

# /1net

## **Summary of discussions**

(26 October 2013 - 30 January 2014)

The purpose of this document is two-fold:

1. To provide a concise summary of discussions that have taken place on the /1net mailing list since its inception.
2. To distill the list's wide-ranging content into a form that will help multiple conversations move toward conclusion or resolution.

To that end, there are three sections:

1. A chronological summary of the evolution of the mailing list
2. A list of proposed issues for discussion, based on conversations, expressed intent and a range of other factors made clear below
3. A list of topic categories based on posts

All postings to the /1net list have been reviewed, including information linked to within postings, e.g. documents or articles that subsequently form a basis of discussion.

<b>Chronological summary .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Proposed issues.....</b>	<b>7</b>
Explanation of topic factors .....	7
Brazil meeting.....	8
Multistakeholder model .....	9
Cooperation and coordination.....	10
ICANN and IANA .....	10
/1net .....	11
Surveillance and security .....	12
Principles and definitions.....	13
Others .....	14
Content.....	14
Privacy .....	14
Freedom of expression.....	15
Human rights.....	15
IPv6.....	15
Access .....	15
Legislation.....	15
IGF .....	15
<b>Topic categories .....</b>	<b>15</b>

# Chronological summary

The list was opened at the end of October 2013<sup>1</sup> and included a small group of individuals who set themselves the task of developing the basic structure and approach of /1net.

The group concerned itself with issues of semantics (was it an "initiative" or a "dialogue"?), naming proposals (1net? gnet? What tagline? What website address?)<sup>2</sup>, and how to develop the group (a steering group made up of members of the commonly accepted "stakeholder groups")<sup>3</sup>.

As the creation of the group had been proposed publicly there was interest beyond the small number of people on the mailing list. Within a very short period of time the group reported that others were approaching them, frustrated and suspicious of what was taking place out of sight.

## Website launch

The group launched a website (at 1net.org) to provide information<sup>4</sup>. Following an official announcement about a widely anticipated meeting in Brazil, talk turned to what the newly named /1net group could and should do in preparation for it<sup>5</sup>.

Around the same time as a preparatory meeting was held between organizers of the Brazil meeting and members of the Internet community, the list was opened up to a broader group of people.

People who had previously expressed an interest were added to the list manually, and a link to the mailing list's online archive was promoted<sup>6</sup> while efforts went on behind the scenes to transition the mailing list to a permanent home on the same servers as the /1net website.

A number of new members to the list were openly skeptical and suspicious<sup>7</sup>. Several questioned /1net's legitimacy and aggressively pushed for information about its intentions while also seeking to influence the group's direction by writing and engaging extensively.

## Issues

Over the next month, there were several main threads of discussion:

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://nro.net/pipermail/i-coordination/2013-October/000000.html>

<sup>2</sup> <https://nro.net/pipermail/i-coordination/2013-October/000009.html>

<sup>3</sup> <https://nro.net/pipermail/i-coordination/2013-October/000040.html>

<sup>4</sup> <https://nro.net/pipermail/i-coordination/2013-November/000043.html>

<sup>5</sup> <https://nro.net/pipermail/i-coordination/2013-November/000077.html>

<sup>6</sup> <https://nro.net/pipermail/i-coordination/2013-November/000214.html>

<sup>7</sup> <https://nro.net/pipermail/i-coordination/2013-November/000083.html>

- Representation and roles
- Updates on the Brazil meeting
- Ongoing efforts to define and refine what /1net was and should do
- Analysis of various Internet governance related articles
- Identification of topics for /1net to work on

Most contentious was the issue of representation and roles. Both inter-party and cross-party discussions saw some members putting voice to their concerns and suspicions. This focus was strengthened when it became clear the organizers of the Brazil meeting intended /1net as an organization to adopt a central coordination role for non-government actors.

In order to make progress, the different "stakeholder groups" were asked to self-organize and put forward names for the /1net steering committee (leading to some debate about whether such groups were valid and what role the steering committee should have)<sup>8</sup>.

Discussion occasionally threatened to become too self-referential and at times the list was unhelpfully dominated by a small number of individuals. It was also targeted by a troll<sup>9</sup>.

However ongoing preparations for the Brazil meeting, as well as a steady stream of Internet governance articles<sup>10 11</sup> and thought-provoking posts<sup>12 13</sup> (some forwarded from other mailing lists<sup>14</sup>) have helped the /1net mailing list to remain a dynamic and interesting forum.

## Transition

In mid-December, the list was transitioned to /1net's servers, without issue<sup>15</sup>. Sign-up was simplified, leading to a jump in subscribers, and posts.

A number of problems started to emerge as the group both expanded and sought to make progress:

- The frequency of posts made it increasingly time-consuming to follow discussions
- The linear mailing list, combined with numerous concurrent conversations, meant it was difficult to capture useful information or move discussions forward in a useful direction<sup>16</sup>

<sup>8</sup> <https://nro.net/pipermail/i-coordination/2013-November/000124.html>

<sup>9</sup> <https://nro.net/pipermail/i-coordination/2013-December/000401.html>

<sup>10</sup> <https://nro.net/pipermail/i-coordination/2013-December/000455.html>

<sup>11</sup> <https://nro.net/pipermail/i-coordination/2013-December/000573.html>

<sup>12</sup> <https://nro.net/pipermail/i-coordination/2013-December/000263.html>

<sup>13</sup> <https://nro.net/pipermail/i-coordination/2013-December/000513.html>

<sup>14</sup> <https://nro.net/pipermail/i-coordination/2013-December/000586.html>

<sup>15</sup> <https://nro.net/pipermail/i-coordination/2013-December/000754.html>

<sup>16</sup> <https://nro.net/pipermail/i-coordination/2013-December/000413.html>

- The need to meet tight deadlines for selecting representatives coincided with increasing numbers of people becoming aware of the process, some of whom felt they were not sufficiently represented

A number of changes were proposed<sup>17 18</sup> to improve efficiency.

Meanwhile, the expert knowledge of mailing list members continued to be revealed, with issues ranging from the history of prior Internet governance discussions<sup>19</sup>, to the decision-making procedures within different fields and cultures<sup>20</sup>, to the functioning of core Internet systems<sup>21</sup>.

### **Making sense of it all**

In the New Year, a graphical representation of discussions up until that point<sup>22</sup> helped provide a framework of understanding of /1net and led to an increase in posts that sought to differentiate and define specific issues for further discussion.

The selection of Steering Committee members led to a first meeting and new mailing list<sup>23</sup>. The agenda for the first meeting<sup>24</sup> contained many of the ongoing questions on the list, including:

- The role of the Steering Committee
- How to structure the mailing list more effectively
- The role /1net is to take for the Brazil meeting

A series of questions to ask the organizers of the Brazil meeting with respect to /1net's role were produced<sup>25</sup> and sent.

A second meeting of the Steering Committee the following week continued the discussion. It was noted again that there need to be active efforts to improve the efficiency of the main mailing list (a periodic summary of discussions was proposed). An update on the Brazil meeting preparation was provided, but at the same time it was agreed that /1net needed to structure itself to function beyond the April meeting. Website improvements and a new forum mechanism were also outlined<sup>26</sup>.

---

<sup>17</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/discuss/2014-January/000497.html>

<sup>18</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/discuss/2014-January/001308.html>

<sup>19</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/discuss/2013-December/000339.html>

<sup>20</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/discuss/2013-December/000064.html>

<sup>21</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/discuss/2014-January/001330.html>

<sup>22</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/discuss/2014-January/000535.html>

<sup>23</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/steercom/2014-January/date.html#start>

<sup>24</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/steercom/2014-January/000066.html>

<sup>25</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/steercom/2014-January/000112.html>

<sup>26</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/steercom/2014-January/000118.html>

On the main mailing list, continued efforts to define /1net's role began to achieve general agreement<sup>27</sup>. And a concerted effort to develop a way for the list to work productively on specific topics<sup>28</sup> helped moved things forward.

An undercurrent of tension remains however. The launch of the Brazil meeting website at 'brmeeting.br' reignited concerns that important decisions were being with sufficient notice<sup>29</sup>. Concerns about aggressive or personally abusive behavior on the list continue to surface<sup>30</sup>, as does argument over representation<sup>31</sup>.

Ongoing preparations for the Brazil meeting continue to spur discussion, as did the announcement of a new Commission that would look into the issue of Internet governance<sup>32</sup>.

Two significant threads have emerged. One concerns the possibility or otherwise of multiple Internet roots and has brought out a significant exchange of views and knowledge over the technical functioning of the Internet<sup>33</sup>. The other covers the political dimensions of the existing agreements that surround how the Internet's root is currently managed<sup>34</sup>.

Finally, a reasoned endorsement of the Montevideo Declaration by a Regional Internet Registry<sup>35</sup>, and discussion regarding an interview with Edward Snowden<sup>36</sup> helped bring the list back around to the original reasons for its creation.

---

<sup>27</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/discuss/2014-January/000671.html>

<sup>28</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/discuss/2014-January/001325.html>

<sup>29</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/discuss/2014-January/001119.html>

<sup>30</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/discuss/2014-January/000830.html>

<sup>31</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/discuss/2014-January/001278.html>

<sup>32</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/discuss/2014-January/001519.html>

<sup>33</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/discuss/2014-January/001652.html>

<sup>34</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/discuss/2014-January/001433.html>

<sup>35</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/discuss/2014-January/001620.html>

<sup>36</sup> <http://1net-mail.1net.org/pipermail/discuss/2014-January/001642.html>

# Proposed issues

A frequent topic of conversation on the mailing list has been the identification of specific issues that /1net can and should tackle.

The list below, ordered in general priority, has been developed from the mailing list and is intended to serve as a start-point and practical summary for /1net work.

---

## Explanation of topic factors

	<b>Low</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>High</b>
<b>Importance</b>	Unlikely to be impacted by /1net	Of relevance	A core interest
<b>Interest</b>	Limited discussion on the topic	Some discussion, or discussion confined to a subset of participants	Lengthy and broad discussion
<b>Agreement</b>	Most statements challenged by others	Occasional agreement, frequent disputes	General agreement with occasional argument
<b>Resolution</b>	Topic not within /1net's influence; solution unlikely	Interest in reaching agreement despite challenges	Determination to work together to find solution

---

## Brazil meeting

Topics, approach, desired end result

Importance: High

Agreement: Medium

Interest: High

Resolution: High

The Global Multistakeholder Meeting on the Future of Internet Governance will take place on 23 and 24 April 2014 in Sao Paulo, Brazil. More information at <http://brmeeting.br/>

/Inet is an official partner of the conference and has been asked by the hosts to supply the names of people who will sit on key committees deciding the meeting's approach and agenda.

Additionally, there is the hope and expectation that /Inet will act as a way for non-government actors to develop common topics and views to present at the conference.

Some view this work as /Inet's main reason for existing, at least in the short term. As a result, every aspect of the meeting has come under careful consideration and discussion.

Among the main sub-topics are:

- How large the agenda should be and which topics it should cover
- Who should be chosen to represent their stakeholder group
- How events should be reported back (both planning conferences and the main conference)
- How the conference should fit in with existing organizations and upcoming conferences e.g. the IGF, the ITU's Plenipot
- What a desired end result would look like

The issues that have been most widely referenced and accepted as being a good foundation for discussions have been: the Montevideo Declaration<sup>37</sup>; and President Rousseff's address to the United Nations<sup>38</sup>.

---

<sup>37</sup> <http://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-07oct13-en.htm>

<sup>38</sup> [http://gadebate.un.org/sites/default/files/gastatements/68/BR\\_en.pdf](http://gadebate.un.org/sites/default/files/gastatements/68/BR_en.pdf)



## Multistakeholder model

### Advantages, limits, evolution of the decision-making model

Importance: High

Agreement: Medium

Interest: High

Resolution: Medium

There is general agreement that the multistakeholder model of decision-making that has been developed by the Internet community in both ICANN and the IGF needs to be strengthened.

The model has been pushed at international conferences on Internet governance, dating back to the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS). And it has been defended and promoted by some governments - most notably the United States - in recent years, particularly at the World Conference on International Telecommunications (WCIT) in 2012. However, there is a sense that many governments have not fully embraced the multistakeholder model.

Revelations by former NSA employee Edward Snowden are widely believed to have led to a loss of trust in existing governance structures.

As such, many on the list feel that without an active review and defense of the multistakeholder model, governments may increasingly pull decision-making powers over the Internet into their sole domain.

The appearance of the term "multilateral" in a key speech to the United Nations by Brazil's president<sup>39</sup>, the compound term "multi-stakeholder/international" in draft documents produced by the European Commission<sup>40</sup>, and a note questioning the validity of the multistakeholder model in a paper produced for India's National Security Council Secretariat (NSCS)<sup>41</sup> have all raised concerns that the model itself is under question.

There is a general feeling on /Inet that the multistakeholder model needs to be reviewed and improved. At the same time, its advantages should be relayed clearly and concisely, particularly to governments.

As a neutral forum focused on Internet governance issues, /Inet may be the best vehicle for such a process.

---

<sup>39</sup> [http://gadebate.un.org/sites/default/files/gastatements/68/BR\\_en.pdf](http://gadebate.un.org/sites/default/files/gastatements/68/BR_en.pdf)

<sup>40</sup> <http://www.internetgovernance.org/2013/12/06/europe-at-a-tipping-point-leaked-ec-document-stirs-internet-governance-controversy/>

<sup>41</sup> <http://www.thehindu.com/sci-tech/technology/internet/article5434095.ece>

## **Cooperation and coordination**

Improving how information is shared and decisions made

Importance: High

Agreement: Medium

Interest: High

Resolution: Medium

There is widespread agreement that there should be greater and more effective cooperation and coordination between the groups that are responsible for different aspects of the Internet.

Despite years of public pronouncements in favor of cooperation, there remains an ongoing dispute over how the Internet should be governed, broadly reflecting a philosophical difference between centralized and decentralized decision-making, and most commonly summarized as a struggle between ICANN and the ITU.

The WSIS process and Internet Governance Forum (IGF) - itself the result of WSIS - are sometimes framed in terms of competing interests. Additionally, the phrase "enhanced cooperation" has been the source of years of tension and disagreement and in part led to a split between governments that was tangibly reflected in the signing/rejection of an agreement developed at WCIT in December 2012.

Many on the mailing list highlighted the need for non-government groups to cooperate more effectively with governments. One thread questioned the assigned "roles" developed in the Tunis Agenda.

The Internet's technical bodies have been meeting periodically for a number of years under the banner of the "I\*" or "I-star" organizations, but those meetings are small and limited to the executive level.

In addition, posters from all stakeholder groups reported limited understanding and exposure of the issues beyond their own networks. Mainstream business groups and civil society organizations show little interest. One poster noted a shared interest, but no crossover, between Internet governance groups and those involved with the World Trade Organization (WTO).

If /1net is to achieve its key goal of ensuring all voices are accounted for when deciding upon the future of the Internet, there will need to be sustained efforts to help different groups communicate and work with one another toward agreed, common goals.

## **ICANN and IANA**

Internationalization, globalization, moving beyond the USG

Importance: High

Agreement: Low

Interest: High

Resolution: Low

ICANN remains the most discussed and analyzed Internet governance topic and institution - to the extent that posters frequently complain it is taking precedence over other equally important issues.

Related and linked to ICANN are the IANA functions; specifically the ability to add to and edit the root zone file.

There are many issues with ICANN: how it makes decisions, how different groups are represented, and how effective it is at following its rules and enforcing contracts. But the most significant aspect of ICANN and IANA that has been considered on the list is the influence of the US government.

ICANN is based in the United States and is subject to US law. Its main accountability mechanism is through an "Affirmation of Commitments" signed only with the US government. And much of ICANN's authority stems from running the IANA functions - which are a bundled contract awarded solely by the United States government.

Despite extensive discussions about the limited ability of the US government to have a real-world impact on either ICANN or IANA, even seasoned Internet governance observers argue that there needs to be a revision of the US government's role following the NSA/Snowden revelations.

The much-anticipated meeting in Brazil in April 2014 was set up in part to review US government influence on the Internet. Likewise, the Montevideo Statement by the I\* organizations was clear in its desire to make both ICANN and IANA more global. The European Commission has been explicit for some years about its desire to change current arrangements.

There have been numerous efforts - many by ICANN and the US government - to review and update the situation. But in each case the status quo has been retained, leading to renewed calls for change.

It is possible that /1net as a neutral body and with its main driver being to maintain a single, interoperable Internet could help develop ways to evolve the existing arrangements to the general agreement and benefit of all.

## **/1net**

What it is, what it stands for, how it should work

Importance: High

Agreement: Medium

Interest: High

Resolution: High

Unsurprisingly for an organization that was created in short order, without a defined charter, and with lofty expectations, a significant amount of the discussion on the /1net mailing list has been about the organization itself.

Many attempts to explain what it is have appeared on the mailing list:

"A tool that allows us to rally around critical elements, principles and maybe proposals toward the evolution of a multistakeholder approach to Internet governance/cooperation."

"A neutral, focused initiative to discuss selected Internet issues with the intent of working towards actionable collaborative solutions."

"An inclusive and open venue supporting discussion of Internet governance matters for all those interested."

Among the issues that have been discussed are:

- The degree of openness and mutual respect that should be adopted
- How different groups should be represented
- What processes should be used to make decisions
- Whether the mailing list should be moderated and/or split
- What documents should be posted
- How discussion can be captured meaningfully
- The long term goals of the initiative
- Why /1net is needed at all

These discussions have helped people think about the value /1net can bring and have allowed for critical analysis of proposals. However the mailing list has shown its inherent limits. It is necessary for /1net to find a way to formally define itself in a way that those inside and out can easily understand and support.

The organization needs a mission statement, a clear set of goals and an agreed structure to fulfill its ambitions.

## **Surveillance and security**

Strengthening the Internet's infrastructure against all threats

Importance: Medium

Agreement: High

Interest: Medium

Resolution: Medium

The main driving force behind /1net's creation - as well the Brazil meeting and Montevideo Statement - was fallout from a series of revelations over the United States' National Security Agency (NSA) online surveillance.

Most striking were:

- Tapping the data centers of key Internet companies including Google, Facebook, Microsoft and Yahoo ("Prism")
- Tapping fibre-optic cables to access Internet traffic ("Tempora")
- Breaking and undermining encryption protocols
- Intercepting huge quantities of web traffic in Latin America, including the emails of the presidents of Brazil and Mexico
- Monitoring the online habits of individuals it considered a threat

There have been a large number of impacts as a result of the revelations:

- A loss of trust in Internet governance structures, especially those with United States government involvement
- A drive by some governments to pull Internet issues under a government-only or government-led mandate
- A group of the largest Internet companies calling for reform<sup>42</sup>
- Focus on the role of NSA employees within Internet technical bodies
- Focus on the need to add data encryption as a matter of course

Posters on /1net recognize the need for the broader Internet community - and the multistakeholder model - to be a key part in efforts to limit online surveillance, even though this was not an area of expertise for most.

Broader issues of Internet security were raised, such as the injection of fake BGP or DNS data, and the technical responses to them (DNSSEC, RPKI).

It will require significant and thoughtful policy discussions at both the technical and political level, and across organizations, to arrive at effective solutions. /1net could play a useful role in that exchange.

## Principles and definitions

What Internet governance means now and in the future

Importance: Medium

Agreement: Medium

Interest: Medium

Resolution: Low

---

<sup>42</sup> <http://reformgovernmentsurveillance.com/>

A stated aim of the Brazil meeting is to create common Internet principles. That has sparked discussion of accepted norms first developed during the WSIS process just under a decade ago.

Also under review have been the large number of Internet principles produced by other organizations (the OECD<sup>43</sup>, G8<sup>44</sup>, EC Commissioner Neelie Kroes<sup>45</sup>, Council of Europe<sup>46</sup> and others).

A comparison of all such pronouncements by two researchers at the New America Foundation has been referred to frequently by /1net posters.

Extensive discussion has taken place around the Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG) and the Tunis Agenda (the summation of the World Summit on the Information Society), both from 2005.

Much of the conversation about WGIG has surrounded the definition that was arrived at for "Internet governance". In brief, the final definition was determined to be the result of compromises that some posters - including one or two that were in the small WGIG group - feel are no longer relevant.

Likewise, aspects of the Tunis Agenda - which has been used as a foundational text for Internet governance discussions over the past decade - came under scrutiny, particularly the concept of defined roles for different stakeholders.

While the discussion was informative and interesting, it was largely limited to academics and there was broader disagreement from the group over whether the topic of principles and definitions was something that /1net was best suited to address.

## Others

### Content

A wide range of content issues have been touched upon, including: child abuse images, spam, cybercrime, intellectual property protection.

### Privacy

Related in some respect to surveillance and Internet principles, policy discussions over privacy are active in both the US and Europe as they relate to online activity.

---

<sup>43</sup> <http://www.oecd.org/internet/innovation/48289796.pdf>

<sup>44</sup> <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2011deauville/2011-declaration-en.html>

<sup>45</sup> [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\\_SPEECH-11-605\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-11-605_en.htm)

<sup>46</sup> <https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=1835773>

## Freedom of expression

A constant consideration whenever discussion turns to how particular types of content or behavior can be limited or restricted online.

## Human rights

A topic that infuses all discussions at the inter-governmental level due to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights - one of the most significant and tangible achievements of the United Nations.

## IPv6

Moving people to the next generation of the Internet's protocols is a permanent pre-occupation of the technical community.

## Access

There are significant barriers for much of the world's population to get online.

## Legislation

How legal systems try to make sense of the conflicts that the Internet continues to produce can often serve as a focus on particular issues.

## IGF

What role the annual forum can play in Internet governance discussions and how /1net can work in concert with it.

# Topic categories

Based on an extensive analysis of the mailing list, the following categories have been identified as capturing its content most effectively.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Description</b>
/1net	Issues about /1net itself such as level of openness, approach, goals, decision-making mechanisms.
Access & Development	Conversation around access to the Internet and the online challenges faced by those not in the First World.
Balkanisation	Discussion over the risk of the one global Internet breaking up, and how to overcome them
Brazil	Discussions on and organization around the April 2014 Sao Paulo meeting

Content issues	Topics such as spam, child abuse images, intellectual property, copyright, crime
Cooperation & Coordination	Discussion over ways to help different organizations work together more effectively
Freedom of expression	Everything from US First Amendment Rights to protecting the voices of the globally dispossessed
Governance principles	The multiple Internet principles, WGIG definition of Internet governance, Tunis Agenda, and so on
Human rights	Protection of human rights online
ICANN & IANA	Conversations about both ICANN and/or IANA
IPv6	The future of IP addressing.
Legal & Regulatory	New or proposed regulation, legal judgments or disputes, or legal analysis of other topics.
Multistakeholder model	Many aspects of the decision-making model that the Internet world has innovated
Privacy	Protecting people's details online
Roles & Representation	Reviewing the different parts that people play and their authority to do so with Internet matters
Surveillance & Security	Concerns about abuse of the Internet's infrastructure, NSA/Snowden, DDoS, man-in-the-middle attacks etc
Technical	A catch-all topic for technical topics