



ICANN, WSIS and us:

-- the Role of AtLarge

ALAC Workshop on WSIS

Oct 29, 2003

ICANN Tunisia

Izumi Aizu

*Asia Network Research/***GLOCOM**

<izumi@anr.org>



My participation to ICANN so far

- **1996: GLOCOM sponsored a Panel on Internet governance at INET Montreal**
- **1998 participated IFWP Steering Committee**
 - **APIA as the only legal entity from Asia**
 - **Sent comments to USG**
 - **Participated all IFWP meetings, chaired WG on Membership**
 - **Hosted IFWP in Singapore**
 - **GLOCOM meeting with Ira Magaziner in Tokyo**
- **Convey voices from Asia**
 - **1999 MAC to establish membership structure**
 - **2000 Election, Study in 2001 as NAIS**
 - **2002 "reform", 2003 became ALAC**

WSIS

World Summit on the Information Society

- **Proposed by ITU, hosted as UN Summit**
 - Geneva, Dec 03; Tunisia, Nov 03
- **Adopt Declaration and Plan of Actions**
 - Governmental negotiation, with Private sector, Civil Society/NGO participate as "observers"
 - Head of States to endorse
 - No legally binding power, but politically yes
- **Many "Side events" to take place**
- **Why summit on Information Society ?**
 - Development and ICT
 - How to deal with Digital Divide?
 - Social impacts of ICTs getting larger
 - UN reform? (undercurrent)



WSIS Preparatory Process:

- '02 UN General Assembly Resolution
- July 02 – PrepCom1 (Geneva)
 - Regional meetings: Africa, Europe, Asia-Pacific, Arab, Latin America, West Asia
- Feb 03 – PrepCom2 (Geneva)
- July 03 – Inter-sessional meeting (Paris)
- Sep 03 – PrepCom3 (Geneva)
- Nov 03 – PrepCom3A (Geneva)



ICANN became a big issue

- Symbolic entity for Internet Governance
- Civil Society/NGO raising concerns:
 - Not open enough to citizens, critical to the ICANN “reform” process undermining AtLarge
- Governments arguing:
 - Direct government regulation vs. self-regulation by private sector (industry/civil society) on “Public Policy” issues
 - China, South Africa, Brazil, Egypt, Mali... asking:
 - Change USG control of the overall framework including the Root servers into “intergovernmental” body
 - ccTLDs in their countries under their sovereign rights
 - (GAC not sufficient)



Negotiation around Declaration

Original language (March 03):

[44. Management of Internet names and addresses:

Internet governance must be multilateral, democratic and transparent, taking into account the needs of the public and private sectors as well as those of the civil society, and respecting multilingualism. The coordination responsibility for root servers, domain names, and Internet Protocol (IP) address assignment should rest with a suitable **international, inter-governmental** organization. The policy authority for country code top-level-domain names (ccTLDs) should be the **sovereign right of countries.**]



July Intersessional meeting (Paris)

WG discussion/negotiation:

- **Through “intergovernmental organization(s)”**
 - **China, South Africa, Brazil, India**
 - **Private sector led:**
 - **EU, Canada, Australia, USA, Japan**
- **It seemed that they have reached a consensus language, but the chair came up with a different version, EU and others protested against that version**

Final Draft in July

[44. International Internet management:

The international management of the Internet should be democratic, multilateral, transparent and participative with the full involvement of the governments, intergovernmental organizations, private sector and civil society. This management should encompass both technical and policy issues.

Final Draft in July (cont'd)

While recognizing that the private sector has an important role in the development of Internet at the technical level, **and will continue to take a lead role**, the fast development of internet as the basis of information society requires that governments, take a lead role, in partnership with all the other stakeholders, in developing and coordinating policies of the public interests related to stability, security, competition, freedom of use, protection of individual rights and privacy, sovereignty, and equal access for all, among all the other aspects, through appropriate **[intergovernmental/international] organizations.**

Original Draft prepared for PrepCom3 (September)

**42. [Internet issues of an international nature related to public policies should be coordinated:
(Alternatives:)**

- a)* between governments and other interested parties.**
- b)* through/by appropriate intergovernmental organizations under the UN framework.**
- c)* as appropriate on an intergovernmental basis.**
- d)* through/by appropriate international organizations.**
- e)* through appropriate and mutually agreed international organizations.]**



The dancing goes on... at PrepCom3:

a:USA (Only a), Australia, Mexico

a or d: EU, Norway, Senegal

**b:Mali, Mauritius, China, Uganda,
Brazil, Saudi Arabia, Zimbabwe**

d: Canada, Japan

- **Developed and Developing**
- ***Cancunization?***
- **Frustration and coherent position by many developing countries**





Chair proposal (cont'd)

- iii) Development and deployment of a broad-based multilingual domain and host name solution that is compatible with the current DNS architecture,
 - iv) Coordination and implementation of the multilingual domain name strategy with country code registry interested in implementing multilingual domain name capabilities in their top level domain names.
- 2) Governments are encouraged to
- i) Establish national and regional Internet Exchange Centers
 - ii) Manage their respective country code top level domain name (ccTLD)
 - iii) Promote awareness on the use of the Internet





What are the real issues around ICANN?

Internet Governance entered into the mainstream of the international politics – and ICANN became the symbolic object whether you like it or not

What is the most legitimate way to manage the global resources of Internet?

There are no consensus (yet) on its principles and processes

Key question: Who controls the Root? ICANN, USG or Internet community?

Controlling the Root, by Milton Muller

USG and ICANN need to show the clear intention and Roadmap to “Internationalize” the management of the root and related resources



Challenges

**Governments need to understand aspects of technologies
Technologists also need to understand aspects of
(international) politics**

**And we need to establish mutual understanding with
appropriate fora**

Insuring the public involvement, but how?

Indirect approach:

Government representing the people

Direct approach:

ICANN to implement it as a part of its core function

Is current AtLarge framework sufficient?

NO!!



WSIS – to be continued:

- **PrepCom3A Nov 10-14, Geneva**
 - **Subject to resources availability**
- **Informal consultation ongoing**
- **High-level negotiation?, Dec7-9, Geneva**
- **Summit Dec 10-12, Geneva**
- **2004: PrepCom process again?**
 - **And/or Create a Task Force in other venue?**
- **2005: Summit in Tunisia, here!**



Why users need to participate?

- **Let the technologist/biz take care?**
- **Governments/int'l organizations regulate and manage?**
- **Where is the users voices and inputs, who are affected?**
 - **WhoIs and SiteFinder shows good cases**
- **Check and balance**
- **In Global Governance framework?**



But how do users participate?

- **Direct involvement in decision making**
- **Involvement in Policy development process (not decision making)**
- **Indirect advice, inputs only**
- **Through nation states,**



Asia-Pacific Region

Unt. Arab Emirat.	Micronesia (FS)	Korea (DPR)	Nepal
Afghanistan	Georgia	Korea (R)	Nauru
Armenia	Hong Kong	Kuwait	Niue
Australia	Indonesia	Kazakhstan	New Zealand
Azerbaijan	Israel	Lao (PDR)	Oman
Bangladesh	India	Lebanon	Papua New Guin.
Bahrain	Iraq	Sri Lanka	Philippines
Brunei	Iran, Islamic	Marshall Islands	Pakistan
Darussalam	Republic of	Myanmar	Palestinian Ter.
Bhutan	Jordan	Mongolia	Palau
Cook Islands	Japan	Macao	Qatar
China	Kyrgyzstan	Maldives	Saudi Arabia
Cyprus	Cambodia	Malaysia	Solomon Islands
Fiji	Kiribati	Norfolk Island	Singapore



Asia-Pacific Region

Syrian Arab Rep.	Cocos Islands		
Thailand	Christmas Island		
Tajikistan	Heard/McDonald		
Tokelau	Islands		
Timor-Leste	Taiwan		
Turkmenistan	Antarctica		
Tonga			
Turkey			
Tuvalu			
Uzbekistan			
Viet Nam			
Vanuatu			
Samoa			
Yemen			



アジアのユーザーにとっての課題

- 国際ドメインネームの導入
- 新 gTLD の導入
- WHOIS データベースの個人情報とプライバシー
- ENUM : 電話番号のドメインネームへのマッピング
- IPv6 導入 ?
- 国別 TLD の管理体制問題
 - 自由化、政府の関与...



個人で本当に参加できるの？

- 個人ユーザーを代表するのは誰？
 - 「個人」を理解している<専門家>が必要
 - 経済学者 = 公平競争、資源配分
 - 法律家 = 社会的公正、権利用語
 - 消費者団体
 - ネティズン
 - 政府（公益の代表）、産業界（顧客）の協力も不可欠



ICANN AtLarge今後の予定

- ICANN チュニジア会議 10月27-31日
- ICANN ローマ会議 04年3月2 - 6日
- APRICOT2004 KL 04年2月18 - 27日
- ICANN KL会議 04年7月19 - 23日
- ICANN ケープタウン会議 2004年12月1 - 5日

- RALOをいつまでにつくる？



新しいNGOが必要？

- ネットのガバナンスの国際活動
 - ネットのガバナンス = 市民社会の参加が必然
 - 民間業界の「自主規制」になればなるほど
 - 途上国との国際協力
- 国内でもガバナンスが必要に
 - ドメイン名、IPアドレスは「独占」？
 - プライバシー（相互監視の時代にどうする？）
 - ウィルス、スパムの被害は？
 - テクノコミュニティーだけに任せるのではなく

NGO/CSOの課題

- 国際ガバナンスにどう参加する？
- 自らのガバナンスは
- 参加する「権利」と「実力」（資金は？）



グローバルガバナンス 新たな原理が必要？

- 市民社会<ネティズン>の位置？
- 相互協力を可能とする原理は？
 - <自律・分散システム>？
- 多元的な価値観：多数は多数のまま
で？



アジアでALをどうつくるか

- ALSの立ち上げが先決
 - 既存のグループ：ISOC支部、ユーザーグループ・・・
 - 新規グループ？：JAPAN ICANN Forum再構成？
- RALOの形成へ
 - 2カ国以上、3団体以上のALSで構成、ICANNとMoU
- 資金はどうするの？
 - 現在はボランティア、、とても続かない!
- なぜALに参加する必要があるの？



新たな制度設計 / 分析が必要？

- 現実に、どの制度ならどういうメリット・デメリットがあるのか
- 移行コストは？
 - 現在のテクノエリート主体
 - ネット業界の主体性アップ
 - 既存国際機関に移転
 - 枠組変更 = 国際組織の創設

Thank you and See you online
ご清聴ありがとうございました

会津 泉
国際大学GLOCOM
アジアネットワーク研究所
<izumi@anr.org>

