>> ANDY: And, of course, a role model. Okay, ladies and gentlemen. Now moving on to our keynote speech, we have two keynote speech for this morning, keynote speech number 1, the theme of which is the Next Ten Years -- Internet Governance Forum As a Bridge Between Two Worlds. Please join me in welcoming our speaker, Mr. Markus Kummer from the board of ICANN, Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Number. Applause. He specialized in internet governance and policy, and was Internet Society's Senior Vice President. He worked for the United Nations before as the Executive Coordinator of Working Group on Internet Governance. Our applause for Mr. Markus Kummer.

(Applause)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much for this warm welcome. It is not easy to speak after this moving tribute, but nevertheless, it gives me great pleasure to be here with you. (Clearing throat) In Taipei, I attended the first Asia Pacific regional IGF six years ago in Hong Kong, and it is fantastic to see how this has grown. When we started the IGF, we could not think about this spread of national and regional IGF initiatives. And by now, they have spread all over the world in every continent. It is really, truly amazing.

Let me also start with a short disclaimer. Yes, I'm listed as a board member of the ICANN board. I am a board member. There are several of us here. But we're not speaking in this quality. I'm speaking in my personal capacity as someone who has been associated with the IGF since the beginning, and who stays associated. I'm also the Secretary of the IGF Support Association. We cosponsored this event. And we are not listed because for some reason, there was some hiccup with the transfer of the funding, but the funds will arrive, I can assure the local organizers.

And at the same time, I also invite you to join the association as a member. It shows the broad support the IGF enjoys. And it is here to collect funds to support the regional national IGF and support the global IGF.

[ ding ]

>> MARKUS KUMMER: This doesn't seem to work. I try to go to the next slide. Oh, it's this one. Okay. Much better. Just a brief slide on the content of my presentation, and I will not speak about the transition. That has already been mentioned. This is, of course, a key element in internet governance, but there will be other sessions. I will focus more on the IGF, give some background context. I was asked to speak about the future of the IGF, to understand and predict the future, you have to understand the past. And I will talk about the past, the first ten years, the renewal, and end with an outlook.

I can be quick on some of these slides. We all know the history, where the internet comes from. A quick reminder that the internet first surfaced as a political issue during the world summit of the information society, and now, 13, 14 years ago. And that was, on the one hand, recognition by governments that the internet now is something important, something you have to care about. But at the same time, it showed that there are two different approaches -- there is on the one hand the very structured world of governments, and on the other hand the world of the internet and the internet community, and that was a clash between two visions of the world.

The world, I think, all participants here in this room know, the world of the internet versus the world of the classical intergovernmental operation. Now, we all know that the internet is different. It's built on very libertarian and democratic axioms. It's developed outside the world of governments. And its distributed governments model is adapted to the underlying distributed technology. It is based on voluntary operation with decision-making processes. And this naturally clashes with the international order as we know it, which is based on the model of nation states and the U.N. charter.

Now, we have seen in the past 15 years that some governments are comfortable with this new world, whereas others don't feel comfortable and would like the internet to respect national sovereignty. This goes back to the '90s where we had two approaches. One was the hands-off approach, as EETO,

the other one was more classical, U.N.-like, and that led us to the Information Society. That was totally in line with how the global community deals with global issues -- you have a summit, you try to find targets and come to solutions.

And WSIS was held in two phases, the first in 2003 in Geneva. There, they found it difficult, governments, to come to grips with the internet and the internet governance. And a solution to that was they created the Working Group on Internet Governance. I'm pleased to welcome two members of this working group, from Singapore and Japan. They were members of the group, and they're also here. And also the Geneva Declaration created the Motion of Multistakeholder Governance.

The next phase, WSIS in Tunis, was influenced by the Working Group on Internet Governance. The methodology was open, inclusive, and governments by and large endorsed the report. They recognized that existing arrangements had worked well. They also recognized that there was room for improvement, and they created a new forum for internet governance dialogue, the IGF. And they came up with a working definition of internet governance. You can read it. It's quite a complex definition. It's quite the mouthful.

But what does it really mean? It clearly means it's more than just naming and addressing. And it relates to public policy issues related to the physical and logical infrastructure of the internet, and related to the use and abuse of the internet. And importantly, it is based on multistakeholder cooperation. the Working Group on Internet Governance came up with a rationale for the new forum, basically identifying that there was something missing. There was a need to create something where all stakeholders could discuss these issues. (Clearing throat)

And the IGF, in many ways, served as a bridge between these two worlds I have referred to, the world of government and the world of the internet community. It is a new kind of dialogue that had not taken place beforehand. And in that sense, the IGF is not a traditional U.N. process where governments discuss and negotiate resolution, but it serves -- it's here

to bring people together, people who would not normally meet under one roof. And it is not here to take decision. And this is by some perceived as a strength, whereas some others see that as a weakness.

But over the years, the IGF has succeeded in creating trust among those who participate in the discussions, and it has also created a sense of community. In that sense, the IGF is, indeed, a bridge, and also a synthesis between traditional governance processes of the U.N. and multistakeholder processes. It is a bridge between top-down and bottom-up approaches. It has, on the one hand, the legitimacy of a U.N. process. It is a platform that is convened by the Secretary General of the U.N., conferred to many governments who would feel reluctant to attend a meeting of the internet community.

But at the same time, it has the credibility of a multistakeholder process. All stakeholders will have a stake in the internet, be that a financial, business stake, or a technological stake, are there. And they can participate in the discussion. We have experts on all these issues, be they technical, societal, political, economic. And that gives credibility to the discussions. As I said, the IGF is not a traditional U.N. process, and as such, it is not funded through the U.N. regular budget. This makes it difficult on one hand, because the secretariat of the IGF has to go around and ask for money.

But on the other hand, it is also as positive. It's important to know that the annual meeting, not unlike the Asia Pacific regional IGF, is funded by hosts. And, again, the IGF Support Association has been set up to provide also the possibility to collect small contributions, if thousands of people give each 20 or a hundred dollars, it also adds up. That was one of the reasons why we set up this association. And thanks also for giving a contribution to the IGF. Now, the IGF mandate is set out in the Tunis agenda, and it's clearly a mandate -- the key paragraph is to discuss public policy issues related to key elements of internet governance.

That shows it's a platform for dialogue, not a decision-making organization. What is it all about? It

provides space for structured policy dialogue on internet-related public policy issues. It provides a platform for sharing best practices, and it provides a neutral meeting place for all relevant institutions, be they intergovernmental organizations, or the internet institution such as ICANN, such as the RAS. And by providing that space, it helps build trust and confidence in internet uses. The methodology is based on information and sharing these practices, think globally, act locally, the recognition that no one size fits all solution, and that solutions need to be adapted to the needs of each country.

And the debate so far has shown it is a multi-dimensional debate. There are several dimensions. There's an issue of quality, the government approach whereas the multistakeholder -- there is the political debate, the role of one dominant superpower, in essence the role of the United States. And this is hopefully now to go away with the transition. There's the governmental aspect, the digital divide. Not everybody has access to the internet. There are economic aspects. Many countries see a perceived loss of revenues.

Also, they see the dominance of big multinational players. We will hear from one of them just after me. And there are technological issues. We have seen, for instance, conferences that some governments would like to apply the technology they know from the circuit-switching to the internet, to the packet-switching. And last but not least, there's also a cultural dimension, dominance of one language and culture, there's linguistic diversity. And kudos to the Asia Pacific region for having worked hard to make it multilingual.

Now, the Internet Governance Forum can be seen as an experiment. It is based on the convening power of the U.N. It is a soft governance approach. The IGF has no decision-making power. It has no power over distribution, like a national parliament that can take the money from the rich and give it to the poor. The IGF has no such power. But it has the power of recognition. You can identify issues of concern and give attention to an issue. It can put an issue

on the agenda of international corporation. And thus it can shape public opinion and policy-making.

Now, there are different views on strengths and weaknesses. There has always been a complaint that the IGF is nothing but talking shop, because of the lack of decision-making power. They would like to see tangible outputs. Whereas others see precisely that as a strength, because there's no pressure to make decisions. That provides a space where people can have an open discussion without being afraid that what they say today may be held against them tomorrow. And there are also different interpretations of the IGF mandate.

There's a paragraph where it says that the IGF can make recommendations. But there's a caveat there. It says "where appropriate." This is language that was negotiated by diplomats. And naming of "where appropriate" in diplomatic speech is never or only over my dead body. Somebody can always say it's not appropriate. Other stakeholders were not used to the nuances of diplomacy, so as a clear recommendation for the IGF to come up with tangible outputs.

And this played out in the first renewal of the IGF. And they took this criticism. And a mandate was extended for five years -- move the IGF as part of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development. And they worked it many times in Geneva, came up with a report which was actually very good. Many good suggestions. Suggestions to move it out. The weakness of the report -- how this could be implemented -- many recommendations -- neutral -- but this is not unusual in the U.N.

They have a good idea. It's known diplomatic --
(audio breaking up)
>> MARKUS KUMMER: Now, nevertheless, there has been an evolution since 2010. The IGF clearly has evolved. There is now an IGF community of disciplines that are comfortable to address delicate issues, for instance, surveillance was addressed in 2013 at a meeting, and it was the first meeting in the United States of America, actually, where they openly talked about this issue internationally. And also, the IGF

has developed intersessional communities, other best practice forums in 2014. There are thematic things such as connecting, the dynamic coalitions that have been with IGF since the beginning, now also work together to show -- and, of course, all the national and regional IGFs. They are a very important part of the picture.

So, preliminary conclusion, the first ten years confirmed the value. And it is a win-win situation for all stakeholders. They can learn, shape, and develop. Now we have a new mandate. That new mandate is for ten years, from 2015 until 2025. This obviously is of great importance as it gives more space to the IGF. It allows it also to develop multiyear work programs. It is easier to approach donors to secure funding. As we now have a well-established ten-year lifespan ahead of us. It was a retreat called by the United Nations just weeks ago in Glen Cove in New York.

There was a nomination process. Stakeholders could nominate representatives. A few people were also invited -- part of the group. And the report is now available on the IGF website. Stakeholders are invited to comment. There will be an official public consultation. It confirmed very much the general idea of what was in this year's working group. And there is clearly appetite to move towards more intersessional activities in the multiyear work program, and also there is a need to closer link the IGF to other relevant organizations.

And since the setting up of the IGF, now we also have the Sustainable Development Goals, and the community feels the IGF should closely align to that. The retreat also made the distinction, and we all understand, what the tangible outputs are. There have always been some, such as the summary. Now we have reports of outcomes. We should not overlook the intangible. That is, education. You can inform yourself. People went to sessions. Exchange points -- set up -- change point -- networking. All these intangible outputs are equal.

Now, the role of the IGF, again, it has no decision-making power, it can shape the decisions of those who have the power to change the internet. Now, IGF -- beyond 2025, will there

be a need for the IGF? Will all the issues the IGF is dealing with be solved by then, or will there be a need for a new internet organization, with decision-making powers? Maybe not. I don't think there will be any agreement to set up a new organization with strong powers, as there are existing organizations for all of these issues.

But there is a need for having an interaction. The IGF has provided that. And one thing we know for sure, the internet will not be the same anymore, as the internet is not the same now as it was ten years ago. So, my humble prediction is that there will be a continued need for stakeholder dialogue, be that in the IGF, or on a different platform. And ultimately, these discussions about the future of the IGF are part of the debate, what kind of internet we want. We want an internet that is open, global, interoperable, based on innovation without permission.

These are some of the basic tenets. That means also -- this video message. We accept the risks that come with an open internet, or do we want an internet that is above all secure? And -- question --

(Applause)

>> ANDY: Thank you very much. Thank you, sir. Mr. Markus Kummer. Thank you for sharing. Please be seated. And that is The Future of Internet, from our keynote one. And moving on, keynote two.