

## IGF 2014 TURKEY MEETING OF THE DYNAMIC COALITION ON CORE INTERNET VALUES

<http://youtu.be/LHkXhjF6Zqs>

<http://coreinternetvalues.org>

The Session took place on September 5, 2014, 11 am at Room 10, IGF Istanbul, Turkey. The panel was chaired by OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND, Chair of ICANN At-Large and included Adam Peake, from GLOCOM, David Cake, from Electronic Frontiers in Australia, Dr. Steve Crocker, the Chairman of the board of ICANN, Larry Strickling, the Assistant Secretary for Communication and Information as the U.S. Department of Commerce, Dr. Vint Cerf, Chief Internet evangelist, Google participating in his role with ARIN, Baroness Rennie Fritchie from Nominet, Sivasubramanian M. Is from the ISOC chapter in Chennai, India, Desiree Miloshevic, Senior Advisor, Public Policy and International Affairs, ISOC and Afiliias, Amy stepanovich from AccessNow and Paul Wilson, Director General of APNIC. Sebastien Bachollet, Member of the Board of Directors, ICANN and Joly MacFie, Vice President of Internet Society New York, both moderated Remote participation.

### FORMAT

The format of the session was a five-minute statement from each one of our panelists, to describe, what their organisations are doing to support the cause for preserving Internet values and preserving all those core Internet values that help the Internet bring all that innovation throughout the recent years.

### SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS RAISED BY PANELISTS AND PARTICIPANTS

#### Core Internet Values:

Internet was designed with an open architecture, with a technical layer that made it possible for applications to be built on top, without the need for permissions, which brought to the Internet several applications such as Skype, ebay, and Twitter and everything good and bad. Documents created were open and freely distributed; the processes creating Protocols are open.

With TCP/IP, any computer can send a packet to any other computer. The network does not look inside the packets, which is the cleanness of that design, and the independence of layers which allows the Internet to grow and to be useful. Internet is a Universal, Neutral platform that

does not discriminate against particular hardware, software, underlying network, language, culture, disability or against any particular type of data. The Internet is a “Dumb” Network, with a lean architecture.

The end-to-end connectivity is super-important and requires unique addressing. The IP addressing community provides addresses to the IP address and preserves the global end to end nature of the Internet at considerable cost as the Internet grows, and it's at cost to the ISPs, to preserve the routability of the Internet as it exists, as it grows. It is not possible to maintain the end-to-end and unfragmented model of the Internet unless every point on the Internet, every device can be addressed individually, this makes IPv6 essential. The network is what it is today because it has a commercial engine underneath it. This economic engine must keep going going without harming all of the properties of the Internet.

It is important to maintain low barriers to entry to the Internet. Barriers could be economic, they could be technical. They could be policy barriers, and all these barriers to be kept as low as possible. The founding fathers decided not to place any barriers on the worldwide adoption of Internet as a Communication technology.

We are not free from harm in this Internet space, and we have to take steps, technical steps, and political steps, and other kinds of practical steps, to preserve people's safety in this environment. And this involves all the stakeholders. All of them have some shared responsibility for protecting the users of the Internet from harm. There are views that Internet should be a Secure Network, but this needs to happen without altering the core values. A project such as Encrypt all things could protect user data. “Encrypt everything” is a fantastic principle but not at Internet layer. A single monolithic encryption system underlying the Internet would have implications on technology and policy and access and authority.

## Core Values in Internet Governance

Our task today is really to maintain that openness and to see how we can translate those core values into the Public Policy making.

While it is important for Internet Policy to embrace Core Internet Values, we also need to look at how we develop policy.

Two enabling values are important- respect and responsibility. Stakeholders will have to work with respect for each other and take responsibility. Internet is no longer a technology. We need to develop ethics and norms for the Internet. Trust existed and that has been built, initially, as by John Postell. There is trust in the technical community and their competence to run the network, there is also personal and interpersonal trust that existed in the early academic community and

to build and maintain the networks. Institutional trust is our next step, where we need to think how we can really best deliver that. Within the Internet Society, the of trusteeship stems out of the word trust. It's just a new notion that needs to be a little bit looked in and dived in -- looked in more deeply.

The issues related to risk to children or state secrets ought to be addressed in the local space of law and social practice; a huge social effort is needed in impeding abuse as this happens in real world, not on the Internet. Harms that occur in the Internet originate in one jurisdiction and sometimes terminate in another. The victims and perpetrators are in different jurisdictions.

We need to retain the neutrality and the ability to innovate, the ability for speech, permissionless innovation. There are critical Internet resources to managed and we have governance issues to be resolved.

In the 90s, the Internet was expanding greatly Internationally and International citizens wanted to have a say in how the Internet was going to run. And that was a value that was important to the United States Government at that time. ICANN was expected to seriously attract International engagement in the governance of the Domain Name System issue.

Governments need to understand the deep differences between a national Telco regime and the Internet, which is a very, very different model. At the International Telecommunication Union there are proposals from other Governments to increase multilateral control over the Internet. The Governments that tend to support governmental control and Regulation of the Internet also tend to be the Governments that are most likely to censor content in their own countries and otherwise act in repressive manners. Of the countries that the WCIT in 2012 who supported more governmental Regulation, 65 percent of them regularly engage in censoring content.

The NETmundial principles are fundamental to the utility of the network and one of them is to preserve the ability of its participants to speak. We have to come up with ways to build on the NETmundial. United States Government, from the start, has promoted and sought the expansion of support for the multistakeholder process. The 1998 white paper from the Department of Commerce, the U.S. made the assertion, that there was no role for Governments to participate in the management of the Domain Name System.

Civil rights are not Core Internet values but Global Values. But there is interaction between the [Internet Values and Global Values].

The accountability framework needs to be larger and stronger than the accountability frameworks now. We could explore a model of expanded accountability, whereby the Internet Governance institutions could be strengthened for a propensity to make balanced decisions, just as whole organizations are strengthened

## CONCLUSIONS and FOLLOW UP

We need to continue to work country by country and stakeholders need to work with their respective Governments to impress upon them the importance of supporting the multistakeholder model.

We have to come up with ways to build on the NETmundial, work on the transition of the IANA functions to continue to build support and win this argument, once and for all in terms of who should be controlling the Internet.

On the Internet, Self Regulation or multi-stakeholder engagement, imply that all stakeholders have to take responsibility.

Our task today is really to maintain that openness and to see how we can translate those core values into the Public Policy making.

A model of expanded accountability could be explored for institutions in Internet Governance, to strengthen the framework of Internet Governance so as to cause smaller questions to be dropped and overall the trust is built up..

Institutional trust is our next step, where we need to think how we can really best deliver that. this trusteeship theme that stems out of the word trust. It's just a new notion that needs to be a little bit looked in and dived in -- looked in more deeply.

We need to look at core Internet principles of how we develop policy.

To examine any conflict between components with a view to sustain core values, for e.g., the contrast between privacy and transparency.

Report prepared by Sivasubramanian M

[6.Internet@gmail.com](mailto:6.Internet@gmail.com)

Link to Video Recording: <http://youtu.be/LHkXhjF6Zqs>

Link to Session Transcript:

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/174-igf-2014/transcripts/2030-2014-09-04-dynamic-coalition-on-internet-and-climate-change-room-6>

Link to Coalition Blog: <http://coreinternetvalues.org>