ICANN
Transcription ICANN Hyderabad
GNSO Non-Commercial Users Constituency (NCUC) Outreach
Thursday, 03 November 2016 at 13:45 IST
Note: Although the transcription 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 meeting, but should not be treated as an
authoritative record.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar
page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Kilnam Chon: And this meeting, we planned 90 minutes. But (unintelligible) an
                 announcement was made for the 180 minutes. So at least we will do the 90
                 minutes and beyond it's up to us. We'll discuss it. We want to keep the
                 (unintelligible). But tentatively 90 minutes. We start a couple of minutes late
                 so we will be a couple of minutes.

Milton Mueller: Can you hear us (Miriam)? I'm talking to the ICANN staff (unintelligible). No,
                 you can sit there.

((Crosstalk))

Milton Mueller: Okay. We share a mike.

Kilnam Chon: Okay.

Milton Mueller: Loud and clear. Okay. All right then. We will get started now. Welcome everybody. This is the Academic and Civil Society Outreach Session sponsored by the non-commercial user's constituency. And you can, I, the agenda is projected up on that screen. How many of you can actually read it would be a good question?

Kilnam Chon: Yes, small.

Milton Mueller: Maybe you could make the chat a little smaller and the windows for the slides a little bigger. I'm not sure we need to see the …

Kilnam Chon: Anybody the remote? (Unintelligible).

Milton Mueller: Well there's a lot of people on the remote.

Kilnam Chon: The remote? Okay.

Milton Mueller: Yes, so the video, they're seeing the video.

Kilnam Chon: Okay fine.

Milton Mueller: Okay, so I'm going to begin by talking about NCUC and Giga-net. Basically we're going to have a pretty informal session here today. We'll have some introductory talks by Kilnam and myself.

And then we will open up the floor to discussions from people who are researchers or activists in this region to tell us what they're doing and discuss the possibility for networking and mutual support and then engage in a general discussion of what we hear.

So this is more like a meeting even though this formalized setup might not make it so easy for us to talk to each other. And most of you are staring at

your computer screens so hopefully this will work. All right. So I'm Milton Mueller.

I'm one of the members of the Non-commercial Users Constituency. I'm an academic at the Georgia Institute of Technology. And I think (Miriam) is pulling my slides up there. So let me begin by talking about the Giga-net since many of you are academics.

So Giga-net is one of the early institutional responses for academic that came out of the World Summit of the Information Society. We, as we went into the World Summit we realized that there was a lot of really interesting problems and that most of the people issuing papers and discussing those problems were Civil Society activists.

And that there might be a role for academics to be providing a little more objective and impartial analysis of some of these issues. And so we decided to create a special organization for academics and it was called the Global Internet Governance Academic Network or Giga-net.

And some well-known people were involved in forming it such as Wolfgang Kleinwächter, myself, Bill Drake and many others. I think the main output of Giga-net is that in conjunction with the Internet Governance Forum, the Global Internet Governance Forum, every year we have a symposium on day zero. That is the day before the actual IGF starts.

How many of you are planning to go to the IGF this year? Oh, not very many, wow. So, if you care to, it you come in a day early – you're not going Kilnam.

Kilnam Chon: I'll go. I'll do remote.

Milton Mueller: Oh, you'll do remote? Okay. So the Giga-net will have pretty good symposium. They've been getting better and better I think at the years pass. They have papers. It's a competitive kind of standard, the academic

conference format in which they issue a call for papers. The papers are evaluated and the best ones are selected for the program.

Now one of the things, now you see the link to the Website there. It's giga-net.org. You can see that you have, a membership application there. The membership is fairly straight forward. They're simply asking whether you are a researcher or not.

You do not have to have a PhD. You do not have to have a tenured professor position. I don't know if for some reason this sort of mythology was spread in the early days of Giga-net. But fundamentally we're interested in you being a researcher rather than just somebody who is interested in internet governance issues. We do want the organization to be focused on research.

The whole thing is quite relevant to this meeting is that Giga-net sort of lends its support and provides a framework for communicating with academics around the world and it lends its support and its brand, if you will to regional events. The initiative for these events typically comes from the local region.

So, for example, in South Korea in 2009 one of the professors there at the Seoul National University decided that she wanted to have a conference on internet governance. And she put together a really nice program.

Some of the academics were local. Some of them were coming in from the rest of the world as part of the ICANN meeting I think that was nearby. And they had a very good academic conference in Seoul in 2009. We've done them in the U.S. We've done them in Europe.

The most recent one in Berlin was connected to the Association of Internet Researchers. How many of you have heard of AOIR? Yes, so this is a big conference basically of social science researchers of the internet.

And Dimitri Epstein and the Berlin Humboldt-Institut put together a really nice program. And so it was a collaborative effort. So the point here is that people in India, people in various parts of Southeast Asia, China, could also put together a regional conference.

And Giga-net will, you know, if it's truly an academic conference Giga-net will help you promote it and publicize it and provide some of the basic infrastructure for putting something like that together.

Another feature of Giga-net is academic paper archive. We have just arranged with SSRN which is a very large archive of paper which are basically Open Source. Actually they store the paper and they have an indexing system and it's, you know, it's up there on the Web for anybody to access.

And it's organized according to certain categories. And so if you get one of your papers accepted into Giga-net then, if you wish, you don't have to publish it this way. Some people have to not make it Open Source because they want to put it into an academic journal.

But if you wish, the paper that you publish in the Giga-net symposium will also be put up on SSRN which literally means that millions of people will be able to see it. So that's Giga-net.

Now if we can go to the next slide, I'll talk a bit about Non-Commercial Users Constituency and then turn it over to Kilnam. So how many of you have not heard of the Non-Commercial Users Constituency. Let the record show that there are no hands up. Okay.

Kilnam Chon: How many of you know NCUC?

Milton Mueller: And they all get to raise their hands, right. Actually nobody raises their hands for that either. That means they're all asleep. Or they're reading their e-mail,

yes. So we have brochures here. If you haven't heard of this – we'll pass it around.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Milton Mueller: Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Milton Mueller: Yes. So the NCUC is part of ICANN's attempt to provide balanced representation of different stakeholder groups within the policy making process. So within the GNSO you have a Commercial Stakeholders Group which consists of commercial businesses, trademark owners, internet service providers.

And they have a certain number of seats on the GNSO Council. And you have a non-commercial stakeholders group which includes the NCUC. And in addition to that you have two other stakeholder groups around the, what's called the contracted parties, the registries and registrars.

So these, the GNSO Council is divided into the four pieces. And each of them has a similar number of votes on the council. And in order to ensure consensus in the formation of policy, the voting rules are structured in a way that requires the support of at least three of these stakeholder groups before you can pass any policy.

So the upshot of this is that people in the NCUC are actually shaping and voting on policies as well as helping to select with the other stakeholder groups two of the Board members that are seated on the ICANN Board.

Now many of these domain name policies involve things where we need analysis and research. Just to give you an example there's been a

longstanding debate about the accuracy of who is data and the privacy, relationship between privacy and who is.

And, you know, some people would say oh the data is all very inaccurate. And other people would say no, it looks pretty good. Some of it's inaccurate. Some of it's not. So there's a very simple and obvious empirical research group of questions to be solved there.

And so there's a very dynamic and complimentary relationship between researchers and the policy making process. If you can, as a researcher bring new information, new data that is relevant to the policy process it will be welcomed at least by people who agree with the results. That was a joke.

So that's why we put these two things together, academic outreach and civil society outreach, is that we think that one of the strengths of NCUC is it includes the non-commercial sector of academics and that academics can contribute to the policy process by doing applied research that relates specifically to ICANN policy processes.

And this brochure gives you a sense of the kinds of issues that we work on such as human rights, diversity, consumer choice, multi-lingual internet and so on. So if you're not already a member of the NCUC and if you are eligible to be a member we would encourage you to take the brochure, look at the URL and take steps to join.

And if you're more, if you're not interested in directly in participating but are more interested purely in the research aspect and I would encourage you to go to the Website for Giga-net and get involved with that, if you're not already.

So with that I'm going to turn it over to Kilnam who's going to talk about the view from the Asia Pacific.

Kilnam Chon: Okay, yes. Thank you. I was wondering why I was invited to co-chair this meeting. Probably I'm the oldest. I saw the computer networking before the internet in the 1960s. And after I started a couple of years later internet started showing up.

It was a very minor networking effort. We had (unintelligible) ix or seven major and internet was one of them. That was almost 50 years ago. It turned out the NCUC, the late 1990s when we started forming the ICANN. We are, it was almost a fight, like a battle.

ICANN's really a (DNSO). A combination of GNSO and (CCTOD). And how do we organize, structure this group? Today you would say like a multi-stakeholder. Then, 18 years ago, no way. Like (unintelligible). I was sort of in charge of, one of the persons in charge of (DNSO).

(Unintelligible) showed us, look at this one, we call it the constituency. Almost all of private sector, commercial and only one, non-commercial which is this one, NCUC. So we said, why we have to have six private sector and only one non-private sector?

So that we tried to change this one, even though we succeed (unintelligible). And the second one is a (unintelligible). So in the late 1990s it was almost one-sided, private sector. And so it's a long way, it was a battle. Even though NCUC was not sort of treated as a minor player of the (DNSO). So it was a lot of those struggles.

Then come to these (unintelligible) governance. Milton is one of the pioneers in this area. And then we just finished (unintelligible), India, (unintelligible) (internet) governance. And two months ago we had a first, I wouldn't say first but (unintelligible) (internet) governance.

So we are sort of getting ready in this area, in certain areas. And now let me give this presentation with (total) experience. And why we are having

outreach. And I want to have a good discussion. Do we need outreach in Asia? Well we don't need anymore.

And, can we go to the next page?

Milton Mueller: (Miriam), can you change the slide?

Kilnam Chon: Okay. Yes. I don't' know. Can you read it? Okay, first of all, Asia Pacific. We have over 50% of the world, either operation wise or internet user wise. Operations, second, Asia Pacific, it's a bit huge. And we have (unintelligible) genius from very small to the very large.

Like India and China, one point some billion. And we have many small especially in the Pacific islands. Now all together we have 50 to 100 depending on how you count. And the language and the culture, many. So this larger scale in the (unintelligible) genius area.

How do we do it? It's quite a challenge. And every time we try to organize sort of how to deal with this one. Next page please. First, let's do stuff from the civil society since this is in the title. And it's interesting. And we want to see this one, we just published a book called this one, Asia (Pacific) History, (third edition).

If you want to access on a Website, there's full coverage (unintelligible). And this is the data from this book. Possible numbers. Somehow surprising. India is very big, 19 civil societies in internet area. Then Philippines is 14. Those two are the major.

Probably that's what to expect. But India and the Philippines are the two major. And especially India. Double. It's very high. I'm going to comment. We started having a good publication and lecture out of India.

Milton Mueller: What are you counting here? What is the 19?

Kilnam Chon: Oh, those are number of civil societies, internet civil societies.

Milton Mueller: Number of organizations?

Kilnam Chon: Yes, how many civil societies we have in each country. Oh yes, this is the number of the number of civil societies in each country. And, so the total number of civil society activity in India is pretty much poor to the USA or even more. Like I usually say like India and the USA are the two major civil society communities in the world.

And the Philippines is sort of surprising having those 14, second largest. Then South Korea, Bangladesh are the (next growth). Then probably you may be surprised Japan has only four. Almost very little civil society activity.

And I don't' know why this is the case but this is the data. So depending on how you look, pretty much this order remains the same. Next page. Academia, not so active. And I hope, I want to hear because there are many people from the university how you guys are doing with governance in the broad sense, how you're doing? And what's the issue you are having?

Like objectively, the United States is leading by far, the European countries including U.K. And think about okay, that's one year, think about say like ten major publications, (a book or papers). Who did it? Who wrote those books or papers?

You can see pretty much it's almost monopolized by the American and in a lesser degree, the U.K. And almost none from Asia. And this is a challenge. Even though we have more than 50% of internet users and many of those are civil societies, the publication activities (unintelligible).

Of course we start having good quality publications especially out of India which is very good but it's still a long way to go. And then are we doing

research or some activity? Yes, we do. You can find, we have 50 to 100 research centers in the universities in Asia.

But the output are not too perfect. And I want to hear, why is that the case? Again, I want to hear those many cases. Then a couple of other things. First of all, internet society centers at universities, we start having those in coordination. And the (unintelligible) in Hong Kong, they're coordinating with the conjunction of (Harvard) University.

So we are coming up but still it's very low. Next slide please. Internet organizations more in general, one thing very unique is internet society. In countries in Asia, internet societies are very visible. In many cases, internet societies are the major internet organizations in each country. (Unintelligible)(China) and Korea, almost none. No activity.

But the rest of Asia, civil societies, no internet societies is the major so that we really appreciate this effort by the internet society. Without that many countries there are no organizations and (APREF), Asia (APREF) is good. (APREF) finally took off. Not doing very well.

But (nationwide) somehow almost no strong active (APREF) in Asia. We want to know why this is the case. And next slide is (unintelligible). This is very strange. Until three, four years ago, nothing. We have a (unintelligible) from Europe, nothing from Europe. That and America, as we have (defined) here.

And (unintelligible) is a spinoff of the Latin American (School) of Internet Governance. Then Africa. Then comes Asia. As soon as Europe setup we sort of set up next. But that was the case. That was three, four years ago. But looking to next year, would you believe next year we'll have about twelve SIGs, School of Internet Governance.

Out of twelve, about eight of them in Asia. And there are about three or four, you know, remaining in the world. So all of a sudden School of Internet

Governance took off in Asia, you know, big style which is very good. Now the (user reference) if you want to know, (APRGF) has a very good Website and (APSIG) Website.

Milton Mueller: Change the side.

Kilnam Chon: Oh yes, next slide please. The references. The last one. Then we did a decision in terms of (unintelligible) project about 80 offers an at least 50 advisors. And we spent five years to come up with this 3 billion, the regional history, the first (interval).

No other region (jump) on the reginal internet history yet because it's very difficult. And the implication is, we want to help each country to (write national internet history) in Asia. And using this material you could start in a much ready state.

And so if you want to write a national internet history, please contact us. And also, we need many more of those initial articles. Like how's the internet governance being developed specifically in India? We don't have any article so I want you to contribute those articles.

And that's the way you can sort of mobilize internet governance activity, research and activity and the deployment. Okay, with that let's start the, open up the floor for the discussion.

Milton Mueller: Yes, so first I want to say, I'm passing around this signup sheet and just asking for your name, organization and email address. If you wanted to put it down, you don't need to put your, anything down you don't want to put down.

And now I'd like to ask people who are involved with research in this area and I'm going to start with the Center for Communication Governance to, maybe just tell us a little bit about what you're doing and what your plans are. And how you might leverage this meeting to advance that agenda.

Poomjit Sirawongprasert: Thanks Milton. Hi, I'm Poomjit. I work with the Center for Communication Governance, (governance of international law in New Delhi). Our intention with supporting this meeting and coming is to see if there's any interest in kind of setting up an Indian or a regional research network along the lines of Giga-net.

Just to give you a brief snapshot of the kind of work we do, we have three different research teams. One that works on internet governance that I work as part of. There's one that works on civil liberties that look at more human rights questions.

And one that works on cybersecurity. What we realize in working in this area for the last three, four years in India I that there is a need for more organizations to do this kind of research. And there's definitely a need to support each other while we do this kind of work.

So we're just, we're looking to support other organizations that might do this kind of work with open-ended conversations. And my colleague (Arturo) will tell you more about the report that we just published.

It looks at (unintelligible) stakeholders in India over the last five years. So we looked simply taking from the kinds of things (Kalum) was talking about. We looked at the kind of Indian stakeholders that have participated in internet governance organizations.

What are these teams seeing and what are the broad things that they're engaging on? So, and we have copies of the report here. So if anyone is interested, we'll be happy to pass it around then and continue conversations beyond this meeting.

My colleague Aarti will tell you more about the report itself and the kind of things we found which I think might contribute to the conversation we're having.

Aarti Bhavana: Thanks Poomjit. Aarti with the Center for Communication Governance. So in this report we have looked at multi-stakeholder engagement in the various internet governance forums, that is ICANN, (unintelligible) and (IGFMAG).

So we've looked at the past five years of participation which becomes particularly relevant in terms of ICANN. Within the ICANN chapter I worked on, we looked at how Indians have participated in public comment processes, in face to face meetings like this as well as on mailing lists, sort of the main constituency mailing lists that are open.

To this, we realized in the perspective of stakeholder groups and respective of constituencies or (ACR) advisory committee reconciliations, there are a few issues that are common and of common concern across the board some of which are the issue of jurisdiction, the issue of diversity, of ICANN legitimacy so and accountability.

So these are the four main issues that we managed to pull out or that we managed to (collect) all the interventions into. So to this report we go through the stats. We take you through the latest interventions that people have made. And yes, the report, we have lots of copies here so if you'd like to discuss it with us we're more than happy to. Thank you.

Milton Mueller: Good. So I see another researcher from another institution over there at the end of the table. Jyoty would you like to give us some perspective on what you're doing and how you interface with ICANN?

Jyoty Panday: Hi. My name is Jyoty. I'm working with the Telecom Center of Excellence at the Indian Institute of Management. We have so far focused largely on the

telecom side of infrastructure and have not been really active in the internet governance space.

But previously I worked with Center for Internet Society which is where I got involved with ICANN and this little bubble. More than sharing my insights actually I think one way of taking this discussion forward may be that there's a lot of legal issues that are constantly coming up in this area of work. And it becomes a little inhibiting for social studies backgrounds for academic institutes that are not involved from a legal perspective to then engage and step in.

So I think it would be really great to hear from voices who have been active in this field for very long. And what are some of the issues that are not just legal focused? For example, competition. I mean everything will have a legal perspective. But I would be really glad to hear from the experts in this room on some of the issues both midterm and long term that need attention from a management and institutional framework.

At the Center now we are primarily focusing on petition and consumer trust related issues. How the TLDs and CCTLDs are doing. And then this, as you'll see, how an intersection with diversity about which countries are participating and who is actually drawing policy discussions? Who's framing the agenda?

So we want to actually look at the more practical perspective and not the heavy legal questions which there are far more, you know, knowledgeable people you're dealing with. So that's my two bits. Thanks.

Milton Mueller: Thank you. So just a bit of a follow-up question. So the work that you're doing there is going to intersect with ICANN in the future?

Jyoty Panday: Yes. So right now the accountability work is going on. We're not going to be participating too much in those streams but we are looking at the more two to three a plan where we're trying to get into competition and consumer trust issues.

And we'll be participating in those work streams and those policy processes. So regarding privacy issues, what are the practical implications for internet users? So we're not trying to get into more policy questions but more about the implications of those policy decision-making and questions at the larger level especially from a country like India like from their perspective.

Milton Mueller: Great. Is there anybody here from CIS in India?

Kilnam Chon: No.

Milton Mueller: No?

Kilnam Chon: She's in this building.

Milton Mueller: Elvis is in the building. Okay. So at this point then I'll ask for people from institutions that I may not know are here to feel free to volunteer and tell us what you're doing. Anybody care to jump in here? Yes.

(Don Milya): Hi, my name is (Don Milya) from Korea. I'm working at …

Milton Mueller: I don't think they heard your name.

(Don Milya): Yes, work at KAIST which is the (science and technology) school in Korea. And I'm also working with many people (unintelligible) about 20 years to find a good collaboration with the many sectors in Korean internet.

Well recently including myself I would like to actually get some advice or any kind of suggestions, how we actually connect the local internet governance issues with the global ones? So for example, we talk about the ICANN, the (IANA), you know, the delegation issues.

So what does that mean to us in our local governance, internet governance? But many people really don't, you know, understand. Well, I try to find some, you know, the relevance and some connectivity.

But so first, that's the one thing I would like to ask the people in this room, how they actually interpret (IANA) transition in the local internet governance aspect? And second, how we actually developed the local governance internet issues and bring them up, escalate them into, you know, the global, the space.

That's two questions. And the good thing I would like to share with is, we've been actually hammering the government and the government now. I don't know why but suddenly they open up their arms and we try to build a little bit more levels, you know, the connection between civil side and academia and also the government.

So they, oh, you don't – okay, sorry. So we're still waiting. But the government said there must be a way to convey the Civil Society of Academia, the internet governance, you know the issue raising to government, you know, the leading, some (unintelligible) making committee. So we'll see.

I think it's a very good starting point of how local Korean and internet, you know, own governance issues to be, you know, they prevail to, you know, the actual policymaking. Okay. Thank you.

Milton Mueller: Thanks. Great. Yes, (Haron).

(Haron): Yes Chairperson Milton. I'm (Haron) from China Institute of the internet governance and the law at Beijing University and (unintelligible) and tele-communication and post graduate student and majored in this issue especially in IG.

And I would like to talk about what we have done, you know, in our university. My institute is the first one in China to deal with this issue but most of them are from the law background or this issue.

So I think firstly we have some subjects of these, you know, our institute including most of them about the cyber law (internet) law and the, some privacy information. So some privacy security.

So otherwise we, when it comes to the IG issue, (unintelligible) took it up in my university. Firstly is it about the language. Not so much Chinese people are really good at English fluently speaking. So the first issue is about that barrier of language.

And the second thing is about the knowledge background. It's not only included about the law background issues but we also try to learn some technology language, so technology language and also the policy making language project in China.

But the most important key issue is to try to be involved in the international internet governance. So therefore I attended (unintelligible) this summer and also trying to be involved in the (unintelligible) the last three years. That's all. Thank you.

Milton Mueller: Afghanistan, (Nafstrad) would you like to comment.

(Nafstrad Hollad): Yes, hello everyone. This is (Nafstrad Hollad). I come from Afghanistan. On the question on research, we're newly starting to form groups and teams in Kabul, you know, given the amount of time. We're literally starting from zero. There's nothing there. So one of the, on the research side, what we're doing is we formed a committee inside our association to start focusing on the issue of internet governance.

It's really small. It's nil. So I could literally use all the help that all of you guys can provide. And then on the activity side, we've been having these discussions with (ASGON) the School of Internet Governance and the local IGF which could hopefully help us out.

But there's a lot of issues with that, with the amount of support that we get. And we're trying to work on a draft concept which we might end up doing big research on.

And I could relate to a lot of our Asian colleagues here on that is the fact that as you can see on the left, you presented, there's a lot of this work being done in the most devolved countries which are already developed to a certain extent.

But where we need the internet the most is in the countries like Afghanistan and India and all of these. But really less work is being done. So one thing that I would direct back the question to you would be how do we upscale these countries in these initiatives on the terms of support that we're providing?

I know we're doing some things but how can we upscale them in order to at least, you know, catch up to other regions. If not based on our need we need to be way up ahead in the ladder.

Kilnam Chon: Yes, that was very interesting case, Afghanistan. We were surprised. They are quite ready. And they are going to have a first School of Internet Governance next year. What does this mean? USA is also preparing to have a first School of Internet Governance and probably they could do it in the next year. So we'll see, who's going to do it first? And with that, next, let's do some more on the School of Internet Governance.

Brazil is a very interesting case. First of all they sit in Latin America School of Internet Governance. And they (unintelligible) partly because of language,

Spanish and Portuguese. They made a major move. They setup a new School of Internet Governance.

(Unintelligible), the first time in the world, (unintelligible) we want to hear how you are doing with this kind of thing and also others in research and development. (Hatmud) would you.

(Hatmud Glaser): Thank you so much for the opportunity. My name is (Hatmud Glaser). German name. But I live in Brazil since the 50s so I am probably one of the oldest in the room. And I just stopped my activity at the university in Brazil. And I'm working full time for (Nick Biare) domain names in Brazil.

We have a multi stakeholder model. We start '95, '96 with this model. We have a Board of 21 members and all four sectors are represented in our Board. (Research), NGOs, academia and industry. And our model was probably pioneered in Latin American and some other parts of the world.

So that was (unintelligible) who started with the summer school in Germany ten years ago who invited me to introduce the Brazilian model in the summer school in Germany. Milton and others know the school there. Since then I am faculty member and every year I go back to Germany to introduce the Brazilian model, the Brazilian way.

But we discovered that in the country a lot of people don't know the model that we are using. So we started in 2009, 2010 together with Argentina, the (South) school in Latin America. But two, three years later we decided to have the Spanish for the Spanish countries and the Brazilian only for my country for Brazil.

And we have now four schools behind us. Three schools, five days, 40 hours, more than 40 hours. We start at 9:00 in the morning and work until 10 p.m. So everyone is obliged to stay full time in the same hotel. No way to go out.

We have lectures. We have exchange. We have hands-on, practical training. We simulate some real situations so that we try to show how we work together as a multi-stakeholder model, how we reach consensus. Every day has one emphasis. We start with the history of the internet.

Then we go ore to the technical part of the internet. Then for the legal aspects of the internet, then we compare some different models. We have all the history related to IANN to (IANA) to IT. So everything is on the table.

And then for sure we have the celebration. We finish our 45 hours, 40 or 50 hours training. Every evening after dinner, we have hands on. You know that already every one of us was a student in the past. After eight hours lecture you are tired.

So we have after dinner a very German style training and discussion with wine and caipirinha. Wine, you know, and caipirinha is a Brazilian normal drink. So we have two hours relaxing. Not sitting as here. Very formal way. And discuss every evening one problem.

Can be human rights. Can be privacy. And then we ask our students to participate. One secret in Brazil is let's avoid to have big groups so we have numbers between 30 and 40 students, no more.

The accent is we need to have time to exchange, to receive questions and to discuss and have them really sense between the students and the faculty members. So we have 40 students.

Normally 15 to 20 faculty members. Not only CGI Board members but also from industry. From government. From the regulator side. From the ISP side. Different participants.

And this year, this last year we started for the first time with a shorter course lecture, only two days only for (court) members. Brazil is famous to have

actions by the (court). They don't know the law. So they stop Yahoo. They stop Facebook. They stop Whats App.

Because of some criminals they avoid the hundreds of millions of Brazilians who can use the social networking. And we need to go to these guys and teach them that this is not the best way to do it.

So we start in the first semester with 40 lawyers, court members, judges and different people let's say legal side of the internet. And in two weeks we will have the second time an experiment in (unintelligible) students. The second new branch is only two days. Only 15, 16 hours.

But the idea is we need to explain to our authorities. We need to explain to our Congressman. We need to explain to our Senators. We need to show to our different ministry how we govern the internet. It's not only academia. It's not only social. It's not only activists.

And we try to go step by step going this way. And I am working 20 years with (Nick Biard), the steering committee. So now it's time that we forget the technical aspect, if it's okay. We have high level technical experts here. And we need to go more with the legal participants in the internet on all different levels.

I think that we can have an exchange. I know (unintelligible) years ago. And we just had a short meeting. I will send some contributions and I hope that I can learn also with the agents and with (unintelligible). Thank you very much.

(Becon Spresher): My name is (Becon Spresher. I'm from Nepal. I'm Internet Society Nepal chapter. Currently I'm (unintelligible) and I'm heading one of the departments of commercial bank, (unintelligible) bank, ebanking and (ISO).

(Unintelligible) internet society is more active in south this year so we are the active chapter in internet society in terms of activities. And we are also trying

to organize and internet (ITF) Nepal last year but due to some technical reason we couldn't.

But definitely this year we are going to organize. And we seek support from ICANN and different stakeholder societies. Due to (unintelligible) in Nepal, you know the internet is in shadows these days. And internet society is trying to come up with different strategies.

And we do have strategies planned. Last year, last two months back internet society held a strategy meeting and we came up with different strategies that internet society is going to organize.

And this (IGF) internet forum in Nepal, my main concern is that because of the civil society is more active than government. That's why we are enforcing to government and seeking help from different organizations.

So I would like to request, so how can we go ahead with this, to organize this event so that we can come up with a main call. Thank you.

Milton Mueller: Are there any other people who wish to tell us what they're doing? Yes sir. Come up to a microphone. There's one here. There's one over there. Right here there's an empty space on the table.

(Todd): Hi. My name is (Todd) from South Africa. I'm the Secretary of (ISOC), (unintelligible) chapter. Basically when it comes to internet governance, we started running those types of forums back in 2015. And it took us a long time to (do that) engaging government.

But now talking about the people who've been involved in terms of the multi stakeholder process, civil society has been playing a very critical role in mobilizing other players. Local business within the industry has also been part of the process.

So one of the benefits it would seem is that members who usually get involved in the process, they find some inspiration and expiration whereas we see businesses now playing a minimal role within their internet space itself.

Because we were running the internet governance on a provincial level, not necessarily an international level. And it's only this year that we are (in the mission) of IGF just before the African IGF.

So I think it has been positive on our side because we are now engaging government. Just before we came to the ICANN meeting we were busy communicating with them and engaging them on their ICT white paper policy to make sure that the outcome that comes from the African IGF is translated or can be seen on the national policy.

So one of the cost areas for us has been access, making sure that people get connected on the ground and also the cost of communication is one of the things that we've been looking at because a lot of the people, they think that connectivity and the cost of that connectivity, it plays a critical role in people being able to participate within the intended space. But now, with government, if we'd have went (unintelligible), where they want to now regulate and classify content that is available online and also critical infrastructure is one of the things that they want – they like make sure that it is properly managed. So under (unintelligible), I'd say that we have been able to create (unintelligible), specifically for people who are new to the concept because in South Africa you find a lot of people who do not necessarily have the digital know how to. So it build – the IG concept brings that capacity and knowledge element, in terms of the (unintelligible) and community and participants of (unintelligible) activities. Thanks.

Milton Mueller: Anyone else want to get in? All right, so I hear two distinct themes here, which both involve kind of academia and civil society. One of them is about research. About organizations usually associated with universities or institutes. Analyzing these issues in their area and issuing papers or analysis

that might influence the policy process or the development of the internet in that region. The other is about education. It's about bringing people in their countries or in their regions up to speed on how the internet environment works. And that doesn't necessarily have to be done by universities, sometimes it seems like the internet society and some of the institutions like (NicVR) are actually taking a lead in promoting or fostering this kind of educational activity. Although, I think it's very important for independent academics to participate in and help shape these educational programs, otherwise they might just become sort of, self-promotion by these internet institutions.

So I think there's a very different set of questions and a very different set of problems depending on whether you're talking about the research end of it or the education end of it. Not that they're disjointed or disconnected but that they are very different problems. So for example, of how (Ron) – you're talking about paging university posts and technologies. You have basically, you're doing – you're trying to start a research capability there right? But at the same time, you're doing an educational program not so much – it's almost an academic degree program right?

Yes, so – how would – how possible would it be for (BUPT) to host or support a educational program like one of these schools of internet governance that is not part of an academic (unintelligible) program but maybe collaborating with other institutions in the regions on something that happens, maybe – either in China or somewhere else.

Man: Okay, thank you professor. As for your question, and firstly, as the post graduate at (MI), I try to involve all (unintelligible) to the fix. Also the (unintelligible) like this program. But you said the possibility to held this (SIG) in China, I think it could be go ahead just as I have a discussion with Professor Cho yesterday. And we said that maybe the China (unintelligible) maybe will be had next year and the - professor Cho also has the corporation with Professor Hong (Hsue), as a (unintelligible) university. Also as my

institute is maybe the first one in China to focus on this issue. Maybe we are all likely to get involved in this issue programming.

But as I'm just post-graduate, maybe when I come back I can have the communication with my professor.

Man: Now let me raise two issues for the Asia/Pacific. Okay we are doing an internet governance forum and also the (unintelligible) internet governance yes, we are doing okay. The one missing area, like a giganet. The place for the researchers for publisher paper to get together. Of course, you could go to the giganet. They do the meeting on yearly but it's expensive. Typically, probably you need two, three thousand dollars and even meeting here, guests coming to Asia, then it's one thousand dollars. And that difference is big for the Asian. So the – how do we, does (unintelligible) of a giganet like those (unintelligible) in Asia and the second is a (EVS). Probably the conjunction of a giganet.

How do we sustain? Because one time may not be good enough. We should do this (unintelligible) to sustain. Second one is, let me give to the – I want to have a (unintelligible) to support this argument. We have some remarkable case in India, end of last year. I was visiting India, and would you believe in the television, announcer talked on a net neutrality every day. So net neutrality is in Asia topic on the major television. And that's the – I guess India is the only country in the world hearing about the major news there. Because of this issue within those free basics and Indian government and the community. And I look up this one – okay, conclusion is this is a remarkable case. Why Indian don't publicize? The second, why don't you – this (unintelligible) seems to be one of the highest in the world. If that's the case, why don't you transfer this know-how to the other country in Asia and the world? The way Indian government handle this one, okay, there is some issue. And of – they may be violating net neutrality. And (unintelligible) (unintelligible) for the comment.

And the main (unintelligible) serious society in India. Suddenly the very high quality of those papers, comment how they put together and how they're not (unintelligible) meet a meetings, to make a conclusion. This trial is not a (unintelligible) (unintelligible) holder or you may call the Indian style (unintelligible). And there is abuse for it. The port is by the far the highest in the world. One of the highest in the world. If that's the case, why don't we raise a paper and publicize, and transfer. Then we have one handicap.

Actually India, is in particular, publishing a many good paper and books, then why don't we know. We (unintelligible) books, like (unintelligible) book, because he write a book in MIT press. Okay. The Indian doesn't work first. They don't publish in MIT press. So we have those building handicap. And this is something we have to work out. I'm not saying like oh those Indians they should (unintelligible) they might be first to publish a book. Some of them may do that way. Also we have to have a good publisher in Asia too. We'll get sort of a combination.

So the – in a (unintelligible) we have all those infrastructure is not quite as ready as U.S.A. Or Europe, but we – the students of the India would you like to comment like on those issues I raised? How you could lead? And you guys seem to be so shy to publicize this remarkable effort. Would you like to comment?

Go ahead.

Man: So with specifically the net neutrality issue. We of course, as a research organization help with submitting comments to the government and circulating it. And sort of helping civil society understand what the legal issues involved were. And we're happy to report that some of the things that we submitted were actually used by the government – in the policy (unintelligible) afterwards. But the credit for the kind of things you are describing should really go to the civil society organizations because I think they allied with a lot

of media organizations. They allied I think with a comedy troop – comedy group which publicize the issue on YouTube and the video went viral.

So I don't know how much, we as an academic organization can help with, you know, making the issue this big. But in terms of, you know, building capacity in terms of sharing our research. We're always doing that. So all our reports are open access, we're open to ideas and how we can make them more accessible. So we brought our latest support here, we're launching a (heat) speeds report in a couple of weeks. So if any of these topics are of interest to you, I mean, we're open to collaborating with people from within the region, other regions. That's why we heard of this meeting. So yes, we're open to ideas on how we can take this forward and kind of help each other in researching on these topics from a regional perspective.

Man: Okay, so (unintelligible) (unintelligible), and I was also one of the (unintelligible) India's (unintelligible). I saw (Chapter) (unintelligible), yes, so I was one of the (unintelligible) (unintelligible), the head campaign which was created by the civics society and the tech community, which fighted against Facebook and this net neutralities.

So when we were (unintelligible) for the theme, initially there was no support from the public community also. So we ran a lot of the thing he mentioned. We ran a YouTube channel. (Aber) released a video with supports, and those videos, with the help of (Perse), we could reach more people.

But the thing is that even though the technical community and the civil community were involved with that, involvement of academy was less. The academy even they didn't know about the issue, or, it really was less. So if we could involve academy more into this, then that might result in these publications research and books. And this – the (unintelligible) campaign, the thing is completely open to (unintelligible) data, and they can – the other communities to other nations if they want to replicate the same, they can use the same. So that's my addition. Thank you.

Man: Yes. I think you mentioned professor, I think one of the things that we're missing in Asia Pacific is the fact that we do collaborate on, at least for Afghanistan, if I may take it, we sort of collaborate on a country by country basis. But we don't think as a region to understand that we belong to our region and then obviously for all this research to have one point of, you know. The thing is like if I want to research on India, then I go to a few of these Indians institutes and then do the same for other countries.

So if we have one integrated platform where we could all get together and discuss these issues and share resources, that would be of a lot of interest to a lot of us.

Milton Mueller: I'd like to follow up – I think it's very interesting to talk beyond the country level. Particularly when you're talking about the internet. Really, there are ways in which the telecom infrastructure certainly the physical layer and the physical layer is very dependent on national policy. But the internet layer, the third layer, the fourth layer, the application layer, is highly globalized and regionalized and so many of the issues that the policy issues that you deal with, net neutrality for example, are really – there's a national element and there's a transnational element. So the net neutrality debate for example, around free basics is very much a global issue.

I was not that impressed frankly with some of the economic analysis behind the opposition to free basics, I think they could have benefited quite a bit from some critical research. I met somebody at the Indian school named (Nina) is she here? She's at the Indian Management, some kind of a management school. She's doing a study on net neutrality in the Indian context. I wish she were here, could contribute. But the point is, again, we're dealing with the relationship between research and education and civil society. So I would like to again highlight the critical nature of developing your own research capability, which of course involves collaboration across national lines and can sometimes be global.

And then the education in some ways comes second. However. One of the things that -- I can't remember your name -- he said that the academics frequently are disconnected from the ongoing policy issues and they're not producing papers that are really relevant to what's going on in an immediate sense. This is a real problem particularly in some of the more highly developed academic environments because the academics get rewarded for doing things that relate to other academics. And frequently they are told, particularly junior professors, are told that if they're out there fighting policy battles, they're not contributing to their discipline and they may not get tenured. I don't know if it's the same system system of tenure in China or India or elsewhere here that we have in the U.S.

Man: (Unintelligible) of what?

Milton Mueller: Academics like me are the exception rather than the rule in the U.S. and typically it's much more standard for people to write for other academics than to jump into these policy issues. So that's an issue too. And that's why I like to see the rise in India at least of these institutes that are bridging that gap that, you know, that CCG has been tracking ICANN very carefully. And developing that capacity is critical, you know. It's not just that you're – feets on – boots on the ground, civil society foot soldiers who are fighting for some cause but also the analytical capability to critically evaluate what's happening and have some understanding about how to direct it. You know, on a long term basis. Or to step back and criticize what's happening that's really important.

So let's go back to the point that was made about national versus regional. How could an infrastructure be set up to support, you know. Is there really a region here, okay. I mean, I know obviously Afghanistan is in a region with Iraq and Iran and Syria and so on. And that's clearly – there's a lot of social, economic, cultural ties among that, but when you get to Afghanistan and Thailand, I don't know. I mean.

Man: No, South Asia.

Milton Mueller: South Asia. Yes. South Asia and so on. How much can we help as giganet or even as NCUC in developing a regional – a truly regional capability in the sense that the region actually functions in a helpful way.

(Todd):   Milton, my proposal is that we need to start – let's say, in a very careful manner. We cannot reach the world if we don't know exactly what we like. In Brazil, we did a (lock), 2009, the ten principles between our members CGI with one goal; to reach the academics, to reach the court, to reach persons out of our influence area.

                The principles that we develop are the – how we use the internet to avoid the main idea was to avoid the (unintelligible) wrong decisions. So we have neutrality, we have universality, a lot of principles. This document is in English, so I can give you the web page.

                Then happened, a very surprise for us. The government take over the principles and hired a research center to request to receive contributions. And more than 2000 contributions from all over the world, all over the country, came in. Then a new group work and transformed this contributions in a law. In 2014, in the opening speech of the Net (Modial) Conference in Brazil, this was officially they create as a law in Brazil. It's a Bill of Rights for the Internet.

                Before we go into details to criminalize the best use of the internet, we defend the good use of the internet. So now we have principles by law in Brazil that the defend the use of the internet. With a lot of (unintelligible) affirmations, universal, neutrality and so on. But starts with these very small group. So probably we can use in some country -- let's say, four, five, six, people together -- to work with some model that we already developed in Europe and the west, and other parts of the world. I like to contribute with our document

and this – the principles that we approve later in Net (Mondial) Conference was a set number of the ten principles.

And my understanding is that Net (Mondial) was the Conference that over hundred countries approved a lot of principles that now are well recepted worldwide. So work step by step 2009, 2012, 2014 and now 2016, our government, again give a new step. So it was a process. Ten years of hard work developing. So my proposal is let's start step by step and use – we don't need to discover the wheel again and again. So let's use some contributions from other countries. And I am willing to help and probably we can put together the summer school documents that we have, giganet documents and distribute, probably we can print and can help others.

So Afghanistan and South Asia are willing, Africa are willing, it's not the best document but it's a contribution for free.

Man: Two comment. One of them is of (FSIG). We are inviting those academics, like next year we are inviting your boss to give a lecture. And some more. We (unintelligible) invite about three or four, five professors then spend one week to track (unintelligible). So we hope that would do something for the region. But (FSIG) is very small operation, only 40 to 50 people. The (unintelligible) second, this is something we'll do. The second is a migration – does it make sense to have a giganet like a one day workshop? One day conference during the (unintelligible). Since (IGF) co-locate with has a co-location of a giganet, so why not the giganet Asia could locate to the (APIGF).

Currently, (APIGF) is almost no academic, no those research people presentation. But that's a good place to have a introduction with a practitioner. So does it make sense to have a (unintelligible) event? And if so, would you like to (unintelligible) here to coordinate. Yes, (Glen).

Dave Cake: (Unintelligible) taken from – I'm from Australia, from Electronic Frontiers Australia but also I'm a PHD Student in the Internet Studies Department in

Curtin University. If you wanted to do a giganet associated with next year, the (APIGF) is in Australia. I would be very happy to help coordinate that. I would you know, know all the people who would be willing to jump in.

Milton Mueller: That's great to know. And let me just say that the original rational for giganet was precisely to put the academics right in the faces of the practitioners and vice versa, so that's why we linked our annual symposium to the (IGF), the global (IGF). And if you can do that at the regional level, again that's a great idea (unintelligible) and you have a volunteer so I think that would be really a good step.

(Hartman) on the other hand was suggesting that countries with their own legal structures could initiate a process to develop a set of principles for internet governance and then they would already have a cumulative wisdom of the Brazilians and the Net (Mondial) to draw on but they may want to – obviously for those principles to have legitimacy within a country, they would have to be kind of re debated and rehashed and agreed upon within that country. Any other comments?

Dave Cake: And I will say, just wanted to – while I had the opportunity to say also in Australia next year, the world wide web conference is being held and I'm also organizing a small, sort of, internet governance politics and technology kind of side conference to that. Which I'd be very – so if anyone is thinking of attending the world wide conference or just otherwise would like to be in Australia in April, I'd be very happy to talk about how that could be, you know, possibly linked into anything to do with giganet or other activities in the region.

Monika Zalneriute: Hi thank you, (unintelligible), I'm from University of Melbourne as while, just like (David) from Australia. Mel, just like you let them propose, I would like to step back and to have some time – a more critical look at this and I'd like to ask, is that really true that people from non-Anglo Saxon countries are not really engaged or is it an issue about framing and the language. Just like

you wrote in one of your papers that's saying that internet governance is such a constant – that people sometimes might necessarily use it explicitly but nonetheless be engaged in the issues that we're also engaged.

So I think that, at least in my view, there are people that are doing a lot of work as researchers on similar issues. Maybe not necessarily explicitly framed as such and in my view at least, they don't have to be necessarily framed as such because there is also some ideology behind calling things internet governance. So I think there is a danger in sort of just co-opting other perspectives into our umbrella sort of. Because I know people are doing a lot of critical work. Critical political economy work or criticizing techno empires that is also very relevant to what we do but nonetheless, I'm sure they wouldn't be here. So I just wanted to say how do we – do we, sort of, want to also connect with those researchers. Because I think that that's the same subject as we talked about, so thanks.

Milton Mueller: To respond to that, yes there is – of course there's a vast field of sort of – let's call it, STS, Science Technology And Society studies that – it does not intersect with these institutional formations and in a way that's maybe a good thing for some people to be involved in those areas and for there to be cross fertilization. But on the other hand, as I was saying earlier also, a lot of academics that are not connected to the actual institutional mechanisms, a lot of what they write does not seem to have relevance to the people who are making these decisions. Because it's just – they're using fancy language, you know, really complicated (fuecodian) terms and it's not always clear to somebody who has to make a real policy decision in the real world. How they take that analysis and do something with it.

So the strength of this community is that they are deeply connected, intricately connected to a real policy making environment and that imposes a kind of constraint on the vision in some sense but also a discipline of, you know, what are you saying that actually helps ICANN or its stakeholders to figure out how this all effects them and what they need to do about it.

Woman: Thank you. Just one sec, I'll give it to (Neil) then. But the sort of research you advocate, then is pretty much – it's like civil society then. You only say that the research matters as long as its policy relevant somehow, so I think that then we miss a lot as well as researchers the analytical, sort of critical, analysis as well.

Milton Mueller: That's not the research I'm advocating. That's what I'm saying, that's what this is. That's what we're surrounded by so if you find people who have trouble intersecting with, and incorporating these more academic forms of discourse, it's perfectly understandable because they just don't know what to do with it. And that's a problem on both sides, but really the – I think the onus is on academic researchers to say this is how what I'm doing is relevant to real world stuff you're doing. Or not, maybe it's pure like, sort of a philosophical and abstract discourse – theoretical discourse, which you know, can be a value for its own sake, just like poetry or you know, art. It's you know, it is what it is, you love it for what it is regardless of its practical application.

But this community, you know, is built around the practical problems of internet governance as we understand them. Actually I – but the other point you made about, not everybody calls what they're doing internet governance but in fact it is internet governance and it's highly relevant to what we're doing.

We – let's see it's 3:30 so.. we started at ...yes we have until, we have another fifteen minutes so just signal that we would be wrapping it up now without getting into. Is there anything that we think we haven't discussed that we really need to discuss.

Man: (Unintelligible) remember the time that someone in ICANN, I don't know who the (unintelligible) stats try to have an academic stakeholder group. My suggestion is, I start my life in ICANN '98. In the NCUC as an academic

because we're the only spaces I discover that was open for me. On this time I was not related to IP addresses, to domain names, to any legal aspect. Then the time came and I was invited to take over (Nick) (unintelligible) and I now stay in the family for the IP addresses in Latin America with (LochNique) and others.

My proposal that (NUC) starts with a smaller group only of academics that the giganet will be an official department or subsection or activity of the (NCOC) and yet we bring more academics in. I think the discussion is on a key point that now we can go to action. I think we discuss enough, we have material, we have a lot of visions of meets, of requests. Let's do it as a new mission for the (NCOC). You are the leader.

Milton Mueller: I'm trying to imagine the look on people who are the official elected officers of giganet when I tell them they're now a department of the (NCUC). But I think the idea of having like an academic special interest group within (NCUC) is a good one and I think it's less a matter of formal declarations or formal organization, it's just what we're doing right now today is to say, you know, one of the key parts of the non-commercial stakeholder group is in fact, academics and they can contribute.

They're not just stakeholders in the sense that an education research network has domain names and IP addresses but they are people who can contribute and a knowledge in analysis to the policy process and critical evaluation of it in a broader sense. And so, that's something that we can really contribute and therefore we've tried to do this outreach to academics. Particularly since it seemed like Indian society was really developing its own capability in that direction and you know, with reports and analysis coming out of these institutes. So we wanted to encourage that and to build on it.

Yes?

Woman: I want to say something. My name is (unintelligible) from China, International (unintelligible) of China. But in fact, I retired already. I try to catch all the people – the meaning and I cannot catch all – cannot understand all. If I make some mistake, I said something wrong, I'm sorry.

I want to just say that in fact, in China already have many (unintelligible), university, even government pay a lot of – pay attention for internet governance. Also, (Dr. Farm) maybe he is from (Shan To University) also do internet governance research. I think, for me, I opted details from International Centers of China and also me personally, like to do some research in internet governance.

In the beginning, I already follow IDF, 2006, 7, 8 – 2008 (unintelligible) (unintelligible). And also I joined, attend some ICANN meetings several times. I think internet governance, maybe we are understanding not same and the issues who take care are not same. Yes, in Africa you have IG, and some countries, some area you have internet governance form. But I think also, we have internet governance in China but not in main IGF. We already do a lot of things in this area. SO like Mr. (Hoang) posted on the – (unintelligible) communication. They do (unintelligible) it's too long the name. And also (Ching Hoa University), and also like, (Shan To University). And also like information, a company of information, research of China. Like that lady and also we have many company and the university, and the organizations already did some research work.

If you like I can introduce some people or they have done something. And maybe make some cooperation. My personally, also really interested on the – I already read the book Mr. (Muetton) writes in the (unintelligible) and I know, (unintelligible) is a (unintelligible) and write the book (unintelligible) (unintelligible) beginning 2011? Sometimes when you ask the people to Beijing, to ask them who and how to introduce the history, internet history, in Asia, in China. I cannot understand all of you. My English is not good but I'm interesting in it. Thank you.

Man: All (unintelligible) make a full on comment from China, since you have several people here.

(Yao Lin):   Hello, my name is (Yao Lin), I'm from China too actually. I'm (unintelligible) (unintelligible). Chinese ID and GTO already register operator. Actually before that I was quite closely following with the internet governance (unintelligible) the same league and have attended some school hosted by Dr. (Conchesta) and I think environment is a very intriguing environment. Because not only with the, you know, with the knowledge imparting from the lectures to the students but also have bond – there are plenty of opportunity to networking together.

And the vision today is about, you know, my observation of the China's engagement of the internet governance is that it kind of disintegrated, you know, between that real industry practitioner and the academia activities. Just like Mr. Mueller put it, because you know, the academia in China tend to focus on the much more high level topics. But in contrast here, at ICANN level, we are more focused on the practical issues that will have real impact on the internet governance. That's our specific issues but they have great implications. But you know, Chinese academia's tend to ignore that and they really would like to focus on the fly high topics like that. That's my basic observation of that one.

And actually, another observation for NCUC. I am not member of NCUC, but I try just to know about that because I was involved in (unintelligible). I sometimes, I would teach (coding), understanding that the connections between NCUC and, at large, AOAC, what do, you know, do you – distinct yourself to one another. And if there's any possibility that NCUC and at large could merge or sometime, any some thoughts. I don't know. But this is just, some question I really curious about that. Thank you.

Milton Mueller: Well actually, I'm really glad you brought the last issue up about NCUC and at large because it's – it's a really complicated issue in terms of the way ICANN brings in people. Not only is there confusion about NCUC and at large, but within the non-commercial stakeholder group, the ICANN management arbitrarily created two constituencies when most of us wanted to just have an integrated stakeholder group. So now we have to explain the difference between NCUC and NCSG and between NCUC and NPOC, which is the other constituency.

So here's the story in a short. So the at large as we now know it is a residue of what was originally individual membership within ICANN. So ICANN had, when it was first formed, we were very concerned about accountability. We knew it would be a problem. And the solution at the time was, half of the board will be elected by individual members. And that was called the At Large Membership of ICANN. As opposed to the supporting organization membership. The supporting organizations means the domain names, the addresses and the protocols. And so, you know, I hope nobody from ICANN is going to get mad at me but I always like to say is that they had the election and the wrong people won so they abolished the elections and they created what we now know as the At Large Structure.

And the At Large Structure was conceived in a way that did overlap with non-commercial organizations. The difference is that NCUC is lodged within the GNSO only. SO the NCUC technically has nothing to do with CCNSO, nothing to do with ASO, addresses, it's focus exclusively on domain name policy. And the At Large is supposed to be these structures that feed the elect members of the At Large advisory committee and the (ALAC) offers advice to the board about anything it feels like offering advice about.

And then of course, since 95% of what ICANN does is domain names, At Large ends up doing a lot about domain name policy but fundamentally they are supposed to be quite a different thing. They're an advisory committee, not an supporting organization, they are not directly making domain name policy,

they are simply offering advice to the board. But the real domain name policy is supposed to be made within the GNSO.

Now can we ever merge with At Large. Well, the problem with – we have created overtures coming from both sides and sometimes being rejected by both sides to essentially say, we're civil society and one arm of civil society influences ICANN through the At Large, others influence it through the NCUC. You can be a member of both, nothing stopping anybody who's eligible for membership and NCUC can also be a member of the At Large probably, if the At Large – if they have membership in some At Large Structure.

And there's a lot of overlap. I would say maybe 10% of our members are in both. We encourage that kind of overlap in a sense that, you know, it helps to integrate activities as civil society within ICANN. But in terms of a formal structural merger it just wouldn't work without re-organizing all of ICANN. And since I've just completely rewritten their bylaws and reorganize themselves, and the people in the next room are talking about how to reorganize the GNSO, again. It's not an issue that I'd be willing to take on.

Woman: Hi (Judy) again, I just wanted to go back to Milton's point of the very nicely laid out that there are two needs here. One is about research and the other is education and I just wanted to bring everyone's attention back to the conversation that I keep picking up in these subgroups, which is about practical issues and long term issues.

I think somewhere in our engagement and (unintelligible) with each other, we need to accommodate both these issues because, just to give you an example The PICs and what is the public interest in the long term issue. But certain specification (unintelligible) (unintelligible) do not practical implications that you are – that are (unintelligible) actually dealing within the policy processes that are underway and not time bound. And sometimes it's not feasible to do both at the same time. So for example, our (unintelligible)

(unintelligible) looking at who's still engaging and what issues over the long term and that has a huge implication. But if (unintelligible) (unintelligible) policy processes could also have their own benefits.

I think we need to keep that in the back of our minds as well, thanks. And also (unintelligible) is in the room now so, just to (unintelligible) their work and – we all went around saying what we worked in India and what issues in ICANN so you are not there then.

Milton Mueller: Speak CIS or forever hold your peace. You're hiding. Come on, we won't' bite you. Come on out. Ah there he is.

Man: I really have nothing to say, it's my first ICANN meeting so I'm observing. Thank you.

Milton Mueller: Well you might want to tell people what CIS does and how it intersects with the ICANN process with internet governance more broadly.

Man: CIS produces research and six broad categories. Accessibility for the disabled, openness, intellectual property, internet governance and telecom policy. Those are the areas that we focus. Our interest, as far as ICANN is concerned, is in several areas. The (keen) that ICANN increase its transparency procedures, particularly, (unintelligible). I will claim that we must be the only organization that has done substantial work in that area.

There are other simple research methods that we're using to understand ICANN. Which is follow the money, until we got involved, nobody knew who paid who how much and for what. So that's another area which we are interested. I don't think you can understand the question of conflict of interest without knowing who pays who how much money and for what.

Another, perhaps, interest of ours is to deconstruct ICANN propaganda. ICANN produces a lot of propaganda to ensure that those that participate in

ICANN processes don't ask any difficult questions. So we take ICANN propaganda and we (unintelligible) and produce ordinate of accounts of what is going on. As the research organization that focuses on the public interest, our key role we believe is to speak truth to power and therefore our research is not very popular. People don't like the research we produce but that is our goal. Our goal is not to make friends but through produce research that speaks truth to power. Thank you.

Milton Mueller: That's good. So we – I've read some of your research and I liked some of it. Yes, it's – I wouldn't say it's unpopular, I'd say it's controversial sometimes as is the research produced by my own and I think we beat you by about 10 years in terms of deconstructing ICANN propaganda but, it's excellent to have additional voices with different perspectives engaged in that process. The supply, or the demand maybe exceeds the supply of counter propaganda.

Okay, were there any other comments. Yes?

Man: Oh sorry. One last input is in regards to what you mentioned in the all-around research, civil society and education. I think civil society it's not necessarily exclusive of academia. It's inclusive of everyone. As much as it's within the frame work of internet governance, which really understand.

(Todd): (Unintelligible).

Man: Oh okay. So my point is that academia, their role is very important in terms of the internet governance process. I can give you an example because one of our members. A PHD student, is doing some practical work to completed their course. So currently, they are planning to have the first community network summit in Africa as an example that we don't necessarily – (unintelligible) our people who are clearly in schools. Even if someone has completed whatever education they can still contribute as much as I am coming for that kind of a breakdown.

I also do some practicality research to assist the course of internet governance because when talking about local content development, especially in relation to (unintelligible) (unintelligible) of the internet, I think academia plays a very important role. Especially when you're looking at your libraries, your universities, your school, (unintelligible) that making those entries online so that people are able to communicate in whatever language.

Because we are working towards – as a chapter, within South Africa, we are – we eventually done some research to look globally in terms of what has been done, what is it that we can do (unintelligible). So because (unintelligible) is one of those things that we've identified. But now, we've - academia, we need to clearly define that; this is how they can assist to push the cause. Because our chapter, when we started off, we did not have any facilities. So they provided us with those types of facilities.

And our members, they also go out in different countries to equally go out there and learn. So I don't think we should be that much hard on civil society. Academia is part of the process. Maybe we just need to reemphasize that. This should just take into consideration the academia. Thanks.

Milton Mueller: Well so this has been a great discussion. I think we have some practical suggestions for going forward, we have the idea of a linking a regional giganet meeting to the Asia Pacific IGF. We have the idea of countries developing internet governance principals, sort of following the model but not necessarily the principles or outcomes of the Brazilians.

We have I think a better understanding of the dual need for research capability and education. And we I think all agreed on the academics providing an independent perspective on the education that the schooling of internet governance people cannot be under the control of the institutions who are doing internet governance themselves, otherwise it could become as (Suniel) put it, a propagandistic function. So we need to – it's very important

for independent, critical minded academics to participate in education about internet governance.

With that, again, I hope if any of you are not members of NCUC that you will consider joining. And you are all also encouraged to look at the giganet site if you're a researcher and participate in that. And I forgot one other thing was that the Australian – we have a volunteer to help develop a giganet vent around the IGF that's going to be…

Man: (Unintelligible).

Milton Mueller: Yes, yes. Okay. So I did mention that but I just forgot to put Dave on the spot again so. All right.

Man: Well my announcement, tomorrow between 12:45 to around 4:45, we will have a SIE school of internet governance coordination meeting. And the point of what we are heading is a global collaboration of the school of internet governance. That is sort of a, direction we are forming. This month and the next month. And the whole – if you want to, if you have the time. Please join. Why we want to do this way and how we want to do it and yes. So tomorrow then one month later in IGF. We are having to some global collaboration. It's very interesting thing. So I hope you can join. Thank you.

<div style="text-align:center">END</div>