FINISHED FILE

ASIA PACIFIC REGIONAL INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
EVOLUTION OF INTERNET GOVERNANCE:
EMPOWERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
MACAO 2015
02 JULY 2015
ROOM 2
16:00 LOCAL TIME
CORE INTERNET VALUES
SESSION 34

                            ***

    Live captioning at APrIGF Macao 2015 is brought to you by
Internet Society

     >> MODERATOR: Welcome to the workshop on Core Internet
Values. Actually, this discussion is discussed for the first
time this year, but this is a topic that has been discussed at
the IGF. It has been discussed in IGF since 2009. We had a
workshop on fundamentals, Core Internet Values. This was the
title of the workshop in Egypt in 2009. The workshop was
basically to examine some very fundamental questions, what is
the Internet, what are its core values and what are the values
that cannot be altered.
     One of the values -- these are the questions that were
examined at the IGF in Egypt. Afterwards we formed a coalition
which has been meeting at every IGF since 2010. So after the
original idea, we want to introduce this topic and have this
discussion. In this meeting we'll be examining something. The
IGF's theme would be policy options for the next billion. So we
want to examine in this workshop about making policy in such a
way that the core Internet values are not altered. That is
using a set of core Internet values as a yardstick against which

government policy will be measured, government policy of the Internet will be measured.

　　With this we have the speakers, Paul Wilson, and Jeremy Malcolm from EFF, and Cheryl Langdon-Orr from ICANN, and Yu-Chuang-Kuek, and pretty much everyone in the room is a participant of this discussion. So you are all panelists as well.

　　Would you like to be the first speaker, Paul, to talk?

　　>> PAUL WILSON: I'm happy to make a few remarks, but I won't go on at length. I come from the tech community. It's often the technical approach to the Internet or to anything that might not be valued like it might be somehow disjoined from the values of what other communities might be trying to do. But I think the thing that I'd like to point out about the Internet is that there are technical values which were not -- they were the basis on which the Internet was founded. Quite simple and straight forward, taking the values that are easy to take for granted, but they don't come for free. It's not an unchangeable aspect of the Internet that any of these things continue. In fact, it would be quite possible to something called the Internet to continue into future while actually changing those fundamental values, and the risks there I think is well, we have nothing to compare it with. We can't compare the Internet of today with what the Internet could have been.

　　If it were different, we can't compare with another competing network, so it would be easy for that environment to change in ways that were unplanned or which represented a loss of the core values. So sort of things I'm talking about are, as I said, part of the core original Internet design, which is the global nature of the Internet. The ability to send a packet of information from any one point on the Net to any other point on the Net is one of the key features of the Internet in its original design. That was not something that existed in the various other competing networks at the time. It's something the Internet brought, which is these days it's not always entirely true. Yet what we need to do is to bear in mind that specific feature as something to be maximized or preserved.

　　The borderless nature of the Internet are the fact that when you have new networks that join the Internet, there are interconnections that are made that those networks really seamlessly join into the global structure. Something that's very important these days is actually the neutrally which is implicit in the Internet design. The Internet at the network level sends packets around the network, without distinguishing what's inside the packets and without any necessary distinction in terms of source and destination.

　　These days, if not for the Internet, I don't think we would

have the idea network neutrality. Networks would continue to be designed as they were when the Internet was in its infancy without neutrality at all where you have bundling with sort of the network offerings that were joined and separated from others.

It's allowed network neutrality, and we can argue about something we can try and preserve. Again, it's something that could be lost progressively. Unfortunately, it's very robust. So to sort of disappear without even noticing, but it's a good example one could conceivably could.

The Internet has always been designed and was designed and surprising to hear it said that the Internet actually is a pretty dumb network. It really doesn't do very much other than send packets. It was specifically designed not to have a specific amount of intelligence built into the network, where you have network operation of the decisions based on contact or the quality of service or security issues. The Internet itself leaves all those things to the provider, the intelligence on the Internet existing on the device. It also signifies to try to add value to the Internet in different ways that might actually compromise some of these things.

A technical requirement priority that we have at the moment is the transition from IPv4 to IPv6. It, again, is actually a matter of the success of that will allow the preservation of certain aspects, including global attribute, which would be progressively if we stick with IPv4. With the current address shortage, it means we actually have sacrificed and lost much of the network that transparent point to point, end to end ability. So IPv6 can do that.

I'm talking about things at a technical level, but I think these aspects of the Internet really do translate into the Internet that we have today that has enabled the innovation of the incredible growth and expansion of the Internet that we also should appreciate and we should prepare for as well, because the Internet's got to be at least twice as large as it is now over the next five to ten years or maybe many more than that.

So I think the next billion are also depending on the preservation of the Internet in its current and ideal form rather than compromised form that could possibly emerge in the direction.

>> You were talking about the borderless nature of the Internet. When talking about that, you said with a new network joins the Internet, it is automatically absorbed and the Internet is designed to be -- to facilitate that. It's not geographically network, when Internet came, there was nothing to modify the Internet to support the Internet. Apart from the Internet, we are talking about Internet of Things. That is a

new technological development.

When Internet of Things takes shape, there's nothing needed to be changed from the architects of the Internet. The Internet of Things and mobile Internet will probably technologies that were not conceived originally, but still when these new technologies came into being, Internet automatically supported it. Probably when we talk about interstellar network, it might support that. From IPv4 to IPv6, and nothing on architectural level needs to be changed to accommodate our IPv6. These are assumptions. Are there really any -- anything that need to be modified that we are talking about networks or are there any challenges with regard to transition from IPv4 to IPv6 in terms of the technical architecture as it exists today?

>> PAUL WILSON: I think you said it very well. These things are evolutionary developments that build on what exists already. We can talk about the interstellar Internet. It's an entirely different environment. The Internet isn't actually built to work with packet delays in the minutes, in terms of minutes. That's something not out there and not an entirely urgent issue. Otherwise what you said is quite true. It's something that the Internet of things is actually not a technology development. It's a concept which is only the ability of more devices to support to take protocols and so on. And the risks -- the big change there is simply in numbers, the number of devices which would come along.

For that reason, we would not move to IPv6 if we were to attempt to deploy a few billion devices onto the Internet with IPv4. You would actually have -- by the time that was done, you would have a network where the assumption fundamentally is quite different. IPv6 is actually quite important. The value could threaten the core values.

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: I liked your presentation of the core values of the Internet. I'm always suspicious when people present core values of the Internet as if they're not any technical values, but also a social value. That's a jump that doesn't necessarily follow. The way you present it, and I think it's correct, to say that the technical values that the Internet not necessarily all, but in any case the Internet that we have is by and large a good thing. It's by and large works pretty well. So if we think we can do better by changing those underlying technical values, then we can try that, but to be aware in doing so the Internet will also change. So if we are going to be changing those values, we should do so consciously, not obliviously.

I also agreed with your point that the core values are changing. You've pointed out a couple of those. One of them was the global nature of the Internet as a single unified

network. I think we can see that changing in various ways where
countries and corporations alike are trying to draw national
borders around the Internet. We have companies doing this by
geoblocking where you have a service that's only available
within a particular region, whether that's licensing agreements,
national base, or other reasons, such as price discrimination,
they only want to sell to one particular market. You also have
governments trying to do the same thing.

     Governments are placing restriction that will block access
to websites outside their borders if they are against national
policy. That may be reasons, maybe religious activities. So
this is a trend that we have to acknowledge is interfering with
the core value of the Internet and we have could extrapolate
from that and say where does this lead if we keep on drawing
national borders around the Internet? I will have more to say
later, but I wanted at first to react to that. Thanks, Paul.

     >> YU-CHUANG-KUEK: Thank you, Jeremy.

     Mine is quick. I work for ICANN. Unlike Paul, I did not
come from a technical community. I came from a very different
place. I'm very comfortable almost. Prior to joining the
Internet industry, I was a trade negotiator negotiating
free-trade agreements. And what happens when you are a
negotiator negotiating free-trade agreements, you spend a lot of
time in rooms. We travel to Macao and different cities. The
exercise is there are boundaries or borders between different
jurisdictions. We're trying to break these borders down.

     The Internet is exactly opposite. It's without any
borders, and it is one of the key values of the Internet. What
is worrying is there are countries who are modern possibilities
of directing these borders. There are governments that, again,
will be the direction of new borders around the Internet. You
also -- this morning we had a conversation about ISP's taking
down contents or IP blocking to IP address filtering for
contents issues as well.

     So, again, this is something that is for someone who is a
relatively new participant in the debates around the Internet
where and there were no boundaries around jurisdictions, but
there is a possible threat of these borders coming up. So back
to what is -- what could be core Internet values from an ICANN
perspective, we have an active interest in maintaining one
global, single, interoperable Internet and maintaining that
integrity of the Internet, the network of networks as we know it
is one of the themes of our activities, trying to tie it into
what the next billion what are going to be new participants in
the Internet.

     I think the presentation of the integrity of the global
Internet as we know it, it should be one of the main points.

But we should be getting the next billion on the Internet should not be a portion, have not be a fragment, should not be an intranet, but the entire Internet.

I think on such a platform, this one global Internet that the new entrance and particularly these people are likely to be the people who need to be the beneficiaries of the Internet. I think we have to be mindful that we can only benefit is if the Internet as we know it is part of this one that we began with. I'll end my comments here and pass things over to Cheryl.

>> MODERATOR: Cheryl, if you're ready, we would like to hear you.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: (No audio).

>> MODERATOR: When she gets ready, maybe we can have some of the participants, what do you think are values that are nonnegotiable, values that cannot be altered, values that you would not like to give?

>> AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm from university. Just -- you are key negotiator and you're trying to break down walls in trade. And obviously the government speaks and all position wasn't good. Now same government feels that walls are you good. It must be; right? They want to tear down the walls in trade, and are the same people in governments that want to put up walls. What is the difference? Are the same people or similar people for thinking that this is good for society and now say we put up a border in this situation. What gives?

>> YU-CHUANG-KUEK: Thank you for that question. I think it's all about trade-offs. So back in the trade negotiation you might trade off something on the intellectual property chapter to get something else back from the rules of origin chapter, for example. And I think these are exactly the same issues that governments are currently trying to grapple with. Trading off the control within your geographical boundaries that governments have been so used to and trading that off with a potential benefits of having citizenry participate in a global conversation if these borders did not exist, I think right now, we often talk about Internet issues or social media issues as if this was something new and we need to have new policies to address them.

The truth is that many of the activities or the challenges that we face in an online environments are mere extensions of what we already see in the physical world. And the complication here is that you are talking about norms that people are used to within the geographical boundary and having these interact with the norms and roles of different countries because Internet does not have these boundaries. It's not the needs to be a moment of harmonization of laws and practices.

For example, yesterday in your panel we were talking about

privacy issues and data protection issues, and how from a privacy perspective the kind of socially acceptable infringements, if you may, on personal privacy that is accepted in Asia is complete blasphemy in Europe, for example. Or if you look at some of the directives coming up from the European Union, they might look like they are overreaching in other cultural contexts.

So this kind of tension is a necessary part of this evolution as we move closer together so there is this harmonization. I think at the end of the day there will be beneficiaries of a cross-boundary industry. We'll be back at the negotiation table. These will be the trade-offs that they are grappling with to decide when and how to come to these harmonization goals.

>> MODERATOR: Cheryl?

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've got a crackly voice. I'm Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I apologize for the technical glitches. I did send a video just in case this sort of thing happened. So perhaps we should have just rolled the video from the top.

I haven't heard every word that was presented today. That's because we didn't have audio and video run through the system. But I resorted to plain old telephone service. If it's out of sync, it's because one was doing one thing and one doing another.

I'm particularly interested in getting very much an end user perspective on the questions when people talk about the core values program. I'll take it back connectivity -- well, from a different perspective. I'm certainly going to use interoperable. I'd also like to add ubiquitous, but I certainly want to say that to me primarily is facilitation communications. I don't particularly care a great deal whether we're talking about machine to machine communication, person to machine communication. There are many things communicating with many things or some other combination of all of the above. I'd like to have audio and video at the same time. That was a joke, by the way.

But what it is is a mechanism that allows communication to effectively happen. Hopefully, it will still happen in a trusted environment, in an environment where there is a degree of knowledge of informed consent, how much information you had privy to that information and communication.

I think also one of the important things is that in the interoperable way, it allows for information. It effectively has value and no barriers to negotiation and to become managed. At that point I'd like to redirect to the panel and you wonderful people gathered in the room.

Thanks.

>> MODERATOR: Thank you. So good to hear your voice.
　　Are there any questions for Cheryl or for the audience or from the panelists? Or would you like to save it for later?
　　We would -- on the video talk, is it the same, Cheryl, or the recording that you sent us a little earlier, was it any different from what you have spoken just now?
　　>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, this is Cheryl again for the record. What I sent you earlier was 22 seconds of far more coherent than what I just gave you. I think at the end of my working day. And I would suggest what you do is attach that as a resource to the day's presentation. You're welcome to use it as you will. It's far more coherent talking. But I do know that some of what I said has already been said by others.
　　Thanks.
　　>> MODERATOR: We'll do that, Cheryl. Thank you. What is the one thing about core values, so it's for you to raise some questions or share your views and I'll pass the microphone to you.
　　>> The core point is there are trade-offs in the choice of values and one of the points we made. There are probably some sort of accept meaning like broader definition, but at the end of the day we got to make some choice in values. Some choices are better than others. To that extent, we will not know until we try and countries try and then see if fail. The marketplace, you know. Thank you.
　　>> PAUL WILSON: I think the question asked before about the apparent contradiction between the idea of the Internet -- maybe it's a contradiction between the idea of the Internet being a permissive place and a free and open network, and parties creating walls. I don't think it's a contradiction so much. It's a useful technology and allows all sorts of things. Company erects firewalls to protect themselves from being spurious, in the same way that governments install firewalls in its connection points to deter what it sees as unwanted traffic. The Internet allows both of those things. I don't think we would want to design a technology that forbade any of that. It's a pretty simple network. We don't want to burden it with anything unnecessarily.
　　I draw a parallel between Internet and clay as a substance that is flexible and adaptable and universal and you can do whatever you'd like with it. So you could choose at the country level, then you can do that. At the country level it becomes an issue for citizens to deal with. At the corporate level it may be a good thing or a bad thing. It may be full protection. It may be control of employees, but you can do it. You can do all these things without affecting others.
　　But if you try to entrench in the Internet to some of the

things that you're trying to do, if you try to bake the clay,
then you're not going to come back from that. If you take
measures that affect and implement not only your own desires in
a local sense, but also affect others, then you may not come
back from that either.
     So in the discussions that I've been involved with for some
time in Internet Governance, it's been in some cases an effort
to re-architect some of the fundamentals of the Internet such as
the addressing system. For instance, all Internet addresses
should be subdivided to countries or countries to manage.
That's kind of an irreversible situation. It's kind of baking
the clay into nationalized chunks. It will be very difficult to
revert. In fact, has got a lot of risks and downsides to it as
well.
     So I think one of the principles, apart from the freedom to
use the Internet as you might wish to, with a minimum barrier to
entry, its subsidiary. It's like you have a solution as close
to the problem as you can. You don't try to find a universal
solution to something that exists in one place. You fight the
people that have to deal with that under their own steam.
     I think subsidiary is important to allow actions to be
localized, but also to localize adverse impacts of what might be
done at the local level.
     Thanks.
     >> JEREMY MALCOLM: There is also a movement connect the
wireless, and it's a movement to encourage people to open up
their wireless networks. This is a good thing. People who are
travelers, people who are like emergency services can have
access to networks where they go. It also means that your
device is suddenly much more valuable rather than just working
at home or the office.
     So it is a policy that subsidiary, you should be able to
decide whether your network is open. You can have the choice to
close it or you have the choice to open it. Now, what we don't
want is a baking in the clay, metaphor, where you're forced to
open it or close it. That is applying a one-size-fits-all
solution that isn't necessarily going to be the right solution.
     Unfortunately, there is a case called the McFadden
reference, in Europe that threatens to bake the clay. Germany
is saying that every open wireless network has to be protected
by password, basically prohibiting open wireless networks. Open
wireless networks can be used for copyright infringement, just
like highways can be used for hit-and-run accidents and bank
robbery escaping.
     This we think is a very bad move, and so we have written a
letter to the European Court of Justice to explain why having no
open wireless would be a bad move that is against the core

principles of openness and subsidiary.

If you could look at openwireless.org, let me know and we'll be happy to address you to that.

>> MODERATOR: We have Cheryl on screen. It's one of her recordings that she sent us, and so we'll listen to that.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: (Audio indiscernible).

>> MODERATOR: That's not the video. The video, I think, directly, not through audio. You have to connect your laptop to the screen and then play the video.

>> The projection laptop in the room and the adobe laptop: They're two separate laptops. So we're trying to synchronize that. The feedback -- we won't share it in the adobe room, because that will create the echo.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Use the paper to write down the names, but if you didn't give the reason why they need to do that, well, it's the kind of thing that privacy protection or something. I didn't sign that because I didn't know what purpose you asked that to do. So we are here to speak about core values, I think one of them is personal protection. So please explain the reason.

>> MODERATOR: The people in the room share the concerns as we all do. It was a good opportunity to network with you and to continue sharing thoughts on core Internet values.

Before I start writing to you or before any of us start writing to you, we would ask you once if it's okay to do, and then use your e-mail address. It's not to be published anymore. It becomes a matter of record as to who participated in that event. And I would respect your consent if you choose not to sign.

(Off microphone)

(Laughter)

>> Jeremy has a sticker that says, "I do not consent."

(Laughter)

>> Maybe I should ask for a technician.

(Laughter)

>> I have question for all while the video is getting ready. Actually, Jeremy, or and Cheryl also in that capacity. In all your interactions, what do you think -- do you think that the values that you thought that were even the most fundamental values of the aspects of the Internet, like the Internet being a dumb network, is it understood beyond the technology community -- beyond the technical community?

So I understand the value of governance. Also the fact that is the value of the Internet being -- global network understood? One of the technical principles of network is that the value for network increases in proportion to the number of users. When it comes to Internet, the value of the Internet --

why isn't the Internet being global? What do you think? Beyond
the technical community, and if it's not so well understood,
what should we do about that?
          >> PAUL WILSON: I've been director of governments enough
to know that you can't generalize governments at individual
level or at country level. So I don't think there is an answer
to who understands what. I think the only universal is that
there is no one who understands everyone. Definitely not. The
best thing to the experts these days are still specialists in
core areas. I think that's value of us all being together and
exchanging views.
          I think the Internet-like technology is a matter of a
series of black boxes. You can understand how something works
and what benefits are and what the risks are without making to
look inside it. If you want to look inside it, sometimes you
have to, and it's not what you might expect. I think across the
board there are many governmental people who understand
different parts of the Internet as a black box. We perform
different functions and those functions can be appreciated
without going into the detail. I think Internet is as a global,
seamless network, something that's quite easy to understand.
What the threats are to that might be a little bit more
difficult to understand. But I think it's a conversation about
if you are talking about exactly what type and how to -- I know
that's not very much of an answer. Jeremy?
          >> MODERATOR: Cheryl, you're on.
          >> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for
the record.
          It's interesting, because I keep following Paul and I keep
having to agree with him. I'm sure we can stop this shortly.
I'm very much in the camp that the man in the industry, the
average user does not need to. But should they desire to, they
should be able to understand these network networks that we
originally, which is essentially to our day-to-day life. Just
as the average water drinker in a city doesn't need to be as
knowledgeable and concerned as the average water drinker out of
a stream might necessarily need to be. Where a city water
drinker just turns the tap and trusts that everything is exactly
as it should be and is going to be clean, hygienic and purified.
That might be a very different set of decisions if you're having
to drink downstream from a pollution source or untainted supply
of watering.
          So it really is a matter of having as much knowledge and
that knowledge being accurate as you need to authorize within
system. However, we do need to make sure that they can trust
what degree of safety, privacy, publicity, security. We think
they're talking to or connecting with these in fact be change in

recipient. All that sort of thing should be part of the trust
model that has to be developed. The understanding of exactly
how it works, no, I don't think it's essential and leave it to
those for people that do not have much to do in their lives.
     >> MODERATOR: Thank you. Any questions for Cheryl on
which she spoke? Is the video still --
     >> SIVASUBRAMAN MUTHUSAMY: As you can usually see, since
April of last year -- greetings from Mordor. You know they have
always been a very proponent to all kinds of initiatives. We
encourage over eight or so. It's interesting, because what
exactly Paul was trying to say, so why governments, certainly
governments, are the concept of the Internet because of that.
Jurisdictional, I think all the governments all not sum, but
newly merged countries need copies of this. Russia to some
extent, China. These are the newly formed countries that
certainly forms of government, it emerged a couple of decades
ago.
     Its mere existence, the Internet retains and just because
they see it some kind of new phenomenon which challenges the
supreme power in governments, you know. They have always been
in the driving seat. There is something purposely unknown,
which is accompanied by absolutely new institutional challenges.
Those governments are not used to. Think of this: Government
is the ultimate and supreme source of power and authority.
There is a bunch of people who call themselves stakeholders, and
based on how decide whether we have access to the Internet, with
services -- I'm just trying to convey that vision. Services
which not be implemented and which not.
     It's not actionable, for example, that in Russia media
ICANN -- not always, Internet regulator ICANN decided something.
Internet Czar Shehade said. But the technical guys, for
example, somewhat do not factor into. These are institutional
transformations which we do not see, but we've a sense that it
shifts in the global governments, something which will be emerge
later on and we will better understand what shape it will take
over time. But governments instinctively, feel that danger,
feel the challenge to power. That's why the goals are let's
give it to the ITU. That's why the questions of who are they
after all? Why should we talk to them when we are not on equal
footing? If we are not on equal footing, but why should we have
that as our counterparts?
     Governments can easily talk to the U.S. administration.
It's like peer-to-peer communication, but this is a different
story. Multi-stakeholder is a different story. It's not that
easy for political governments to absorb and digest that
reality.
     So I would say from this perspective, to me is to keep the

Internet as a public room, to make sure the Internet is available to everyone is not good enough, but just the concept should be embedded in each and every government's public policy. The Internet is a public group, from that the majority to Internet access. These should be a guarantee to each and every one. And I think that our work in particular should be centered on making sure that governments realize for some the different has certain challenges, but the use of it.

Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: When you have concerns about governments concerned about Internet, about governments and that Internet is challenging them.

I was in a meeting yesterday where the Prime Minister of India, he actually placed information technology at the epicenter of the policy. While Internet irritates some governments, but basically the information technology made an announcement, proclaimed that India has a multi-stakeholder of Internet Governance. That's also the information technology and on Internet that actual put Internet to next level, talking about using social networks and governments, not just as a step beyond eco-governments and taking people to take on policy issues and so on.

I think while we have problems with some governments, slowly it was beginning to be a trend that governments are beginning to understand and embrace and endorse Internet more and more. So that is a positive sign. Anyone deal with that?

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you, Sivasubraman. I'd like to jump in, because I think we have done the group a disservice if we left the room walking away with an "us against them" mentality. While there is an expectation for governments to understand the technical community, we need to understand that there is similarly an expectation for the technical community to understand governments. And, also, I don't know that we should start off with the assumption that firstly all governments are more with it. I think Paul was talking about this. The government experience that you've had is different from the government experience that you or one that I have. So governments are different.

Secondly, I think we shouldn't start off with the assumption that the governments don't understand as well. Like when the people are drafting legislation, probably one of the first new things that they want to think about is that the legislation should be technology neutral. It should be principle based, shouldn't be too prescriptive. I think these are things that people understand. But very often governments are also responding to new threats that are looking for solutions.

For example, you might look at European privacy directive and say that observation is ridiculous to expect consent at every stage or consent for cookies to be placed on my computer at every stage, because if I had that, then the shopping cart, as you know on the eCommerce platform, will not work in the way it is meant to work. At the same time, as pointed out in the audience, the governments responding to the particular concerns of the citizenry in terms of the privacy and data protection.

So I think what I'm really advocating here is two things. One analogy that we allow that clay to still be pliable and we don't want to bake anything unnecessarily into something that's irreversible, but there also must be a collective world to meet each other in the middle and to understand a lot of the recommendations and policies that you do respond -- do usually correlate to value concerns that are arising from the citizenry.

As a member of the technical community, I think we should be thinking in terms of how we can be a problem-solving mode instead of the "us against them" mentality.

>> MODERATOR: I think I better stop taking too much time. I still want to respond. Mr. Paul, I don't -- I was not to have the "us versus them" mentality, but that was questions you brought. That was probably because some errors in my expression. I tend to have a lot of respect for governments.

Secondly, I wanted to say something about what you said. While I found your remarks to be very wise, you said that they have to meet somewhere in the middle. So this topic of core Internet values, what is it -- we cannot -- what is it we cannot compromise on? There are certain values on which it cannot be compromised, stepped down and meet governments meet somewhere in the middle.

For example, we cannot make compromise on the Internet being global. We cannot make compromise on the Internet being interoperable. We cannot make compromise on the Internet being dumb. We cannot make compromise of the Internet being an Internet with central core rules. Those values that cannot be compromised we are talking about. About security concerns, we do understand. We'll have to find a solution, not somewhere in the middle, these values are uncompromised.

>> PAUL WILSON: This is my second panel. The last time it was the possibility of a geographic diversified Internet Governance principle. When the fact came up that these two sessions were being held one after the other, I think it was you that said one was a case of deduction and the other was a case of induction in terms of the approach we take. So I'm just wondering if there might be -- if you might have some comments so far about how you see the past panel and this one as whether we can take the deduction and induction thing a little further.

I actually think both of these are in place at the same time. I
hope they're not in conflict. I hope they're contributing to
something useful. I don't want to put you on the spot.

>> I'll just jump in with a response, because I can see we
are in agreement. When we talk about permission innovation,
some things that cannot be compromised. If it is criminal, it
doesn't matter if you believe in permission-less. When you talk
about crossing the line, if it crosses the line, it's
acceptable. Somewhere between these two lines we should be
thinking about how we can collectively resolve problems. I
don't think we're in disagreement. I think we're in agreement.

>> AUDIENCE MEMBER: I just mentioned the deduction and the
induction model to now expand up above. The last session and
this session, the deduction means -- I think our section is a
deduction model. And this session is an induction model,
because this is core value for Internet Governance principles to
extract the principles from the very core values. It's
induction. Am I right? Induction?

>> Yeah, I think so.

>> AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah. From the different ideas and
different notions, but our position is deduction means we would
like understanding the principles from the different
perspective, especially the geographical diverse. Maybe same as
I mentioned about distinction, maybe one principles can be
differently interpreted in different environments on the
Internet Governance. The different things can indicate the same
model in the similar content. I don't know if I'm clear on the
issues.

>> IZUMI AIZU: My name is Izumi Aizu. One is Internet of
Things, another is industrial content. To me, the core value is
openness. But do they really apply to Internet of Things? I'm
not sure. What they really need to be called as Internet
things, I'm not sure? What do we mean by Internet of Things?
Why? Why? Especially this industry alternatives proposed by
corporation and they have solution for which the NGOs for 2.5 K
and some of the presentation, not all.

So it's too much expanding or broadening the original
concepts of the Internet, applying to the areas. I might be
wrong, but what core Internet of Things, I would like to put it
network of things. Internet is described of networks of
networks. Of course, you may have to use the protocol. But the
beauty is this underlying protocol does not really find the
application for the way they are used thanks at least
internally, because there are many areas we may be challenged.
The borderless is now you get from here to I want to watch the
Super Bowl this morning. But it's not improvised. It's the
service provider who uses the mapping where you're from.

I'm still bothered by this kind of expanding the Internet as if they share similar same value, while it is not.

Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'd like to make comment on Internet program and reflect everything to excess, ability to share, ability to innovation, and ability to process. And all the recommendations would be presented, Internet operational process and technical standard. This technical standard should be developed so that if we want no more restriction and share the information.

Thank you.

>> MODERATOR: Cheryl, would you like to say something? Would you like to intervene?

>> Adobe connection dropped, but she's still on Skype.

>> MODERATOR: Any other views on this update?

>> AUDIENCE MEMBER: I attended the session on Internet Governance principles. And then the presenter put up one slide at the end. Presentation and state that is that a universal principles, don't you think it's better to have concentrate on the core principles? So the way I see the question actually is a leading question. I think for me she has a tendency more towards to concentrate on the original level. So if I could relate back to our session just now, I guess if there are core Internet values that are nonnegotiable that are absolute, I guess the answer is, of course we need to have universal or global principle. But are core values negotiable? If that is yes, who justified that?

>> Are you bringing to the slides where the core values are?

(Off microphone)

>> MODERATOR: No, no. The point is that there are some core values. We have not come to agreement what are the core values. We are just discussing and just thinking aloud. We talked about the global means of the Internet and into on. We have now come to the point where they have reached an agreement on one of the core values. There will be a point when the core community will come to an agreement on values and will list one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, as core values. And once we come to that agreement, those values will be nonnegotiable. Those values are -- I cannot negotiate very fast. I would say it like this: These are values that we cannot slip down from. These are values that we cannot alter. But then we come to our definition of what those core values are.

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: I think this comes back to confusion between technical values and social values, because there are technical values that we can observe by looking at the protocols of the Internet and how it would design and if they do share

common traits such as an assumption to the connectivity. That's demonstrable. Social values is an entirely different one. You have the ability to trade freedom expression against privacy and security and so on. I think we need to keep them separate. Otherwise it's confusing.

>> CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think I'm up. Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I think you made a very important point about bifurcating those two points. The technical core values that we knew as a community we would be able to establish. If you listen to our voices, we keep hearing very similar words, the interoperability, stability, etc. The social values are very, very different. And I would hypothesize that both need a degree of flexibility. Because if the Internet and it is all as it was, stuck with a set of unusual rules, we wouldn't have had developed into what it is today.

And so I'm gonna disagree with the moderator here and say to suggest that what we do is a set of aspiration of core values instead of ideals, which is subject to review we are currently operating on, possibly both in technical and the social sphere. I think one of those spheres is going to be far more dynamic and probably needs to be far more dynamic than the other.

Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE MEMBER: My comment is more than a question. It should be clear between social and technical value, is it that simple that some technical value, the need on the social value, or just as technical? Sometimes the decision of choosing certain architecture will result into certain social value. Permission-less operation might be a good example. Of course, it's not only designers' idea that the users accept that deployed, where are you consciously take the decision of such that all just accidently result into a certain set of functionalities, values sometimes, and there are various interactive areas between the two. Just saying doesn't really solve some of the real issues to me.

>> AUDIENCE MEMBER: We mentioned technical values and social values. I think it is very consideration for our discussion. When I bring my proposal up at the last session, I intend to put forward two questions for our panelists. We didn't get to propose the two questions. Right now I want to list the two questions here. Is there a gap between the regional and global for discussing Internet Governance principle? That's the first question. And the other is is there also a gap between the technical and the technology and the policy? Because maybe the framework of operating Internet is technology issues. But that's not enough for us because using a human being using the technology. Technology is technology, but it is a human being using the technology. The

philosophy and the social things is necessary. I think it's my
recipe.
     >> Paula Deen.
     >> AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's not's to divide social and
technical. The bicycle, apparently as we know it, most
decisions of other parties. But you take the decision so it's
safer. Safety overcomes efficiency and this is why we have
bicycle as it is. We have social elements. We have social
elements.
     >> MODERATOR: What was said was very well articulated.
The distinctions between technical and social values are
blurred. In a sense, technical principles lead to a certain
social value. For example, the technical principles of
interoperability leads to global Internet, at which point the
social value, the Internet being global, because more important
are the means by which it was achieved becomes less important.
     So if there is some other way by which the Internet can be
kept global without the principle of interoperability, then it
is important to preserve the global needs of the Internet. I
think we have to look at it as a whole, not by bifurcating
technical values and social values. I think it leads to certain
social value.
     >> JEREMY MALCOLM: If we are talking about social, I think
it was a bit of a landmark of having a multi-stakeholder as to
whatever the core values that we want to see preserved on the
Internet. That's a step towards the -- into a formal agreement
that is a baseline going forward.
     Also, I do think that the technical values do come from a
particular social context. Engineers who developed Internet
were from a particular social strata. They were concentrated in
develop countries. They worked at universities. They had a
particular kind of free market outlook in many ways. And so
that did inform them in a way that they're designed, the
principles that they build the network on. All I was trying to
say in differentiating between the technical and the social is
bearing in mind what we're talking about because if we're
talking about things that are things that are built into
Internet protocols and standards, then that's a very different
thing than talking about we want open and global access. I
still think it's useful to keep that in the back of our minds
when they're talking about core Internet values.
     >> MODERATOR: We are -- she is of the view it has to be
dynamic and it cannot be inoperable. What do you feel about
that?
     >> JEREMY MALCOLM: At some point you get to the place
where it's not even the Internet. Where that is granted social
values to go changing, where is debatable. The Facebook service

where you get access to some of the Internet, at what point does that remain on the Internet if you can access 30% of the Internet at all? Is it still the Internet? If you can access 90%, is that still the Internet? That's the interesting question how far can we move these principles or values until all we're left with is reliant?

>> PAUL WILSON: Cheryl was trying to avoid. Network neutrality is a good example. There has never been pure network neutrality. Internet network engineering provides the different areas of traffic. Instead of making every user make the user fetch the data from a certain place, so if you were to absolutely require network neutrality with no differentiation, then you would actually be asked something unrealistic. I actually observed in many of the Internet Governance principles that there might be a few examples there that may be tested somehow. To work out what it's really practical need.

>> MODERATOR: I would completely agree on net neutrality on those topics that net neutrality populate and so on. So these are actually topics that require a dynamic -- the idea is that there is something else. We have not named it yet what it is. There is something else that cannot be altered: the principles of public good. Yes, that's good. Public good meaning -- Paul, you put some of your closing remarks and briefly conclude.

>> YU-CHUANG-KUEK: I'll take one for the team. There is probably as many questions if everything was in a neat package and we're able to solve all the problems, it would probably mean that either -- well, it would probably mean we haven't been thoughtful enough in thinking through the problems, but more importantly a lot of us would be left unemployed after a session like this. So it's good that we're walking away with problems still.

I just wanted to respond to your question because nobody responded to it. That was in relation to question one. My response is that, yes, there is still a gap currently. However, in an ideal situation and we are very rarely in ideal situations in this world, in an ideal situation, it should be no, there is no gap.

In summary I thought this was a very educational session.
(Laughter)

>> PAUL WILSON: I think my only remark would be, again, what I said earlier about the fact that the Internet has delivered a great deal of good to the world that I think we recognize that has come from a place which we could take granted and we do need and you don't really know what you've got until it's done. There's no model and no test data. In that sense, while it's a very robust environment, and I don't want to claim

that it's not and that it's at great and dire risk right here and now, I think we do need to have our eyes opened together and be careful that we're treading sort of wisely.

>> JEREMY MALCOLM: To the extent that there is -- if core Internet values, as the coalition is trying to say, and I don't know if it is, but if it's trying to say we should preserve them, then that's a conservative outlook. There's nothing wrong with that. You can take that position because it's safe. And you don't see too many changes. But I don't think that those who disagree with that are necessarily wrong. If we want to see some changes made to the Internet core values, then we have made the case for that. We can make a good enough case for that and convince others that these changes may be to the ultimate benefit of the users and the public good. I don't think we should say any of these correlates are (?)

>> MODERATOR: Thank you.

(Laughter)

I have to find words to express what you said. In a sense, if you're talking about certain things, certain values that need the discussion, I'm talking about a point beyond that. After the discussion, after we discuss on the side that okay this needs to be changed, this needs to be altered, what remains are the values we would call core values. At that point those values will remain unalterable. This is just a notion. It's a very, very abstract exercise. It will take time. It requires a lot of clarity

What we have the Internet is enormously valuable. The moment we lose a part of it, it no longer becomes Internet. It's no longer Internet. On the question as to at what level, at what point the Internet ceases to be Internet? At 90 percent, I would say they drop 100 from the Internet. If one country drops the Internet, the remaining Internet is not Internet. What we have is enormously valuable. We haven't experienced that. We have to do everything it takes to preserve it

We'll let Cheryl have last word if she's here. Cheryl?

>> She said to thank the rest of the panel to engage and also that she welcomes our ongoing discussion on the essential issues.

(Applause)

>> MODERATOR: Thank you, everyone. Thank you. Thank you.

(Adjourned)

***

totally verbatim record of the proceedings.
                              ***