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>> ANG PENG HWA: Let me begin by introducing the speakers.

On my far left is Rajnesh Singh from the Internet Society. He has been going around and setting up chapters in the Asia Pacific region and I'm sure you'll see more to him.

Next to him is Dr. Govind, from Nixi. He has been associated with the IT space and Internet Governance for many years now.

Next to him is Mr. Adam Peake, from GLOCOM. Adam, one of the many claims to fame is the NETmundial statement in the same action as the James Bond. Adam has been involved with the IT Internet space for many years. And he has participated as well as part of the Secretariat team, working on the IGF in the past years.

Then we have Dr. Anja Kovacs, and she has come and lived in India after finishing her Ph.D. on India. And she is with the group called Internet Democracy Project, working on freedom of expression. And she has also been part of the Civil Society group, working on the Internet Governance space.

Then Paul Wilson, controlling a very important part of the IP space, IP addresses. He is part of APNIC. Dishing out the IP addresses. Paul has been active also in the Internet Governance space and part of the MAG as well, giving input into organising the IGF.

Next to me is Mr. Hardeep Singh Puri. Some of you will know him. So I have a brief CV of him and I'll just read some points about Mr. Puri. He has been an Ambassador for India for more than 39 years. He has worked as Ambassador and Permanent Representative from 2000 to 2005 in the UN, which overlaps basically the WSIS process. He was part of the counter terrorism Committee and he was President of the UN Security Council in 2012. He is retired from the Indian Foreign Service, 2013, and he joined the Bharatiya Janata Party this year. He has written columns in Indian papers on foreign relations issues, and so he has very valuable inputs.

So let me paint the background as to why we're discussing this topic. If you look at the title, it does seem pretty strange. The answer is that it's the review of the World Summit on Information Society in 2015. The World Summit on Internet Society has a few interesting landmarks. One of them is that until that summit, all summits in the past were one submit. This is one submit where you kept on having other summits. When you walk, you know that there is not just one hill to climb, there are more hills to climb back and up again.

After the WSIS, there was other summits on climate change. This is controversial, as you went along. The World Summit on Information Society was started by ITU in 2003. It was backed by the Arab States, who were concerned that oil, which of course we know is a resource can, if you look at top 500 companies, oil companies, dominate something at the very top. But Arab countries, they knew information would be the next resource and they were not part of the new economy that was developing.

Among the drivers was Tunisia, and they were involved because of the new world communication information order, back in the mid '70s, 1980s. And so WSIS 2 was held in 2005, and was pushing this issue of development of the Information Society as the model for how to -- how the society would develop in the future.

So the issue of development was quite central to WSIS. But if you look at a debate around WSIS and so forth, a lot of the debates have gone around the political aspects; in this case, Internet Governance.

So now we want to kind of steer this back. Get back to kind of the roots of where this all began, activity development, and how do we steer this back to development. How key is development now in the WSIS+10 review? What about NETmundial, how key is development in NETmundial? And if there is to be a NETmundial 2, can we steer that back so that it forms a critical part of the agenda?

The speakers will speak for about five minutes or so on their thoughts about this issue of development, and in the context of WSIS, WSIS+10 review and of NETmundial as well.

I'd like to begin with Ambassador Singh Puri and then work back down the list.

>> HARDEEP SINGH PURI: Thank you very much, Chair or moderator, what shall I call you? Chair. Thank you very much.

I was hoping to not be called upon to be the first speaker because I thought I would utilize this opportunity of listening to these distinguished fellow panelists to re-educate myself on the kind of issues -- no. I'm okay.

Thank you for introducing me. I was present in 2003 in Geneva, WSIS 1. I was then India's Ambassador and permanent representative.

I was also present in Tunis in 2005. As you said, Chair, that more or less overlapped with my role as the Ambassador to Geneva. And then I was in New York. And I was happy yesterday or the day before yesterday the General Assembly adopted resolution A/68/L.54, which deals with the modalities for the overall review by the GA of the implementation of the outcomes of the World Summit on Information Society.

But before I come to 2015+10 and 2015, let me just make a few comments to place in perspective where we stand. If I may be permitted to say, India's policy on this subject of considerable strategic significance has been consistent for over a decade. If you look at, carefully, at what Arun Shourie as the minister said in 2003 in Geneva, what was said in Tunis in November 2005, India pursued the implementation of the report on the Working Group on Internet Governance, Chaired by Nitin Desai, during the 2005 period and the Tunis Agenda.

Now, what is it that we would like to see done in the next phase? And I, since the time given is so short, I would just say what I think India should start by doing. First of all, I think our principal concerns and long-term interests require the renewal of our commitment to protect and promote the Internet as an unprecedented tool of innovation and empowerment.

We should reaffirm our adherence to all the obligations under the various treaties to human rights, to which we are a party, in particular to those relating to Freedom of Expression. We should commit ourselves to all measures to bridge the digital divide both nationally and Internationally. India enterprises need to enhance the use of Indian users of the Internet whose numbers have been growing greatly in recent years.

Now, I am one of those who has always believed that while we have to be acutely conscious of and safeguard our security interests, and I have always said that, you know, you need to strike a fine balance between several competing objectives, I was trying to, in the process of educating myself on this subject today, trying to locate where I have seen more recently an attempt made to see what it is that could be said to characterize India's position. And I was very happy to find the former national security adviser, Shivshankar Menon speaking on cybersecurity in October of 2013. He said: Our approach was to address Internet Governance by preserving the strength that comes from the open nature of domain, keeping it socially responsible and legal. The institutions that are invested with the authority to manage or regulate the Internet should be broad based and institutionalized such as to take on the views of all stakeholders.

Mr. Chairman, you said that Tunis was one of the drivers of the WSIS process, and the Swiss, and they were one of two venues for those two meetings. Interestingly, when we went to Tunis for WSIS 2, some of the concerns we had are not the kind of concerns that we are discussing today at all. There the issue was whether you would access the Internet at all and the issue of freedom of expression. The statement made by Arun, he said we have to strike a fine balance. In India we value freedom itself. It's in freedom that creativity best flourishes.

And then we went on to talk about the digital divide. And there any Indian speaker anywhere could give you an hour-long lecture on what it is that we need the Internet for, what use we are putting it to, and how we have to, you know, get a quantum jump in terms of its users.

Now, I know that I probably crossed my five minutes without saying one or two points, but I promise to come back in the interactive session of what is happening in India.

But what have I been emphasizing in my writings? I think we need a dedicated group of people here in India, within the establishment industry, technical and scientific communities, academia, Civil Society and media, who can reflect upon and define India's interests in the years to come. So that when we look at this very important global asset, global, which is what I regard the Internet as, we are in a position to make sure that we do, in fact, have a comprehensive policy.

I like to sometimes pull, you know, tease my colleagues in Government and I ask them very often, I said what is India's policy on this? And then they said: You know whatever you said in your statement in New York, that will become our policy now. That's not fair. I think we need -- you need actually a multi-stakeholder exercise within us. I know it's a very rich debate and it gets contentious, it gets carried away sometimes for no reason. I think we have red lines but we should start thinking of the next session. And all I'm doing is provoking some thinking on that. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

>> PAUL WILSON: Good afternoon. I'm in Paul Wilson from APNIC. It's a great pleasure and honour to be here on this panel with such distinguished co-panelists, so thank you everyone.

When I think back on the history of the Internet, the Internet is now by one measure at least around 32 years old. And it's already 25 years ago that the WSIS process started; ten years since it concluded.

Even if you look at when the WSIS process started, it was the -- the Internet was a much, much different place. It had demonstrated its success to the extent that WSIS identified the Internet as a key critical part of the goal for the Information Society. If the Internet was successful in 2003, it's a lot more successful today. And the thing is that over this last ten years, what we have done is continue to demonstrate the success of the model that exists while the model continues to be recognized and better understood and advanced and improved across a very broad range of society.

So part of that, once the WSIS had discovered Internet Governance and it had discovered and identified and given a name to the multi-stakeholder process, it initiated the IGF, which is now coming up to its ten-year renewal. And the IGF was a nondecision-making event, which was very important and continues to be important.

But, of course, the IGF itself needs to improve as part of the overall ecosystem. There are other things needed. And the NETmundial I think was a very -- the NETmundial was a very interesting piece in the puzzle of global Internet Governance. It was sort of a pilot event. It was a formal event that was designed to produce outputs. As I said, the IGF didn't and isn't designed to it. It did do that, in a multi-stakeholder manner, it proved that it's possible to produce a valuable and significant outcome.

It relied on rough consensus, on participation on an equal platform by everyone involved. And that was done, really, in a very short timeframe. I think it accomplished quite a lot, subject to criticisms of course. But I think that depends on how you want to measure the success. And also how you see NETmundial as one step in a longer process.

So I think demonstrably the NETmundial output, the roadmap is important. It's produced through an important process, it is an important milestone. I think it's important to follow it and to try and action at least the parts of the NETmundial process and roadmap that apply to us.

Very significantly, I think the endorsement, the recognition, reinforcement of the IGF is important, as part of the NETmundial process. That implies a continuance of the IGF beyond this final event that is coming up. And I think that provides some certainty to us all.

I think at the moment, in the midst of the WSIS+10 process, it's something which I won't attempt to go into, because I know that there are others here who are much more expert and have been much more directly involved than I have, but I think the recent series of events, the -- not just WSIS and IGF, but some others which include in fact the U.S. Governments announcements about the future of ICANN, I think we really are on a roll of some kind. We have a series of progressive events which are advancing Internet Governance and demonstrating, I think, an increasing confidence and increasing understanding and sort of a momentum towards a goal that will be a set of improvements, however they emerge.

ICANN is definitely part of that. ICANN is multi-stakeholder in structure. And multi-stakeholderism is never a perfect thing. It's not a binary on or off. ICANN, like the rest of us, are constantly trying to improvement our models. Let's not confuse it with Internet Governance generally. the scope of Internet Governance is broader and the model of multi-stakeholderism can be extended into that. ICANN certainly doesn't want confusion with Internet Governance more broadly and it doesn't help any of us.

But I think it's part of, as I said, of a puzzle and a series of steps which really are showing us how multi-stakeholderism is starting to be actualized in a broader sense and better understood. And I think that's we're at a very interesting and progressive point at the moment.

That's it for me for the moment. Thanks for the time. Thank you.

>> ANG PEN HWA: Thank you, Paul.

Anja.

>> ANJA KOVACS: Thank you, Peng Hwa. I would like to make some comments about WSIS going forward, based on especially my participation in the WSIS+10 multi-stakeholder preparatory process. For the WSIS+10 high level event that the ITU organised in June, the preparatory process consisted of six meetings, and a whole lot of written input as well.

There were a few things that came out very strongly for me in that process and that's also part of the reason I was so happy when the multi-stakeholder group that organises the IGF agreed to have a panel on this issue.

The first thing is that the development challenges after the second WSIS summit very clearly remain. Just to give one example, we might have a closing of the quantitative access gap today, but we actually have a growing qualitative access gap. And this gap takes different forms. To start with, for example, the gap and broadband speeds in developing and developed countries multiplied something like ten times in a decade. It's not backing smaller, it's becoming bigger. And broadband speeds determine what you can do on the Internet. That also has a skills gap, which is increasing also. And so the idea that developing countries will be able to jump stages of development through technology is becoming increasingly irrelevant, because we not addressing those gaps appropriately.

So challenges remain.

The interesting thing was that the MPP was supposed to do the review of its part of the Tunis Agenda, particularly the action lines, which have very detailed proposals for specific topics within the Tunis Agenda.

Such development issues actually were not really central to the debate. It's not as if they weren't there at all, but definitely new issues were very rarely addressed. And there was a real reluctance to go beyond the text of the Tunis Agenda in 2005. And if you have to stick to that text, issues like cloud computing cannot be addressed because they didn't exist in the same way in 2005.

There were three issues that the debates were particularly stuck on. The first one is human rights. Which is not surprising because we see that in many different fora.

The second issue was issues around security and surveillance which are an important thing for many Governments and don't always get sufficient acknowledgement in these debates.

And the third question was the question of multi-stakeholderism and the role of States in Internet Governance. And it was really interesting how Governments on both camp, one can say, the ones who want more Government control, the ones who speak more strongly in favor of multi-stakeholderism, because of the tensions around these topics, had limited willingness to negotiate text. And so, for example, there was a proposal from UN women to have new action line, specifically focusing on women or gender issues, which the figures very clearly showed would be extremely helpful to bridge a gap. There is a real gap there. But this proposal was shut down and interestingly the first country to speak against it was Sweden. I have no doubts about the commitment of Sweden to gender equality. I think it just showed how the diplomatic tensions around these debates meant that really important issues were no longer on the table.

Now, what does that mean? Is it simply an indication that development has been held hostage to bigger Governments' issues? To some extent, I think that is true. But it's also true -- and this is something I really want to put on the table here -- that the shape that our governance mechanisms will take in the future is also going to determine the way we can address questions of development in those mechanisms.

So for example, people have been talking a lot about applications like Facebook Zero and recently a few days ago there was this announcement from Internet.org, a Facebook initiative, similar to Facebook Zero but slightly more facilities. Those things raise a lot of questions. If people who are only using that are counted as Internet users, aren't we creating two tiers of Internet users? People with full access and only with a walled garden. And is it correct to count all of those people as users? What does it mean if you only access the Internet through a walled garden like that. What does ITR mean to their access of the powerful Internet?

So much the talk, of course, that these proposals are a violation of net neutrality, that they privilege the incumbents. I don't want to take a stance on what is right or wrong. I think for Developing Countries, these are just really, really important questions that need an objective debate and that also need a lot of thought about who is going to take the final decisions on these kinds of issues.

Is it more important that people have any access at all or is it the fact that they get the access through a walled garden such to the detriment that this is not beneficial? Those are the questions we have to ask.

Going forward, I think it's crucial that as part of the WSIS+10 review, we recognize that to address development issue, we need to address the questions about our governance models as well. And since we had another session on multi-stakeholderism in the morning where some of you were present and you went into detail on things there, I won't repeat there.

If I can just take two more minutes to briefly say something about the draft resolution that Ambassador Puri just referred to that has now been accepted by the U.S. Basically, what the resolution says -- sadly, I think -- is that the WSIS review is going to be a purely intergovernmental process. It's going to be a two-day InterGovernmental Meeting attached to the UN General Assembly, with an intergovernmental preparatory process as well, where other stakeholders can make inputs but are clearly not going to be around a table as equal contributors. What Mr. Puri said about how he envisions having models within countries lifted my spirits tremendously and I think balances out some of the shortcomings of that proposal. But I do think that in terms of, for us to actually do that exercise and really think creatively about how to move the Internet Governance mechanisms forward in a way that addresses development, unfortunately, an Internet Governance process is probably not the best decision and I think it's important that all of us think creatively about how we can maximize the opportunities for input as other stakeholder groups in that process, to make sure that development comes to the centre of the WSIS once again.

Thank you.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Okay. Thank you, Anja.

Next we will have Adam.

>> ADAM PEAKE: (Off microphone)

-- sitting outside of the room, Governments were outside and we were not allowed in and we didn't participate in that process. So what we are describing is a great deal of progress in participation of NGOs becoming multi-stakeholders in the process of developing Internet policy, and so that is the sort of history. And we saw that the WSIS was a three-year process, with two summits held in national capitals.

What I'd like to just briefly run through now is where we were at with NETmundial. We saw something extremely different. I was fortunate enough to be on one of the organising Committee, essentially the programme Committee. And what we saw has been somewhat touched upon is in November of last year, of 2013, there was a call to hold this meeting, and it was a meeting that was going to identify -- had the goal to identify a set of universal principles that would support the evolution of the Internet worldwide. And it asked that those principles be viewed from the perspective of the Internet as a platform for social, economic and human development and to exercise human rights worldwide. So that was one of the briefs. And the other, as Paul mentioned, was to look at the development and evolution of the Internet ecosystem.

And the way we got there, thinking about the evolution from WSIS in terms of participation, was this was -- as I said, these principles or this goal for the meeting was identified around November of 2013. By January of 2014, some Committees had been established to do some work on this. And the initial call was simply a global call for comments on these two issues, on principles for Internet Governance and for a roadmap. And that received, in a period of about four weeks, 180 very substantive comments from stakeholders all around the world, Governments Internationally from Civil Society and the private sector.

The goal then was to proceed a synthesis paper that would reflect those contributions, and that was part of what the programme Committee was working on.

So in January -- on sorry, the beginning of February of this year we had that call and by the middle of March a paper had been produced that synthesized these 160, 180 plus comments or contributions.

That again was put out for comment. And interestingly, it was put out online so that you comment on this document paragraph by paragraph. And in a two-week period, in April, 1370 comments were received on this document. So you're seeing a very live evolution of a global contribution about what Internet Governance principles and the sort of evolution of our thinking about the Internet governance ecosystem should look like. Contrasting that with 2002 and the origins of WSIS when those of us who are not Governments were not allowed in the room, is a substantive set of progress, I suppose.

And then when we arrived in Sao Paulo for the NETmundial meeting, there were two days of people lining up and delivering more comments, which were again listened to by a Committee that drafted and improved that document. So that we send ended up with a final outcome document two days later, which hopefully reflects some good, some bad, omitted some things, but it's quite an interesting document when you look at it.

What we got is an affirmation that human rights and Internet Governance, it establishes them as essential right. Rights that we enjoy offline must be enjoyed online. And it's clear that these need nurturing and extending to Internet Governance systems probably through the United Nations system.

It provides a baseline for principles for Internet Governance processes themselves. That approaches should be transparent and accountable and inclusive. And supporting developing countries through capacity building an and appropriate financing. It's well to say Developing Countries should be able to participate, there have to be means for them to participate so that the processes become meaningful in terms of their participation. And I think these principles of governance processes can be used as criterias and measures to see if processes really are multi-stakeholder and hopefully we can start to develope from them.

But just reflecting on some of the things that others have mentioned, probably the most important thing and the thing that is relevant to this meeting is that there was a statement in the  NETmundial document that multi-stakeholder mechanisms must be developed at the national and regional level. A good portion of Internet Governance has to be tackled at this level because it's at the national level, the regional level, that local decisions are made. It is where we influence our national laws and our national policies. It's also where financing and other issues are established.

So while there are global processes, we shouldn't forget that it's actually the national level that we're trying to influence, it's the policies of our Governments and Democratic processes that we're trying to have an influence on.

A bit of a rush summary of where we went from WSIS to NETmundial and I hope we can talk later if you have questions.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Thank you. Next. Dr. Dr. Govind please.

>> DR. GOVIND: Thank you, I think Mr. Puri indicated that he was there at the 2003 Geneva and then the 2005 meeting, (inaudible) was there and we also were contributing towards the, you know, the Tunis Agenda, which the Information Society really set the tune for the ICT events for the developing world. And at that point of time, you know, the world was not in the -- not many Internet access subscribers. Today we are 3 billion Internet connections and we have 6 billion mobiles.

If you look at the journey from the WSIS to today, so we have the development point of view. A lot of things happened. Back in India, we have more than 200 million expert users. We have set up the Internet exchange points back in 2003.

And 2005 we set up the dot Indian industry. And we have set up the national Internet registry last year. So, the whole development process, which was set up or rolling out in the 2005 Tunis Agenda, I will say that those things were picked up by various countries, and then there were, in global Internet Governance forums, which happened year by year, starting with the Tunis and then 2007 in Rio and then 2008 in India. So the issues were access, diversity, openness, security. And then we add the fifth, the critical Internet resources. I think that really is carved in stone that the technical resources and the Public Policy issues are going to come up.

And then 2012, the enhanced cooperation came up, which really said globally how the things started moving in the direction of more participation, more discussion on the issues. And then the NETmundial, where the things are focused more on multi-stakeholderism processes.

What I'm interested in is that in the whole WSIS+10, the last ten years, really a lot of development is taking place. But development is yet to take place. In the developing world, the Internet is going to be more culturally and linguistic, more ID and domain names will be. It will be multi-lingual Internet. Things will be taking place in the Asia-Pacific and Latin American regions. So the whole development of process, which was having certain dimensions in WSIS in 2005, I'd say now it will take a different turn in terms of development that we are to see. We have to see how the development has to take place and how the forming of the development will be. And apart from that, how the various stakeholders, which were very, you know, in a different diffuse manner which started in 2005, today we are having quite open discussions in the IGF, in the Working Group, enhanced cooperation, NETmundial and global ICANN. Today we are more and more talking about how the things need to be. Because that -- for the understanding of things, we were not that mature in 2003 and '5. But today we are moving towards more mature discussions, more openness and more multi-stakeholder processes, which was started at that time.

But today there are other issues which we are grappling with is the data localization, the cybersecurity, and the Internet of Things, which are coming up. So all the complexities of the Internet and technologies, which are going forward. And, you know, the mind boggling statistics, like how many domain names are booked? How many websites are there? Trillions and numbers. All these things so that the Internet is growing and the complexities are also growing.

And how to govern that process needs a lot of decisions. And the involvement of all stakeholders. And I'm sure that, you know, it would be -- I mean, you know, people around. We will be able to see that how the WSIS process is taken to a more meaningful manner in the -- more meaning in view of the future of the Internet in the coming years.

Thank you.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Thank you. Dr. Govind.

Raj, please. Your thoughts?

>> RAJNESH SINGH: So one of the problems being the last speaker in a panel is that everyone said everything that I wanted to say. The good point about that is that I'll be brief.

As the others indicated, we have come a long way since the Tunis agenda, particularly in recognizing the roles and responsibilities of the various groups that are involved in the process or should be involved in the process. And then, of course, in the larger Internet ecosystem.

Looking at the technical community, I think what we have done fairly well is that we are better able to understand and engage with policymakers. And I think it's vice versa as well, policymakers are engaging with the technical and engineering community. The Internet Society introduced a programme where we would bring in policymakers and regulators and take them into an Internet task force meeting which develops Internet programmes. The feedback was that it was wonderful. Most of the time they didn't know how, where and in which manner Internet standards were developed. And being able to expose them to those things was helpful. It helps to improve the conversation as well as the engagement between policymakers and the technical community or the engineering community in particular.

I think the value of open standards has also come to the fore and I think it was mentioned by other speakers earlier.

And the manner in which open standards are developed I think is also very important. Having said that, in cooperation and collaboration will always remain essential to our success. As Dr. Govind mentioned, it's an evolving landscape. What happened five or ten or fifteen years ago is different than the landscape today. We cannot work in silos. That is an important point to emphasize. We have to work across and within groups. Sometimes within a group we might have disagreement, but that should not stop us from the way to objective. It was mentioned about the digital divide, that is something that concerned me more and more in recent times. So I agree that ten years ago, the digital divide was the have and have nots. But today the digital divide is beginning to exist at so many levels. If you don't have sufficient bandwidth, you have a digital divide. You can't access content and service and applications. So those decisions have to mature and evolve along with that.

I think I'll stop there, Peng Hwa. Thank you.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Thank you, Raj. There is a lot of information that has been said. But this there is one thing that is knew and developing on the horizon and this is the fact that the UN General Assembly just came out with a resolution, that Ambassador Puri read and that Adam and Anja referred to. What does this resolution mean? I put it up. If you do a search on this, the UN General Assembly, WSIS, you'll find the statement. I'm trying to look for it.

Probably around here.

It's not quite -- but inside the document. Let me bring it up.

Ambassador, your view on this document?

>> HARDEEP SINGH PURI: It's possible that there is some misunderstanding on what the General Assembly has approved on 8th July, which is -- this is a draft put in 8 July approved yesterday or the day before.

This is going to be a high level event in New York next year, a two-day event. And this is a special honour, which is reserved for very few subjects. So when the President of the General Assembly convenes a high level event, it has the immediate effect of focusing global attention on that particular subject.

Now, this is intergovernmental. That is the United Nations, we are Member States, 193 of them interact. But there are many United Nations and I don't want to go into that in detail. This event is special and I want to read out the operative paragraph. And I think it's paragraph 1, which says "The President of the General Assembly" -- no. It's para 3. "-- in consultation with Member States will invite representatives of all relevant stakeholders of the WSIS to speak."

So this is not an event where only Member States are speaking. This is an event where other stakeholders will get time. Now, you have to determine in the proprietary process how much time the other stakeholders get, et cetera.

Then there is qualifier in paragraph 6. "During the preparatory process, informal consultations will be arranged with all relevant stakeholders of WSIS." And then language here, "encouraging the other stakeholders also to participate." I think the important thing between now and the high level event is to ensure that that becomes a truly multi-stakeholder event, and that is what the Civil Society and other stakeholders should be working towards, instead of bemoaning that this is an InterGovernmental Setting. The fact that the UN is intergovernmental is unlikely to change in my lifetime because by definition it's an InterGovernmental setting. But in so many other things, it is the process, it is the impact which Civil Society brings.

I was in some ways the -- I don't know what the term is, you know, when UN women was born, I was a facilitator for the process. And UN women would never have been born as a single window UN entity if it had not been for the pressure brought by Civil Society and other groups.

So I'm saying a lot of good decisions get taken within Government, but still better decisions get taken when Governments are surrounded by other processes, including pressure by Civil Society.

Thank you.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Thank you. This is wonderful because we have an inside view on how to read the statements.

Anja?

>> ANJA KOVACS: I didn't see the final resolution, actually. I read a newspaper article about it that came out. But I'll look at it later. But thank you very much for the clarifications and also for the point as to how we can engage, because that's obviously really useful.

The only thing I still have in my mind is that in a way the WSIS+10 MPP and the ITU was a fully multi-stakeholder process within the UN setting, where everybody got a chance to speak on an equal footing. Everybody got to make written contributions. And the Chair of the meeting actually asked me personally at some point to make a clear draft of sections of the text. And I do think that was quite unprecedented in the UN setting, that a member of Civil Society is asked in a process, in a UN process, to try and draft a new clean version.

So I think I guess in that way, perhaps we have gotten a little spoiled. But thank you so much for pointing out the opportunities. And I -- we will make the most of it. I hope it's okay if we come back to you on that one as well.

>> HARDEEP SINGH PURI: I can always be a consultant. >> ANJA KOVACS: That would be great. We all heard that Ambassador Puri said this, right?

>> ANG PENG HWA: Adam, any comments?

>> ADAM PEAKE: It just reflects the progress that we made in the period of time, the decade and the half that we started WSIS, that this is an opportunity for other stakeholders to begin establishing the agenda for this particular process, to be involved in the consultations, and then I think this is something that some people in Civil Society are concerned about, that multi-stakeholder processes are trying to replace Democratic processes and that's not really the case. What we're looking for is that our elected representatives and Governments in the United Nations, perhaps, in this case, will then go ahead and take decisions. But the process we helped create through the agenda and through the consultations will be reflected in those outcomes.

I don't think we're particularly suggesting that multi-stakeholderism replaces Democratic processes that it go back many years with Democratic societies. But it's our involvement in the process leading up to the final decision-making processes that are probably the most important.

So it's a wonderful step forward. And thank you for identifying it.

>> ANG PENG HWA: So thank you, Adam.

Ambassador, I have a question, and hopefully it's provocative enough to have some discussion here. If you look at point one, it says that the General Assembly, the President decided the review was conducted by a two-day high level meeting. But it's preceded by the governmental prepatory process. So the stakeholders meet beforehand. But then the conclusion is at the General Assembly. And at the General Assembly, Civil Society and business will not be represented. It's not multi-stakeholder. It's all for Government. Do you have a comment on that?

>> HARDEEP SINGH PURI: Thank you, Chair. I read it completely differently. You are drawing attention to OP1. That says preceded by intergovernmental processes that will take into account. Then OP  -- yes. OP3 says representatives of all relevant stakeholders will also speak in the main meeting itself. In the high level, that's para 3. If you read OP6, it says prior to that, the PGA, the President of the General Assembly, will have informal consultations with other stakeholders. So you've got it all. They will be consulted prior to the convening of the event. That is they will have an opportunity to provide inputs into the preparatory process. Then during the course of the high level event, OP3 says they will actually come there and speak.

Now, what I see happening is that your and mine and somebody else's definition of what is -- what are the stakeholders may run into some trouble. There will be hundreds of organisations wanting to provide inputs and get into the process. There I'm afraid that the determination will be that of the Member States present at the General Assembly. And this happens in all such events. So I'm reading this very positively. That whoever drafted this was able to ensure that this would not be merely an intergovermental, intermember state process.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Thank you for that. I didn't see that. Thank you.

So just to clarify, and I know that some people have these questions, can Governments, after listening to all the inputs, say that: We heard you guys. We participated in Democracy, but we are going to decide this way. And you in the room, you can't speak up. Can you do that?

>> HARDEEP SINGH PURI: I would find it very difficult to agree with that. Let us take the case of a Democracy like India. The guys who we have to listen to within the country are the same people who will be part of the association at the regional and a global level. You can hardly expect a representative of a Government to say I listened to you but I'll do whatever I want. In a Democracy it doesn't work that way.

On the other hand, Civil Society has to ensure that they will put the right kind of pressure through, you know, advocacy work and other ways. So I think that we have come, as one of the panelists said, quite some distance -- I think Adam said that -- since the process began. And now you in fact have this other outside Government input integrated into the very process itself.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Good. I'm opening that up to the floor. We have had an hour of the panel. Questions from the floor?

>> Just a quick comment on that. I think if the General Assembly came up with a document or their output document, their outcome document didn't reflect the input that we had seen previously, then it will be rejected. It will be head up to perhaps not ridicule but it will simply be obvious that that it is not reflecting the process that was supposed to build it. And that's what transparency is about. It's a very good process.

>> Another point I want to highlight is that the InterGovernmental organisations which are there, and how we select the other stakeholders, the representatives and the decision-making process, how it will be truly representative of the stakeholders and what is presented at the whole table. And this the question of the multi-stakeholder process, while we are selecting the representatives, other than the Government, in the whole process of decision-making in the Internet Governance.

>> HARDEEP SINGH PURI: There is clarifying language in paragraph 3 ultimately on who to invite will rest with the President of the General Assembly. So the determination can't be made by 193 countries. It's the President of the General Assembly who will make the determination by consulting people. So, you know, that is how it works. And I entirely agree with my other panelist who said if the outcome document from this process or the, you know, does not reflect and is not credible, then you know it will just be laughed out of court. So I think -- the Governments also, you must give it to Governments. Governments like to not only because they want to consult Civil Society or other stakeholders, but it's in the interest of the Government to do that. Of course, in the process sometimes we are not able to, you know, draw the right balance. I mean, you will have private entities ending up performing other functions which have a security dimension, that Governments will not accept. But if you are able to, at the end, get a process which is in the countries' and the global interest, I think the things will work.

>> ANG PENG HWA: We have questions from the floor or comments from the floor?

No? Okay. Don?

>> DON HOLLANDER: Thank you very much. My name is Don Hollander and I have one comment and then a question.

So, Ambassador, I was delighted with your comment about the Internet for Indians. And I just bring to your attention that perhaps you can share with your colleagues in Government and also the ICT industry, is India is about to launch its dot India in its various languages at the domain names. And so this is the IDN top level names in different scripts.

And there is a challenge around the world that software needs to be enhanced to make sure that it can accommodate the nonASCII characters. So a lot of work is underway and this community seems to be working and encouraging it. But I hope that you would use your role and your manna to help encourage the software development industry in India, which is quite large, to include that in their development work. So that's a comment.

And then a question for those who have been involved with the WSIS for a long time. Has it made a difference or would the achievements of the growth of the Internet, the distribution of access points, would that have happened anyway because of commercial opportunities? Or did the WSIS in getting Governments and community groups focused, really help accelerate what we have achieved?

>> I think the Governments and the process will enable those kinds of things to, like after the Internet, eCommerce, eGovernance and education and all kinds of things have started developing, particularly in India. You can say that it has tremendously impacted many of the development processes, much of the development in the commerce, eCommerce is increasing, the eGovernance is increasing and the dot industries. So it's driven the growth of the Internet rather than the Government driving the process.

Critical mass is arrived on certain things, that it will automatically start rolling out. People will see modified effects in the Internet and the industry. So they themselves will start looking at the things all the others have benefited, how the growth of the Internet really has picked up, has developed the industry and the ICT industry and the growth.

Thank you.

>> Half an century experience tells me that when you have to work out what is a good question, you got a good question. The question is partly hypothetical. This developed from military application, somewhere. Then it was available. And I totally agree with you, had it not been for commercial opportunities, we would have been deprived of much of the momentum. But if you had only commercial opportunity without the support of Governments and whatever else came in through the WSIS process, because you were able to -- I wouldn't use the word "regulate." But you were able to ensure that the WSIS process brought in issues of human rights, they brought in issues of intellectual property, et cetera. If it had been an unregulated marketplace operation by itself, it would not have reached this set.

So I think there are many, you know, when something is a success, you have many fathers. And this is one of those situations. This thing has worked. And the challenge, as I see it as a public servant for many years, is to make sure that this priceless asset is nurtured and strengthened, without, you know, too much swings on either side. But in the future, so that -- I mean, there will be people who will tell that you there has to be more Democracy, there has to be transparency, and that's a good reason. Because can you imagine if it was purely a private entity and that entity decides to become irresponsible and cut everybody out, equally? If it's just Governments, then you could have a situation, large countries like let's say hypothetically China and India -- and I'm not noting that we do it -- can say we don't like that one. Let's set up a system of our own and go for fragmentation.

These are bizarre thoughts.

So when something goes well, it's good to acknowledge the contribution for that success wherever it came from. And it certainly came from the guys who are responsible for the whole conception and innovation, without them it wouldn't have happened. You have to give full marks to the commercial opportunities, and that's why so much is riding on it. But you have to hand it out to Government, who were able to, you know, allow this process to go on and give it such support as strengthened the process.

>> ANJA KOVACS: Just in terms of like concrete things that have happened, I think the different action lines are added by different UN agencies. And I do think in terms of the concrete link, you can establish, it often depends a lot also on how proactive the agency in question has been. So UNESCO has been very good at taking up its responsibility in the WSIS and being quite proactive I think on industry, trying to establish certain norms. They have done a lot of valuable research. They tried to connect with communities. I think the ITU has also done great work in trying to expand the amount of detail we have about ICTs of all kinds. So the figure earlier I was quoting about the growing gap in broadband speeds, that's an ITU study. So I think there is a lot of good work done there.

But for some of the action lines, it's true that agencies approach it in a top down way and I think then you lose some of the value. So this is reconnecting communities, Governments, the UN agencies throughout the WSIS process is one of the things that deserves attention going forward. Otherwise, the connect and outcome and the value of the process might not be clear enough in the long-term.

>> ANG PENG HWA: I have a question concerning this document as well, regarding it seems to be a change in kind of what had happened in the past. With the IGF, Internet Governance Forum, it was top. But here in this paragraph 5, they ask that the President of the General Assembly appoint facilitator to lead and so forth. To help negotiation, that is a word that IGF tries to avoid, negotiations, resulting in an document for adoption. IGF has many reservations about this.

So do you guys want to comment on this? Paul you know that you were talking about this issue outcome. Paul?

>> PAUL WILSON: I think after the history of endorsement and recognition and strengthening of a multi-stakeholder approach to Internet Governance, that I described that has evolved over the last ten years, I'm really with Adam Peake in saying that it would be outstanding and controversial if through a purely Internet governmental process, if there was a rollback of what has been achieved, strengthened, reinforced, demonstrated for ten years as the ongoing model of successful Internet development, very outstanding for that to be reversed in some way. We could take an optimistic approach here and as the Ambassador said, the UNGA is an intergovernmental body. And it's not going to change. And if an intergovernmentally agreed outcome document was produced that really reinforces that we care about here, I think that would be a powerful outcome and I would like to be optimistic about that and hope that is the result.

That is, you know, that is a deliberately optimistic approach, but there are many things to happen between now and the data thing, which is the middle of next year, which I think would set the stage and allow us to see how this process, preparatory process and the rest, was actually proceeding up to this point.

But my position would be optimistic until I'm shown some specific reason for alarm.

Thanks.

>> Thanks, Peng HWa. I like all will try to be optimistic about this as well.

I hope, having come so far as has been mentioned several times already this afternoon, that having come so far we realise that we are actually paddling up the wrong river would be a real shame. So I do think that, you know, I would like to be optimistic on -- the word "Negotiation" concerns me. I haven't seen all the text of this document, so some of it is very new to me. However, having said that, I do think that the national processes -- the natural processes that will drive the input into this could be perhaps somewhere where we could make a bigger difference. I think a a lot of Governments around the world are keen on having the multi-stakeholder or otherwise defined process to have them reach some sort of consensus on what they want to present as their national position.

And I'm hoping that there are many of those, which will look to their population and their stakeholders within their country to help drive their position on that matter. And hopefully that would then, in turn, if this becomes an intergovernmental agreement in the end, but it's actually been driven by consultation at the local level, which would have all those factors behind it.

Thanks.

>> That is my thought as well, that it's not the intergovernmentally agreed outcome document itself, it's the process of getting to that document. And I mentioned that, perhaps not as clearly as I could have done, that in NETmundial we tried to crowd source an outcome document in a period of two weeks, and it was rushed and it was a little bit messy. But at the same time, while that was happening, you may have seen that if you were involved in NETmundial that it was signed into law the Marco Civil Bill of Rights and that was a crowd sourced piece of legislation. It was driven by an open process. I think that I can see Nika from the Foundation for Media, from the Philippines, and they are driving through the Philippine Senate at the moment, a similar document. It's a crowd sourced document about the Internet Bill of Rights.

And these types of processes in reaching the outcome document, that's the interesting part that we can use the Internet to develop the documents, nationally, regionally, or globally. So we have examples of that in Seville, Germany and other places. So it's something to be positive about.

>> Adam, you were positive about documents coming together.

>> ADAM PEAKE: Well, the Marco Civil worked. The process in the Philippines is going forward. The crowd sourcings documents used in Germany were more about establishing a process within the -- within the German Parliament. And that was different. It wasn't legislation shall but it was documents that were -- or it was an outcome document that the Parliament adopted. And there was a great deal of consultation and sort of crowd sourcing in the drafting process. We're learning, because this is new. But we have some successes and this is perhaps another opportunity to see if we can make it work not just nationally but globally this time.

Quite a challenge. Thank you, Chair, two quick concluding comments.

First is not all resolutions which set up high level events in the General Assembly have this kind of language or even that they attempt to reach an outcome. I've been -- I've sat through men many of them, participated in many of them. So there is a level of ambition contained in here, in the words "Resulting in an intergovernmentally agreed outcome" there is a high level of ambition. And since this event has to be held in 2015, there is enough time between now and the event, which will probably be in -- after the third week of September, when the UNGA takes place, for positions -- because you don't have to rediscover the wheel here. All the work has been done. The position, known. It's a question of taking advantage of this event to get focused at the high level in the world, Governments, other stakeholders, et cetera.

And I think this is -- there are resolution users is the word, encourages participation. Thank you.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Since you offered this, as Civil Society, what can we do to have a bigger footprint in this space?

>> HARDEEP SINGH PURI: Well, you know, this is the same advice I would be giving now that I'm a free bird to my colleagues in the Government.

I think the crying need of the yard is to remove the cobwebs, which are partly cynical, partly a lack of understanding each other's position, and develop trust. I this I there is too much of importance out there which should -- which can be -- which can become vulnerable to one or other partners taking responsibility positions.

So I would say to Civil Society, use your persuasion and Civil Society and Democracy has a tremendous margin of persuasion with the Governments, with the commercial entities, to look at the broader picture in the interest of development in countries like us and in terms of global peace and security issues, globally.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Comments anyone, questions?

No?

Okay. Zumi, yes.

>> AUDIENCE: I'm also in the example of very optimistic going forward. However, looking at Paul, I'd like to remind or most of you guys don't know what you did, Paul, in the early days with WSIS proprietary process, where the Civil Society, I think there was no technical community at that time or not -- were not allowed, first, to participate in any of the meetings. And then they started to allow us to observe. Watch.

At one confusion, the Chair said you can speak up and then later the Chair said oh, that was my mistake. And we were shut up. And the various Governments and some other Governments tried to keep that, but it didn't work.

Paul, you were sitting there, do you remember that some pooem Government people were starting to talk about IP address things and you cannot help raise your hands. I'm sorry, but there is some technical clarification you need. Please listen to us if the Chair allows.

And I remember the Chair said fine. And that's sort of the breaking point, later, that they realized some benefit of having different expertise and ideas later on, started, to.

And we tried to do something similar. So it's not just how do you read the languages or how you just theoretically understand how it work, and similar things happened in Tokyo, I won't go into details. But if you just as a Civil Society or whatever characterize the Government as a very typical bureaucratic nonflexible people or institution, that's wrong. And we did a lot of interaction in the lobbies, and we tried to establish a trust between the Civil Society and the Government. We organised meetings with the Chinese Government, India and other Governments, who were hole style to the civil society. We tried to explain. So these are the works that you really should also think about. Otherwise, we are just making all the formal things be it Civil Society or whatever, are not producing that kind of positive result.

That's where my optimism lies.

>> HARDEEP SINGH PURI: All I would say is that perhaps the cynicism is well justified. But I would have thought that if you have a resolution which gives the multi-stakeholder and gives Civil Society an approval and authority to participate, you're better off with this piece of document than without it. If you don't have this piece of paper, then you are at the mercy of the whims and fancies of whoever is Chairing the process. But once you have this piece of paper which is in the public domain, you can say gentlemen, whether you like it or not, we have the clearance to participate. Which one of you will participate, there are to many and the UN works from 10 to 6 or 9 to 6, if you want to extend it. Not everybody can participate. But you're still much better off.

And I'm not holding a brief for the UN processes, but I think this document gives you -- places you at a slight advantage than the previous situation.

And I've been absent since 2005. I'm probably not aware of what has happened and why people are upset. Which is for good reason. But I think this should be welcomed.

>> If I may, to respond, I think in the 2002 document or resolution by the General Assembly, to hold the WSIS itself, clearly stated that all stakeholders participation, they welcome, encourage this. And the full involvement or something like that. Of course, the interpretation of participation varied, can we just participate in the Conference and wait for the decision outside the room. That is one way of participation. And also to participate in the word by word drafting of the outcome statement, that's a different thing. But still we tried to get as much as possible rationally, and sometimes of course (inaudible) and so I echo with you, Ambassador, the same thing happened in the high level meeting where the Civil Society was almost not heard.

But we are well heard. In 2003, the Civil Society made our own statement to the WSIS, because we were not quite happy with the official -- I mean the document, if you remember. And we had a very good document. But it's at the ITU's repository, translating to all six languages of the United Nations, that shows how seriously the Governments also took it. So these are the different sort of manifestations that we can really still continue.

And I'm not too optimistic that sometimes the game may be sent back by several dynamics. So it's not a straight go ahead. It can still be winding around, but we need to go around.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Okay. Anja? Yes?

>> ANJA KOVACS: Just to say that I was not part of the the WSIS and I find it really refreshing, actually, because I notice that all the people in the room who are so optimistic are people who were. So it makes me think also that I think these clarifications are helpful and also the many ideas and like advisable strategies, et cetera, that have come up.

And I can see that for the stakeholders, it's important to have the discussions in other places as well. So definitely we take this forward as soon as possible on our e-mail lists, et cetera. There are many people like me who might on the first reading of that resolution might not be so encouraged, because we have been part of the processes like WSIS MPP and it steems like maybe a step back. But the context given it's good value. So I appreciate that. A lot of food for thought to move forward and also I feel more opt miing mistake than what we started the panel.

>> HARDEEP SINGH PURI: In 2003, one of the things which worried me, when I was talking to the Indian delegation et cetera, is that we were not clear what the issues were going to be. You know. Because most people thought that we were only going to look at whether the Internet -- it's how we can use the Internet, what are the challenges, et cetera. But today in 2014 when we are prepping for an event in 2015, the decisions that are required to be taken are there. You may not get all the decisions But this is going to be a discussion of the informed. In 2003, I was talking to my Civil Society representatives and others, we were all unsure. We were unsure in Government, the Civil Society representatives were less than sewer, and therefore the processes were less than sure. Today it's a different world. You'll be meeting in New York. You don't have the problems of meeting somewhere where Civil Society is not otherwise looked at positively or access is denied.

I remember in 2005, we were wondering what this was all about. There were issues on Democracy, on human rights, et cetera. So that context is no longer there. This is not something on which everybody has a point of view. And it's always easier to have a discussion amongst people who are technically very well prepared.

>> I think I agree with Mr. Hardeep Singh Puri. Today we have a more informed world of the Internet Society and what are the issues. There were 24 issues which came up on the Working Group on enhanced cooperation in Geneva. And so today we know where we are heading, unlike in 2003 and '5, there were other other declarations, and the agenda was prepared. And there were other paragraphs. But now interpreting it after ten years, how it looks like, what are the critical resources, Public Policy issues. So I feel that today, when we go to the next year's 2015, you know, this UN summit, that we will be move -- there will be a more informed way of tackling the issues.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Thank you, Dr. Govidn. I was going to give you a 30 second sound bite but you got it.

Anybody else? Raj?

>> RAJNESH SINGH: So 30 seconds. I wish I could tweak it. I think all I'll say is that there are differences in approach all over the place, be it the organisations, countries, regions. Within those difference, this are lots of different levels of differences as well. But I think we all just need to realise that we have to work together to get whatever our objective is. And as long as we have inclusiveness, transparency and accountability, I think we're getting there.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Thanks.

>> DR. GOVIND: I think the Internet is a great leveler. I think there are aspects of society, which we are not thinking in the print media and other kind of things, this has forced us to collaborate, cooperate and approaches, multi-stakeholder versus multi-lateral. And the organic way of building of the Internet and many more things which were not aware is today, you know, making the Internet to get more beneficial and more development oriented.

>> ADAM PEAKE: I suppose I've been thinking about the point you made about Paul's intervention long ago. That really, in these processes, the nongovernmental stakeholders are there to help, to be positive and to bring expertise that might otherwise be reacting. I wonder how the Government will react at the UN. They might be thinking and holding their heads saying we have got the crazy people coming. But I think the positiveness of wanting to participate and make improvements to the processes.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Paul?

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you. This has been very interesting for me and I hope for others as well. Thinking back, it was actually the WSIS that dragged me as a technologist out of my technical -- my comfortable technical hole and dragged me into this sort of stage where I was forced to start really trying to be understood. I was naive enough to decide, as Zumi described, for better or worse.

This is work that we have had to do. It's work that has been additional to what we used to do, in terms of core technical activities and responsibilities. And I would never say it was not productive. But in some sense, an overhead and it's been a growing overhead. We really have a, for an organisation with a technical mission, we have incurred an increasing and substantial cost in actually participating here. As I said, I would never say none of this is worthwhile, but it's a growing overhead and I would like to think that we will come to a point, and being optimistic, that WSIS+10 may be a point where we draw a line under a lot of questions with a point of understanding, which allows us to sort of turn in some part to our core mission and what we need to do for the benefit of the Internet.

Because speaking, from a technical point of view, we do have plenty to do.

Thanks.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Thank you. And I'll put this slide up there as a reminder that they are talking about development and development is one of the foci of this review.

>> HARDEEP SINGH PURI: I would just say looking back at 2003, in the days when I was in Geneva, we did a lot of International conferences. I think we negotiated the framework Convention on tobacco control, the FCTC, we did other things. At that point in time I was not able to always appreciate what relevance or importance some of the activity we were indulged with having later. Now, looking back at what happened in 2003, I realise that one under estimated the significance of that. So all I can tell you with the benefit of hindsight is that a few years from now, and when you reflect back on what you're going to do between now and 2015, believe me, it is important. Because what is out there, the stake is really important, and especially for a developing country like India, where we have more poor people than all the other countries put together.

Using ICT for development is a very important challenge. And I'm happy to tell you that the newly elected Government in Delhi realises that more than most other Governments and certainly other Governments in India. From the Indian side, you'll see -- I'm not part of the Government, I'm part of a political party now -- much more rigor and commitment to using the ICT for development.

Thank you.

>> ANG PENG HWA: The Internet has many fathers. This panel has one mother. Anja.

>> ANJA KOVACS: Well, I basically already said what I wanted to earlier, which was that I started the panel with a much more pessimistic review of the overall review of the WSIS and also the space that development issues could find on that agenda. And I'm really grateful to everybody on the panel, but also the people who commented from the floor for changing that around. And I look forward to working with all of you, from all stakeholder groups, over the next year and a half to make sure that that outcome document we have by December 2015 for sure I guess will be worthwhile and that we will think back in ten years' time and say that was really important and we handled it well. Thank you.

>> ANG PENG HWA: On a very encouraging note. Thank you. Let's thank the panel.

(Applause)

(End of session, 15:00)
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