland:

In the name of Switzerland, I would also express our thanks to everybody who contributed to this process, which has been very satisfactory so far. And we hope that the next days will also go on in the same spirit.

And before we are waiting to see the written result of this process, I just would like to remind you that, like usually, there will be a reception offered by the Swiss federal office of communication at 6:00 at the restaurant Montbrillant at the ITU here in Geneva.

Chairman Desai:

See you there if you can find your way there. Meeting is now adjourned.

(Applause.)

(5:14 p.m.)