Department of Electronics and Information Technology (DeitY)

Round Table Discussion on WSIS+10 Review

Friday, 18 September 2015, at 3.00 pm.

(The discussion began at 3.05 pm)

>>Rahul Gosain: Good afternoon, everybody. I thank you,
esteemed members of civil society, business, academia,
and technical community, my colleagues from the
government and participants who would be joining us
remotely.

I, on behalf of DeitY, extend a very warm welcome to
this edition of the multi-stakeholder round table. We
at DeitY immensely appreciate your participation at this
round table at such a short notice.

As you would probably be aware, this is the fourth
round table in a series of round tables which we have
organised recently. We plan to organise many more such
events in the coming months.

We would also like to thank all the stakeholders
from India for their active participation in the various
global processes related to internet governance.

It gives me immense pleasure to inform you that
about 10 submissions out of 159 submissions on the IANA
transition proposal were from Indian stakeholders.
I hope we can all agree that this is a very positive

sign and we should all aim for greater participation
from India across all the stakeholder communities.

Today's topic of discussion, WSIS+10 review, is
perhaps the most important issue related to internet
governance. I'm sure that I do not have to further
labour on the importance of this review process.

One of the key outcomes of the Tunis Agenda is the
Internet Governance Forum. The Internet Governance
Forum, IGF, is now in its 10th year and there is no
doubt that it has been a grand success. There is also
no doubt that the mandate of the IGF should be renewed.

The IGF is envisaged as a space that gives
developing countries the same opportunity as developed
nations to engage in the debate on internet governance
and to facilitate their participation in existing
institutions and arrangements.

Ultimately, the involvement of all stakeholders from
developed as well as developing countries, is necessary
for future development of the internet.

Additionally, there is a need to further deepen and
strengthen multi-stakeholder participation in various
institutions related to internet governance. In working
towards such multi-stakeholder participation, it is
crucial to ensure that the objective is substantive
inclusion and not merely formal inclusion, keeping in

3

mind barriers which may hinder participation in

processes that are normally open to all.

Finally, I would like to touch upon the ambitious programme that we have embarked upon under the able leadership of our Prime Minister, Digital India. The Digital India programme directly speaks to the issue of digital divide, which is perhaps the most important issue in the ongoing WSIS+10 review.

The Government of India, as you would all no doubt be aware, has launched an ambitious programme to bridge the digital divide. Digital India is the flagship programme of the Government of India which is to be implemented in the mission node. The mission of Digital India is centred around three key areas: infrastructure/utility to every citizen, governance and services on demand, and digital empowerment of citizens.

The Digital India programme has launched multiple platforms and applications which allow citizens from urban areas as well as the hinterlands to access e-governance services and participate in the largest democracy in the world.

The nine pillars of Digital India programme truly capture the aspirations of the next billion to be connected to the internet. There is no doubt that the Digital India programme and its nine pillars is the key

4

to a people-centred, inclusive and development-oriented information society as has been envisaged by the Tunis

Agenda.

Now we will have a presentation next which will be given by Mr Vinay Kesari, who is a consultant with NIXI, so that he can bring everyone present in this forum up to speed on the WSIS+10 review process.

Now I would call upon Shri Vinay Kesari to deliver his presentation.

>>T Santhosh: Before Vinay starts the presentation, I would request a bouquet be given to Mr Rahul Gosain, who is the Director in Internet Governance.

APPLAUSE

Thank you.

>>T Santhosh: Now I request a bouquet be given to Dr Govind, CEO NIXI.

APPLAUSE

>>Vinay Kesari: Thank you. I'm just going to give a very brief presentation outlining what WSIS is and what the WSIS+10 review process is. I'm aware that most of you present in this room are probably intimately aware of the processes and so on, but this is just to make sure that factually, everyone is more or less on the same page.

Now to begin with, what is WSIS? What is the World

Summit on the Information Society? The WSIS process was basically convened by the UN, beginning in 2003, and the objective was to come out with a roadmap, and I quote:

"To put the potential of knowledge and ICTs at the service of development."

The first phase of WSIS, it was a two-phase process, was in 2003. The meetings largely took place in Geneva and the first phase focused mostly on development-related issues. The second phase, which took place in 2005, in Tunis, pivoted to an extent to focus more on the issue of internet governance.

The Tunis Agenda, which was the outcome of the second phase, set out a definition of internet governance, it outlined the roles of different stakeholders, it mandated the establishment of the IGF and initiated the process towards what is known as enhanced cooperation.

Now in the 10 years since the adoption of the Tunis agenda, various UN agencies have been involved in implementation of various aspects of the outcomes and monitoring of implementation of the outcomes, with overall oversight being given to the Commission on Science and Technology for Development, CSTD, which is part of ECOSOC, which is one of organs of the UN.

Now what is the WSIS+10 review? Paragraph 111 of

the Tunis Agenda called for the UN General Assembly to conduct an overall review of the WSIS outcomes in 2015, 10 years after the Tunis Agenda was finalised.

In order to implement this, the General Assembly

adopted a resolution in July 2014, which outlined the
modalities for this review. I'll just outline a few of
the important parts of this resolution.

It says that the overall WSIS review would be
conducted as a two-day high-level meeting of the UN
General Assembly and the purpose of this would be to
take stock of progress made in the implementation of
WSIS outcomes, addressing challenges including bridging
the digital divide and harnessing ICTs for development.

The high-level meeting is to be preceded by an
inter-governmental preparatory process which is supposed
to also take into account inputs from all relevant WSIS
stakeholders. The process will result in an
inter-governmentally agreed outcome document for
adoption by the UN General Assembly.

The WSIS+10 review process has obviously already
commenced and we're perhaps about halfway through it.
So firstly, let's look at what is already behind us,
what's already taken place.

1 June, you have the appointment of the two
co-facilitators who would basically run the entire

7

process. They are the permanent representatives to the
UN of Latvia and the UAE. They were appointed by the
president of the UN General Assembly to lead the
inter-governmental negotiation process. As mentioned on
the previous slide, the WSIS+10 review is per the terms

of the relevant resolution, largely an
inter-governmental process with inputs from other
stakeholders.

Later on in June, the co-facilitators who were
appointed had a stocktaking session, where they focused
on some of the details of the negotiation process, which
will actually lead up to the December high-level
meeting. On 1 July, you had the first preparatory
meeting of the member states, which was an
inter-governmental meeting. This was followed by an
informal interactive stakeholder consultation on the
next day, where non-governmental stakeholders were also
consulted.

31 July was the deadline for written submissions to
form the basis of the non-paper. I'll just quickly
explain what the non-paper is. The non-paper is
essentially the very first stage in coming out with an
eventual outcome document which will be adopted by the
UN General Assembly in December, during the final
two-day meeting.

8

The term "non-paper" is a United Nations term of art
to an extent and refers to the fact that nominally, the
non-paper is supposed to not be an official document, it
is used to test the waters before coming out with what
is called a zero draft, which is taken to be the first
official draft of the final outcome document.

Prior to coming out with this non-paper, the WSIS+10 review process asked all stakeholders, governmental and non-governmental, to send in written submissions on what they believed the non-paper should cover.

Over 60 submissions were received in total from around the world, five of which were from India. The Government of India also sent in its written submission on this. Pursuant to these written submissions being sent in, we have the release of the non-paper. You'll notice that the date there is a little nebulous, because it was first circulated to the permanent representatives of the various UN missions. So basically it was first circulated amongst governmental stakeholders and it was later released to the general public.

The original target for the release of the non-paper was actually the end of August. It seems to have been slightly delayed, as a result of which we do have a very tight timeline with respect to sending in comments on the non-paper itself.

9

As you'll see on this slide, which talks about what is ahead of us in this process, September 18 is the deadline for comments on the non-paper, which is today, and which essentially means that most people have had just about a week to digest the contents of the non-paper and also come out with their comments.

It's expected that in the last week of September, we

will have the zero draft out. The deadline for comments
on the zero draft is 15 October. This will be followed
by an informal interactive WSIS stakeholder
consultation, which is expected to involve governmental
and non-governmental stakeholders as well, on
19 October.

October 20 to 22 is the second preparatory meeting
where the zero draft will be further discussed by
governmental stakeholders. In the last week
of November, we should expect the second draft of the
outcome document to be out. This will be followed
presumably by further negotiations and finally, on
December 15 and 16 is the high-level meeting of the
General Assembly, where it is expected that an outcome
document will be adopted.

I will just very briefly outline what the inputs of
the Government of India were in its written submission
prior to the non-paper. It talked about the fact that

10

the review should reaffirm commitment to move from
principles to action. Some of the priorities it
highlighted included financial mechanisms, affordability
of devices, as well as connectivity, multilingualism,
strengthening of the IGF and renewal of its mandate,
deepening of multi-stakeholderism and cyber security.

It also talked about something that Mr Gosain also
mentioned in his initial comments, it talked about the

fact that IG processes should be inclusive and the objective should not only be formal inclusion, but substantive inclusion, keeping in mind barriers to participation.

Finally, it talked about the fact that the high-level meetings should be consensus driven and should take into account responses from all stakeholders.

The non-paper is out and that is the subject of our discussion today, so I will quickly outline what the non-paper says and here I will be sticking to the divisions that are contained in the non-paper itself. It first addresses the digital divide, it talks about the fact that a number of innovations have taken place in the last decade since the Tunis Agenda was finalised but critical digital divides remain both between and within countries. It specifically highlights the gender

11

divide, the gender digital divide.

It talks about the fact that access to ICTs and the internet is still key, with a particular focus on vulnerable countries and it talks about trying to achieve universal internet access by the year 2030.

It also talks about ICT for development, where it talks about the importance of accelerating progress towards economic, social and environmental goals, specifically keeping in mind the sustainable development

goals, which again are expected to be finalised and

adopted by the UN General Assembly in the coming months.

     It talks about human rights and importantly, states

that rights that people have offline should also be

protected online. In the context of internet

governance, it reaffirms some of the principles in the

Geneva declaration, which was the outcome of the first

phase of the WSIS process and it reiterates the working

definition of internet governance.

     It calls for further internationalisation of

internet governance, including greater participation of

developing countries and the full implementation of

enhanced cooperation. It also calls for the renewal of

the IGF mandate. It does not specify the number of

years, which has been left open, but it does talk about

the renewal of the mandate.

12

     Under the heading -- if I may editorialise slightly,

under the slightly strange heading, cyber space, which

is a little unclear, it talks about the fact that cyber

security is an increasing challenge to all stakeholders;

it reaffirms the Geneva declaration, which states that

a global culture of cyber security needs to be promoted

and implemented in cooperation with all stakeholders and

international expert bodies.

     It finally talks about follow-up and review. It

talks about the importance of public/private

partnerships in order to actually implement some of the

goals talked about. It talks about the fact that

universal access strategies are important. It expresses

concern at the lack of progress on the Digital

Solidarity Fund, which is again something that was

highlighted to an extent in the Government of India

written submission.

It talks about the fact that priorities should be

given to implementation of IPv6 deployment of IXPs and

resilience of international ICT networks and resources.

Importantly, it also calls for overall coordination

being required with the sustainable development goals

and the Addis Ababa action agenda, and calls for

a review, again in a set number of years which in the

non-paper has not been specified.

13

Before we get to the themes for today's discussion,

to follow on from the previous consultation that was

held, which addressed the IANA transition and the ICANN

accountability reforms that are happening in parallel,

the elephant in the room to an extent is the fact that

the IANA transition process is also taking place at the

same time. It will not be concluded by the time the

final outcome document is adopted by the UN

General Assembly and at this point, issues related to

the IANA transition and so on have not been referred to

by name. However, it is likely that some of those

specific processes relating to internet governance are
likely to feature at least in the discussions that will
take place over the coming months, particularly in the
context of the internet governance portion of the
outcome document.

The themes for today's discussion are largely guided
by what has been mentioned in the call for comments put
out by the UN in the context of the non-paper, which are
firstly, does the structure of the non-paper make sense
and are the elements covered suitable? Secondly,
presuming that the elements are suitable, how should
they be treated in the zero draft which will come out
next? And are there any specific text proposals that
stakeholders wish to put forward?

14

Those are largely the guiding themes for the
discussion today.
>>Rahul Gosain: Thank you, Vinay, for a very informative
presentation.

Before we throw open the forum for comments, I would
like to sum up that in a sense, what we are debating
here or the views which we are eliciting from the
various multi-stakeholders should be provided in the
direction of what should be the structure of the zero
draft, what should the zero draft possibly look like,
what should be its content and what kind of a shape
should it take?

I think I leave the forum now to --

>>T Santhosh: Before going for further discussion, we have
   a video from APNIC. Could that be played right now.
   Then we will go for discussion.

   (Video presentation from Pablo Hinojosa of APNIC played)

>>Rahul Gosain: We should proceed to the discussion.

>>Vinay Kesari: Everyone, before making a comment, whether
   it is long or short, please just state your name for the
   record.

>>Rahul Gosain: Each time anyone speaks, so if anyone wants
   to say a comment, they need to introduce themselves,
   just before they speak out their comment. Thank you.

>>Anja Kovacs: Anja Kovacs from The Internet Democracy

15

   Project in Delhi. We actually co-organised the meeting
   that Pablo from APNIC was talking about and I know what
   he was going to say in the video, so I just thought I'll
   explain. It was an event that took place in Pattaya to
   get non-government stakeholders in Asia Pacific
   specifically more involved in this process. There were
   40 of us in the meeting and about 12 people on remote
   participation. The outcome of the meeting was something
   called the Pattaya Key Messages, we had wanted to
   comment on the non-paper, but because it wasn't
   available yet at the time, because the paper got
   delayed, as Vinay was explaining, we just had
   discussions on several broad areas, which happened to

overlap quite closely with the non-paper, though I think
that was much more meat on our discussions than there is
on the non-paper.

The outcome that Pattaya Key Messages -- if you're
interested there is a web site called wsis10.asia, you
can find more information both about the meeting and the
messages there.

Going forward, we hope to build on this group to
have more people involved, partly also because you
actually need to fulfil a certain set of criteria to be
allowed to make a submission into this process and by
making a joint submission, we allow people who do not

fulfil those criteria to support it as well, so that you
can make your voice heard in this process, even if you
haven't gone to any of these meetings beforehand.

So I just wanted to clarify that after Pablo.

>>Naresh Ajwani: At the outset, let me congratulate DEITy
for ensuring this kind of round table conferences before
their submission of paper. It is a great initiative and
I must appreciate since Mr Rahul Gosain has joined it is
becoming a regular phenomena.

On Pablo video and clarification, I must add our
concern of what happened in Pattaya. There is a serious
tendency among this group to always put their
expressions from the perspective of adding Asia Pacific
to their name. When they try to organise any

conference, whether it is on internet or it is on
internet governance or addresses, they really don't, you
know, even check with other stakeholders, whether we
should really make it as Asia Pacific or not and I think
we should really object to these kind of submissions and
these kind of conferences, because that may somewhere
give the impression that we as a stakeholder from India
are part of these kind of submissions.

So my only concern on Pattaya side is just giving it
a name that we are also party to, their kind of
submissions.

17

In regards to the submission on zero paper, in my
viewpoint, we have concerns which we had expressed, it's
on account of and primarily on account of legal aspect.
It's whether jurisdiction is going to remain US or not,
one; two, whichever organisation gets into engagement on
account of internet governance, would it remain with the
existing infrastructure or would it be expanded?

These are two main concerns which we need to keep
reiterating and I hope the paper which will be submitted
today or by late evening, will have that concern. Thank
you.

>>Prabir Purkayastha: Knowledge Commons.

I would share with Naresh as was said, the issue
about what was really enhanced cooperation agenda,
enhanced cooperation of the Tunis Agenda, this was

raised by Brazil, India, other countries, essentially to

question the monopoly of the root zone exercised by the

United States. That was what enhanced cooperation was

all about and it was thought that in 10 years, we would

be able to reach some point by which there would be

a more democratic governance of the root zone, which

unfortunately has not happened. So that remains very

much on the agenda and it is unfortunate that the

WSIS+10 review does not recognise explicitly that there

is a failure of the enhanced cooperation agenda, which

18

has essentially been stalled by the United Nations.

I think that needs to be registered by Government of

India, that was one of the primary items that India had

raised in both 2003 and 2005.

The second part I would like to point out is that

when the whole issue of ICT was being raised, the

understanding was ICT would automatically lead to

development and to greater inclusion. 10 years have

shown that the growth of internet has shown actually

rise of inequality, so access to internet is no longer

the primary issue. It's also the monopoly power that is

exercised by a few companies and the completely unequal

nature of the relation of people to the internet and

companies which is becoming a very important issue,

particularly as with the growth of mobile, it's quite

likely that we will have connectivity the next five, ten

years, of all -- at least most of the people to the internet, but it is not going to address the issue which has come up subsequent to WSIS, that we are really seeing much greater distribution of economic inequality through the internet as well and this is of course a lot of implications regarding tax, et cetera, as internet-based trading, commercial enterprises rise, it also brings out lots of economic issues which need to be addressed.

19

This, of course, also includes interconnection issues, which ITU has tried to address, which has not been addressed. The interconnection charges are completely inequitable and those are something that we also need to address.

The last point I would raise is why in the WSIS document the non-paper talks about cyber crime and cyber security? It misses out to address, which I think is the most important issue, that internet as a cyber space, if it needs to be defined as cyber space, should be free of weapons of war. That means it should be like outer space, a non-weaponised space and that is far beyond cyber security privacy, et cetera, it is promise of all countries they will not use the internet to attack each other.

Unfortunately, this is something that is growing apace. We already know, thanks to Snowden exposures,

that the Indian internet has logic bombs in it which can be activated at any point of time. The picture is out there in the Snowden exposures so given this state of affairs, I think Government of India should really press that just like as it did for outer space, we should press that cyber space should be free of weapons of war.

>>Anja Kovacs: Since there is nobody else, I'll take the floor.

20

Just to respond first to the Naresh's comment. The messages that came out of the meeting are called messages that are voices from the Asia Pacific. We had people from 15 different countries there. The meeting was initially called an Asia consultation because we only had one person from the Asia Pacific, but we got a lot of support for her points.

It's very expensive to get somebody from the Pacific to your meetings, so we were extremely pleased that thanks to the support of ISOC, that was actually possible in this meeting.

Part of the reason we decided to have the meeting was because the process, the review process though it allows for inputs from non-government stakeholders, has actually not been quite as strong as the original summits in terms of taking input. All of those meetings were extremely large meetings with very extensive government-led regional preparatory processes in which

non-government stakeholders were very closely involved.
All of that was cut this time.

At all times, though I think the people in New York
are very much trying their very best, but it has been
really difficult for us to engage closely with this
process, because information comes out very late, the
paper was released late, et cetera. The speakers for

the meeting, the informal stakeholder meeting in July,
were announced two days before. I had canceled my
ticket by the time they sent me a message to say, "Can
you please speak."

This is not adequate preparation to really allow
non-government participation in these meetings. So our
question was: if we are going to shake this up, how do
you do it? You start by organising your own meetings.
So we admit that it was not a flawless affair by no
means. There were shortcomings. We had little time and
very, very restricted budgets. There were five
organisations that put this together and we all took
this money out of our organisational budgets.

So those are the limitations. I still like to think
that having had the meeting is better than not having
had the meeting.

In terms of the content of the non-paper, if I may,
we think that the structure The Internet Democracy
Project thinks that the structure of the paper is quite

well done and quite clear, though we also think that the fact that the word cyber space rather than cyber security has been used is a bit odd. Perhaps better to call a spade a spade and just call it what we are talking about.

We do feel that the framework is very bare bones

22

though and that there needs to be much more meat on it everywhere. I agree with Prabir that the issues of the digital divide have been dealt with in a somewhat simplistic way. India has in earlier submissions made much stronger interventions on this and we hope that will continue.

There is also very strong under-recognition of the importance for human rights to actually make development through ICTs possible. There is no recognition in the preamble of international human rights instruments and human rights is discussed in all of two paragraphs, while we are very clear that the human rights challenges that have come with the internet are much bigger than that.

On internet governance we also think there needs to be far more concrete language on how to make sure that multi-stakeholder or multilateral internet governance become more participatory, inclusive, accountable, transparent, et cetera.

Where I disagree with Prabir is that India has taken

a much stronger stance in favour of multi-stakeholderism

in June with the announcement of the Minister at ICANN,

and I think the way we see that is the recognition that

there is space for both strong multi-stakeholderism and

more multi-stakeholder participation and multilateral

23

fora than India recognised earlier. We see that

evolution and the very complex stance as a real step

forward and for that reason also believe that India

cannot draw again on the earlier language it had on

enhanced cooperation and think that the way this was

dealt with so far in the submissions was much more

balanced and very much hope that the Government will

continue to follow that line.

    Thank you.

>>Dr Govind: Thank you, Anja.

>>Naresh Ajwani: Dr Govind, if you allow me.

>>Dr Govind: Anyone else?

>>Naresh Ajwani: I just want to clarify my concern which is

purely emerging from the experience I have in the past

of activists or the group garnering legitimacy from

giving the name to the events with especially the brand

"Asia Pacific". What happens when the paper comes out

and they put across the submissions? They put the

submissions as Asia Pacific submission. I think that's

what I'm objecting to. That events like this just

getting a prefix of AP has to be checked because

otherwise activism is not viewed as advocacy, but it is

viewed as a five star activism by many people and

I think that's what was my -- what actually I had

expressed as a concern.

24

>>Anja Kovacs: That is incorrect. That is not the way ...

>>Naresh Ajwani: Today I also realised that the opening of

the event was with the Asia Pacific video and that

multiplies my concern that -- please don't mix up their

concerns with our concerns. I completely agree with

Anja in terms of a multi-stakeholderism, there has to be

a clarity over it, but simultaneously, that I personally

feel holistic approach to internet governance has to be

differentiated from cyber security point of view. When

it comes to cyber security, I would like to make

a request that cyber security means cyber terrorism,

cyber crime, maybe to an extent, but definitely not

beyond that three, four subjects of cyber security.

If it goes beyond, then it brings a conflict of

interest in terms of whether it is

a multi-stakeholderism or multilateralism. When it

remains just only cyber security and even if India's

position it is multilateralism, I appreciate, because

that's where the sovereign gets involved and I think it

should remain to an extent of a multilateralism. But

once it starts coming into trade and other kind of

things, then my concern multiplies that please,

Government of India, take one position. Don't embarrass

us outside, because when you embarrass us outside by

moving from multilateralism to multi-stakeholderism at

times and then seeing what is convenient, I think then

it becomes very, very difficult for us to defend the

position.

Thank you.

>>Rahul Gosain: Thank you, Naresh. Your concerns have been

taken. Now I would also invite more comments from the

industry, one by one, please. Thank you.

>>Brajesh Jain: Thank you. I am Brajesh Jain.

Now this multi-stakeholder/multilateral, the two

things which are very important is privacy and security.

When -- whether it is with reference to the cyber threat

or terrorism Mr Ajwani spoke or Mr Prabir spoke that

outer space, internet is not outer space. Internet very

much is within the -- on the land and each of us has the

capability of disturbing it. Hence, security remains

very important and when the threat comes from the other

part of a geography, how is it to be addressed?

Obviously, the government needs to get involved at

that stage and that has to be recognised. Thank you.

>>Anupam Aggarwal: Anupam Aggarwal, ISOC Kolkata.

My initial comments: considerable progress has been

made since the WSIS because it is a very forward-looking

framework forward and because of its various principles

and action lines. In fact, the reports which have been
submitted till now -- since last two years there are

various reports which have been submitted, are a
testament to that fact and also the non-paper primarily
admits that what further can be done, rather than what
has not been done.

     So, two things which I expect from this zero draft:
one, that a very clear learning process should be
enumerated, that what we have learnt since last 10 years
and how the implementation experience has connected with
the free flow of information and the freedom of
expression. Has that changed anything on the ground
while we were trying to implement all the action lines?

     The second, the structure of zero draft should also
very clearly enumerate that how those implementation
experiences have changed the societal and economic
development of the entire humanity, which we were
initially thinking about when we signed the Tunis
Agenda.

     The third submission will be that in this entire
process, we feel that businesses have not been actively
involved and there is a lot more possibility of
involving businesses in PPP more so that things can be
implemented at the ground level and that's what I think
zero draft should talk about, that how things can be
taken further. Thank you.

>>Jyoti Pandey: Jyoti Pandy from The Centre for Internet and

Society.

With reference to the non-paper, we would like to
note that the paper does not necessarily go into the
distinction between efforts and issues that are more
relevant in a national context, such as access, and
other issues that require participation and
collaboration at an international level, such as
participation of under-served and under-represented
stakeholders in internet standard making bodies or in
spectrum-related platforms and bodies.

Consequently, the targets that are being referenced
in the non-paper and emerging out of this framework
remain at a broad level commitment, framework rather
than targets and action lines that can be taken forward
and our submission should note that. Thank you.

>>Prabir Purkayastha: I think that it's good that Anja
referred to Mr Jaitly's position on the
multi-stakeholderism, India now supporting it and so on.
I would like to remind the audience that WSIS actually
talks about multi-stakeholderism and multilateralism
both, and talks about respective roles and
responsibilities and in this, the responsibility of
security belongs to the state, it does not belong
to -- quote, unquote -- the civil society. I cannot
protect India's security. The Government of India can

and that is its responsibility, it's not my
responsibility.

I have rights. That's my right. That's not
something the Government of India can take away.

I think the issue of stakeholder versus
multilateralism is a false dichotomy. It's effectively
both have roles and both have responsibilities and it
must be understood, governments have responsibilities,
people have rights.

So governments do not have rights. They are bound
by the constitution to fulfil their constitutional
duties. But we have rights. So I think this whole
issue of posing one as either/or is creating
a confusion. It also therefore means that the
governments are not going to fulfil their roles with
respect to internet. If they don't do it then what you
are effectively getting is a supranational state with no
ability to control what happens within your borders,
both with respect to economics and also with respect to
security.

I think that is what is the worrying part, when you
start talking about the soft multilateralism which sort
of wishes away the government, which is what the IANA
transition really proposes. No government role in this
at all. It should be done by -- quote, unquote --

multi-stakeholders, and the government should not play

a role in that, so essentially it will be business

and -- quote, unquote -- civil society who will run the

internet. I think this is my problem.

The problem is that is a sure recipe for actual war

on the internet, lack of security for all citizens and

also complete monopoly that we have already seen emerge

and therefore unequal development as a characteristic of

the internet age and these are the things we need to

address.

>>Gangesh Varma: My name is Gangesh. I'm from Centre for

Communication Governance.

Just taking off on the previous point on

multi-stakeholderism, I agree that we need to be aware

that the governments or if you are having the situation

of a supranational authority and you don't want to lose

policy space, which also brings into the question what

kind of multi-stakeholderism we want and -- there is no

single model, there is a very -- it is not a static

concept. So within each organisation or platform, it

will vary and it's up to us to define what kind of

multi-stakeholder engagement we develop.

Going on to rather a general comment on the overall

feel of the non-paper, I agree and I echo a couple of

the other comments that the measures are rather not

specific and they are not even measures. If you look at

the language that has been used, there is a lot of
"noting", there is "recognising", but how much of the
language is talking about urging for a particular
measure or talking about what needs to be done? So
that's a general -- the language of the non-paper.

Going to specifics, the preamble talks about the
digital economy in paragraph 3. This is very loosely
used as a term. It would do good to define or
articulate what exactly the digital economy is. Again,
to carve out our policy space and where stakeholders can
engage and discuss policy.

A couple of other points on the digital divide. If
we look at the articulation of digital divide, it has
been quite simplified. It needs to be further detailed
and respond to specific measures that we can talk about.
In paragraph 12, they talk about various stakeholders
achieving equitable access, but can we specify what
stakeholders can do and which stakeholders will be
involved in this process.

ICT for development. We talk about paragraph 16,
17, there is linkages between the STGs and Information
Society. The linkages can be more clear and -- specific
references to certain STG goals can be made.

The other points on human rights and internet

governance have already been discussed.
>>Dr Govind: We have two remote participants, Mr Parminder

from IT for Change from Bangalore. Can we get Parminder
here now.

>>Rahul Gosain: Hi, Parminder.

>>: Thanks. Mr Parminder, can you come on ...

(Technical break)

>>Parminder Singh: Thanks. Sorry to take so much time of
the meeting and I will be brief, because I know this is
a difficult medium.

I appreciate the points which have been made by the
Indian government in the previous submission about the
Digital India part and ICT, which I think we should
contribute a lot to and we have indeed a lot to
contribute to, and that is very good and I'm very sure
Indian government will do very well in any case.

The point I want to make, however, is about the
strategic interests India has at geopolitical and
geo-economic level in this field and whether we have
been able to kind of articulate that. I can try to put
it in this way, that let's not just respond to because
there is a non-paper, we are getting a response to it.
I would like to ask ourselves even if we did not have
the non-paper, what is it that we want from global
governments in this area? That would be called as

32

articulation of strategic interest, that we know what we
want and that's what we push for, not just responding to
a situation.

In this case, I think both on the area of security,
which has been discussed, but also in the area of
economics, social and cultural advantage globally, there
are huge amount of things which are very important in
this area and will become more and more important for
India to engage with global policies and that is not
happening and India has always wanted that there should
be a public policy space at the global level. That
should be kept open, so that when we need global public
policy in this area, we should be able to act on it.

So I'm a little surprised in India's earlier
contribution, which says that the meaning of enhanced
cooperation is not very clear. Because India's stand
has always been that we are very clear about what
enhanced cooperation is, which is a space where public
policy can be articulated.

To just end it, I would just like India to keep this
strategic interest especially on the economic, social
and cultural policy side and be more forceful to ask for
some kind of space to be created within the UN to do
public policy in this area and the way to do that is to
push the enhanced cooperation in this paper and thank

33

you very much. That will be my short comment.
        >>Dr Govind: Any other remote participation?
        >>Rahul Gosain: Ashwini, are you online?
                If we don't get him right away, then we could just

play the video of the feed.

Are we getting Ashwini?

>>Ritu Srivastava: Thank you, everyone. I'm Ritu, I'm from
Digital Empowerment Foundation.

I'm happy to see that India's contribution towards
the side of WSIS as well as on the paper of Digital
India plan, but in this non-paper, I would like to
recommend that in preamble 3 that we are talking about
the digital economy, the recommendation should be that
it should also include digitally excluded society, what
we are thinking about the digital economy including
digitally excluded society or is it only covering
digitally economic society? So that's one thing.

The second point, the second recommendation could be
the non-paper also does not reflect upon the innovative
use of radio spectrum, dynamic spectrum and other -- it
limits to the wireless broadband, it should also be open
for other alternative solutions for wireless
technologies, other solutions as well.

Another point which I would like to is -- the limit
is talking about especially related to the cyber space

34

and we heard a lot from Anja, Prabir and many others
have spoken about, but also to discuss about the
monitoring and surveillance by state and non-state
actors, it should also be reflecting it. The non-paper
does not even talk about the surveillance by the state

and non-state actors.

Another comment which we would like to also have a look is we all are talking about the freedom of expression, in the human rights section, which is very much limited. It does not cover human rights angle from the angle of freedom of association and assembly at all.

Another recommendation which I would like to highlight is that we all are talking about security base, so there also should be mention about the right to safe and assistive technology and affordable technology also to be mentioned here. We are missing out the low cost and affordable technology.

Other factor is missing in the non-paper is use of local content and creation of local content is not -- we have not emphasised anywhere in this non-paper. Thank you.

>>Payal Malik: Good afternoon. Thank you for giving me this opportunity. I am Payal Malik. I was until very recently the Chief Economist at the Competition Commission of India. Now I'm back to the university,

35

where I'm an associate professor of economics and I'm today representing Learn Asia, a think tank based out of Sri Lanka which has done considerable amount of research on issues of access, affordability in the ICTs. There I had a position of senior researcher fellow before I went on deputation to the Competition Commission.

I had looked at the telecom space for about 10 years
and the lessons I got from voice and now can be
replicated here when we are looking at the WSIS+10
review non-paper on access to internet, is how
liberalisation and competition can be one very, very
potential and strong instrument of access. The paper,
while it gives some generalities about how access can be
achieved, our focus at Learn Asia, in my own particular
research, has been how this centrality of markets should
be brought forth, which seems to be missing in any
government dialogue. Government and markets seem to be
dichotomous or ... to each other, which may not
necessarily be so.

So what can governments do in order to make their
regulations, their policies conducive for the markets to
provide the access solution should also be brought out,
where India has done pretty well in comparison to its
peers when it comes to centrality of markets in the
telecom sector for getting the voice access.

36

However, to carry forward the same momentum in
broadband and data -- similar problems are arising and
that centrality of markets has not yet taken deep roots
when it comes to internet access, the reason being
market failure in the form of access to domestic
backhaul.

So what kind of investment models, public/private

investment models in the domestic backhaul could promote

access should also come in some kind of a specific

recommendation when it comes to WSIS+10.

Second, yes, indeed there is space for the

government, we talk about universal service obligation,

but our countries happen to be the worst implementors of

the universal service obligation which huge amounts of

funds being available but not being utilised for the

purpose which they have been collected for.

So rationalisation of universal service obligation

funds such as to use them in a public/private

partnership more for providing access could be one of --

giving centrality and importance to markets and

providing access could be one of the important

recommendations in this WSIS+10 review to make it far

more prescriptive than the generality which is coming

out of this paper. Thank you.

>>Amrita Chaudhary (CCI): I would like to comment on the

37

digital divide, while as most of the other fellow

participants have said that it is very loosely worded,

saying "to take measures to achieve universal internet

access". If we look at India's submission, we had

mentioned the amount of progress we have made in taking

access to people and the initiatives being made.

Subsequently, in the current submission, if we could

also have some measures stated as to how the

non-represented or non-connected can be connected, maybe

through assisted modes of cyber cafes or telecentres or

any other modes, that would possibly help in sharing how

nearly 1 billion population can be connected by 2030.

If that is WSIS+10's aim, India's contribution would be

significant.

So in the zero draft obviously there has to be more

measures on how this can be achieved, and so what was

targeted, the target which was made 10 years earlier

which could not be achieved can be achieved this time.

Thank you.

>>Rahul Gosain: Any further submissions from the house?

>>Renu Sirothiya (NIXI): My reference is to paragraph 6 of

the non-paper. In paragraph 6 it is given that

particular attention should be paid to the specific

challenges facing women, young people, persons with

disabilities, indigenous peoples and marginalised

38

communities. Here I do not find in the non-paper any

reference to the inclusion of senior citizens. So my

urge is that probably we can suggest that there should

be some reference for the inclusion of elderly people

also.

>>Anja Kovacs: I'm sorry, I don't mean to hog the floor. I

just wanted to clarify with reference to Prabir. When

I said I think the Indian government is taking a very

complex approach, that's precisely because I think it is

moving towards recognising that there is a space for

multi-stakeholderism and multilateralism both, and if

you look at Minister Prasad's statement at ICANN, he

explicitly says that cyber security remains the domain

of the state. So that's already part of that statement.

I don't really think that is something that we are

discussing here.

While it's important though that India is

recognising multi-stakeholderism more is because it is

not a unified approach and even at the UN it is

implemented in very different ways. So to build on

Anupam's point, if the WSIS review is going to go

forward without involving people who actually have to

implement what is decided, then it is bound to fail.

Making sure that those people are involved is one

way to implement multi-stakeholderism at the UN, but

39

obviously at the UN, governments are going to continue

to have decision making authority.

So I think that's the positive aspect of India's

evolving approach and having, for example, one body that

will address at the UN all internet issues is not

feasible if you take that kind of a stance, because

clearly that body will never have the capacity to

address everything. Thank you.

>>Prabir Purkayastha: Thank you so much. I also don't

intend to hog, and I'm not going to continue on this

discussion of multi-stakeholder versus multilateral.

I would like to take the question that has been
raised, centrality of the market. I would submit
centrality is owners of the people, it cannot be of the
market. Markets are not by any manner of means
something which can be central in society, if you would
like to promote markets for a specific reason, that's
a different issue, but we cannot talk of centrality of
the markets, neither should we prescribe or be
prescriptive in saying we should do X, Y or Z only to
public/private partnership. That, again, assumes
a particular model is the only one which is going to be
imposed on everybody and that is I think a problematic
formulation.

I would also submit that we should accept that the

40

internet is public goods and that's something Government
of India needs to talk about, we need to talk about
access as a right, internet access as a right, and
internet as public goods and a lot of the points that
have been made right now are really the consequence of
recognising these two.

>>Raman Jit Singh Chima: Hello, everyone, I'm Raman Jit
Singh Chima. I serve as global policy director for
Access Now, which is an international organisation that
works on the rights of users at risk and in particular
the digital rights related to the open internet.

I also worked in industry previously. I am ...
technology legal space in India, but my intervention
here is more focused on specific comments in the
non-paper.

Firstly, I commend the Government and NIXI for
organising this consultation, but more specifically my
general comments on this is the flow from the guidance
on the non-paper itself and I stress that in relation to
our efforts as Indians to be able to intervene on this
during discussions at the UN General Assembly, rather,
around the high-level meeting that will take place at
the UN General Assembly in New York, that most of the
discussion should come from agreed-upon principles and
from other discussions. I just put that as more a focus

41

area that when we channel the discussions from today, we
should make sure that it builds on agreed-upon language,
to use the UN terminology, just because that's one place
to ensure that we get continuity and support for our
principles.

More specifically, and this is my substantive
contribution, would be in relation to what has already
been suggested in the draft, and I would like to just go
towards the non-paper and the digital divide component
and particularly paragraph 9. And I think there's an
important thing about ICT connectivity. Many people
previously have spoken about the importance of

strengthening that, of the impact it has not just on the
digital economy, but on digital exclusion as well.
I believe people from Digital Empowerment Foundation
flagged that.

I probably stress here, and this is a point for us
to re-emphasise the government's own stated policy in
favouring an open internet that allows all interests to
be able to contribute on this, and my recommendation
would be, in looking at the context of paragraph 9
there, we specifically state that as we try to grow
connectivity solutions, this is only benefited by
ensuring a connection or connectivity that allows access
to full internet.

42

So I will stress the point that paragraph 9 because
this is one point that many people will encounter and
very often for developing nations this is a cause of
tension where people say this is a solution for
connectivity, whereas we may believe that is actually
not sort of open connectivity that we want. So it might
be worth our consideration, especially given the
government's stated position on this, to re-emphasise
this at paragraph 9 and the discussions in the
non-paper.

The other point that I would probably want to stress
on is, and I think a few people have already spoken
perhaps about the importance in the section of ICT for

the international action plans, but I stress two of the
interventions. In the human rights section, especially
given the statements made by India previously about it's
important to respect the rights of citizens across the
world, that of users across the world, and, for example,
the rights to privacy don't only depend on whether you
are a US citizen or an EU citizen. We stress that,
again, governments must respect that. And that might be
a point for us to emphasis, given the revelations we did
see during the Snowden disclosures, which affected the
rights of users in India, even of government agencies in
India, due to actions of global governments.

43

    The last and most important point, I just stress and
probably this is more of a question than a suggestion,
is in regards to the section on the Tunis technology
transfer section, the Tunis Agenda specifically, I was
just curious on whether you discussed the technology
transfer mechanism, which was discussed in Addis Ababa
previously, because many other governments will bring up
that issue about technology transfer and growing
internet and, rather, internet companies globally being
able to work together with the developing nations
partner there. It is just a question of whether the
submission finally addressed that point, looked at that
point, and why I emphasise this is that from my
understanding within the UN system, that has been a

discussion that has come up, it has come up again in

relation to the negotiations and discussions on the

STGs, which has been happening at the UN even this week,

and it might be important for us to be able to discuss

that point and again, it is not a recommendation, but

more a question as to whether we are going to take that

point up.

>>LK Goyal: I'm LK Goyal, president CMIA, chairman ...

First of all, I'm sorry I came late. I don't know

what has been discussed, what has not been discussed.

What I'm saying, I don't know whether it makes sense to

44

the group or not, or I'm just talking something

bullshit.

First thing about public goods. If it is public

goods, then who pays for it? Government pays for it.

Internet government is not there. I am not aware how

can it can qualify as public goods.

Second thing comes openness. We are very much

interested to say open policy, open transparency, open

thing, open thing, open thing. For whom we are saying

open? Why don't we talk about accountability? In the

next word we talk of privacy for the UN, for the world,

across the world. Are we having privacy for India? Do

we have accountability in India? Are we going to

internet in X, Y, Z, and post something derogatory or

bad against the Prime Minister? Can anybody find out

who am I?

Why don't we talk those things? We are very happy
to see privacy for the world. Privacy for US, for
Germany, for UK, for Japan, for Australia. Why not for
India? Why? For whom we are working? Tomorrow if
there is something bad, then we are told under the last
order so and so, you have to go to the court, court must
give order, but the court costs, so better to say,
"Sorry, I'm not based in India." Why don't trouble
these things? Thank you.

45

>>Tapan: I am representing ACTO, but this is my own view.

I want to make one simple point, that cyber security
is an important point, which has been raised in the
non-paper. But can we have some solution-orientated
approach rather than stating that only cyber security is
important, is important, but what we can do it, since it
is for multi-stakeholder. Now, although it is a little
bit technical, can we move towards fixed IP addressing
system, because earlier it was IP version 4, so lack of
addressing system, so dynamically IP address was getting
changed. So tracing is an important issue in the --
first of all, who is doing? The traceability factor is
important in IP, security, cyber security domain.

Not only that, traceability, how fast it can be
done. That is also important. If we can move globally,
fixed IP address system which will help, who is the

person, where is the person? So that can be easily

traceable. It can help.

So can we make a project that move towards fixed IP

addressing system globally? Thank you.

>>Rahul Gosain: I think now we have Ashwini on line so

briefly first we will listen to him.

>>Brajesh Jain: You have said fixed IP address, fixed for

the person or fixed for the location?

>>Shiva: Ashwini, please turn your mic to green.

46

>>Sihashish: I'm Sihashish from NIXI. So I will bring back

the discussion to the non-paper again and there are two

very important questions which have to be answered from

the non-paper. One is, for how long do you think we

should renew IGF for? Should it be perpetually

happening every year or over a period of time and if we

do so, then how are we going to fund it? That's one

question.

The second question is, this is a ten-year review

which we are looking at, which we decided in 2005, so

when do you think would be the next review and what

would be a good time to have that review? Should it be

a five-year period, should it be a ten-year period, or

should it be shorter than that? Or should it be yearly

or something of that sort, or should it happen around

IGF every year?

I would like to hear your thoughts on that.

>>Harish Chaudhary: I am Harish Chaudhary from NIXI.

So in cyber space -- so we -- there is two things
I want to mention here. The first one is, how -- there
should be how to prevent cyber wars and this is given
cyber security and all, but actually cyber wars are
there, we have so many evidences, how to stop it.

Then if we are talking about privacy, so in case of
privacy, those private information which is already

47

available on the internet, how to take it back, is there
any policy on how we should work in that direction?
These are the points I want to make.

>>Anupam Aggarwal: Anupam Aggarwal, ISOC Kolkata. In the
context of the question raised, I think it is a very
good question, what should be the term of review and
whether IGF should be perpetual or not. I have been
following IGF since last five or seven years and I have
been party to the discussion in 2009 when the same
question was being debated, whether IGF should be
continued for another five years or not.

It came out that at the end of five years, it comes
as a checkpoint, where you can review what has gone
wrong, rather than a ten-year process. So much earlier
in the game you can make things correct and take a
renewed or a revised planned, if things need to be
changed. So five-year review process, that's what
I agreed to.

In the context of IGF again, what I have seen that
IGF has also involved over a period of time in the last
ten years. Initially, it was only a four-day session.
But of late, last two years I have seen that there are
best practices sessions which have been incorporated as
part of IGF, and I'm party to at least two or three best
practices forums which are there and that gives a very

substantial involvement space for people just outside
the four days when the IGF takes place.

So similarly, in the context of this WSIS, I think
more space for participation throughout the period is
what we looked at and I think that five-year review
process should be fine. Thank you.

>>Naresh Ajwani: On all the forums I have realised and
noticed that IGF truly represents multi-stakeholder
model and I think that's what we should be focusing and
driving, and in my opinion what Anupam has put across,
that five-year review process, and definitely it should
become a perpetual process. It can't be just near five
years we must do the review, but not over the point
whether IGF to continue or not. That should get a life
now. Thank you.

>>Shri Rahul Gosain: Any further comments on that thread?

>>Gangesh Varma: Just to add to that, while we discuss
whether it is five-year or ten-year term, we also need
to discuss on what terms we need to review the IGF, so

the participation and representation aspects need to be
really refined, and as you said, the IGF is also
continually changing and it has evolved, so to give it
a permanent mandate before understanding what it will
evolve into is a dangerous thing to do. So I would
suggest that we give an extended term, but we watch how

49

it evolves and then give it a permanent mandate.
>>Raman Jit Singh Chima: Just on the last comment, to
perhaps suggest that specifically in the recommendations
you might note that since there are specific policy
recommendations and outputs asked of this IGF, which is
the first time that's happened, with respect to the one
policy paper connecting the next billion, which is up
for inputs and just as a reminder to others in this
room, if you are interested in this subject to input
by October. There are also specific outputs expected of
some of the dynamic coalitions, this time with the
Secretariat, so you may want to stress that our support
for the renewal of the IGF and the format of that should
be guided by what takes place at the IGF this November
and that any WSIS discussions that take place that
should be put there.

    Why I also stress this is that there has been
discussions about bringing the WSIS code makers to IGF.
Those in the room may know the process, but my
understanding is it has not been confirmed and the

different members to delegations were discussing that
with the UN Secretariat, but that might be a point we
wish to emphasis that obviously we support the renewal
of the IGF, but the format of how effective it is, what
reforms it might need and for example ... paper on the

reform of the IGF five years ago, we may want to just
see that whatever comes out in November will guide how
we look at the format of the IGF post the WSIS+10 review
in New York in late November/December.

>>Dr Govind: Thank you. Any other comments around this
table here?

If there are no comments now, I would like to thank
DeitY who has also participated in this round table and
one of the important topics WSIS+10 review, where we
talked about the non-paper, what structure it has to be
and what kind of drafting we have to do in the long run
and we will see how the preamble, the digital divide,
ICT for development, internet governance issues, cyber
space and human rights components need to be more
elaborated, rather than just in terms of mere wordings
there, but also in substantive terms, what we need to do
in the context of our country and in what way we have to
move forward in the future such review process which is
going to be over this December. I think this will be
the final WSIS+10 review which will be taking place.

So with that, I would like to thank again the

participants here and we will break for tea now. Thank

you. We will break for 10 minutes.

(The discussion ended at 4.34 pm)