

IGF 2016:

Session Title	Reality of the Answerability of Multistakeholder Model
Date	12/07/16
Time	12:00 p.m. – 13:30 p.m.
Session Organizer	Rafik Dammak on behalf of the Noncommercial Users Constituency (NCUC) of ICANN
Chair/Moderator	Rafik Dammak, NCUC
Rapporteur/Notetaker	Rachel Pollack Ichou, Individual Member, NCUC
List of Speakers and their institutional affiliations	Jeanette Hofmann, WZB Andres Piazza, LACTLD Tatiana Tropina, Max-Planck Institute Burcu Kilic, Public Citizen Michele Woods, WIPO Matthew Shears, Center for Democracy & Technology. Jay Sudowski, Internet Infrastructure Coalition
Key Issues raised (1 sentence per issue):	Definition of community in multistakeholder model Cybersecurity and the limit of multistakeholder model. Why multistakeholder model was successful in ICANN Question of representativeness in multistakeholder model
If there were presentations during the session, please provide a 1-paragraph summary for each Presentation	The workshop didn't include presentations but only short interventions from speakers
Please describe the Discussions that took place during the workshop session: (3 paragraphs)	The workshop aimed to discuss the answerability of multistakeholder model in different spaces such ICANN, WIPO, but also in cybersecurity and trade. The speakers were asked to answer 4 questions. Talking about multistakeholder community imply who is part of

	<p>the community and who is not, that is why we have to be careful with the terms and language used to describe the model.</p> <p>Answerability is one of the challenges we struggle with in the Internet governance system. For example International organizations are answerable to governments and so governments to citizens. However we didn't find yet a way for assessing and determining how to be answerable to all stakeholders. There are also different experiences: Marrakech treaty with WIPO brought civil society participation to the process which is usually multilateral. For cybersecurity, there are some closed spaces which co-exists with multistakeholder model. ICANN was a success because its operational nature compared to others. For trade, civil society succeeded to influence the outcome even it couldn't join the negotiations.</p> <p>The issue of representation was raised. On the notion of representativeness, it was highlighted there is misunderstanding concerning the representative nature of civil society. Being a representative imply having the responsibility of making decisions on behalf of someone. However, civil society does not make decisions on behalf of anyone and there was disagreement since some civil society groups may speak on behalf if their constituents.</p>
<p>Please describe any Participant suggestions regarding the way forward/ potential next steps /key takeaways: (3 paragraphs)</p>	<p>It was suggested to find out the conditions for multistakeholder cooperation to succeed, learning from the experience in ICANN for example with the IANA stewardship transition process such as the notion of chartering and a having a set of principles and parameters up front. We can also identify certain moments when it worked in NETmundial and WSIS.</p> <p>It is nice to think we can have a template but we need also to be quite cautious. It is a mistake to talk about “multistakeholder model” since there are several variations and permutations.</p> <p>It was also highlighted that achievements and success in multistakeholder model were possible because of cooperating together, whether the process was liked or not by the different stakeholders.</p>

