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WTPF-IEG/1/11 (Rev.1)

**REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN ON**

**THE FIRST MEETING OF THE INFORMAL EXPERT GROUP (IEG)**

**20 June 2012**

The first meeting of the Informal Expert Group (IEG) for the World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum (WTPF) took place at ITU Headquarters in Geneva on 5 June 2012.

1. **Introductory remarks**
   1. The ITU Secretary-General, Dr. Hamadoun Touré opened by welcoming the participants. In his introductory remarks, he stressed that:
   * The World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum (WTPF) is different from other ITU meetings, as the outcome “opinions” are non-binding;
   * The 2011 Session of ITU Council decided by Decision 562 that WTPF-2013 would discuss all the issues raised in: Resolution 101 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010); Resolution 102 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010); and Resolution 133 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010).
   * ITU’s method of working is based on consensus, with a proven track record of many examples of resolving difficult technical and public policy issues.
   1. Dr. Touré highlighted the principles of multi-stakeholderism as one of the key outcomes of WSIS and stressed the relevance of these principles as a guiding framework for discussion at WTPF. Dr. Touré urged participants to avoid contradicting ITU’s existing mandate and activities, which are a matter for consideration of the Plenipotentiary and other ITU Conferences and Assemblies.
   2. Mr. Malcolm Johnson, the Director of the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau (TSB), pledged TSB’s support to facilitate the experts in their work and deliberations. Mr. François Rancy, Director of Radiocommunications Bureau (BR), wished the group every success in its work, noting that “he sees no reason why the Group cannot reach consensus on these important issues”.
   3. The Secretary-General noted that the Chairman of the IEG should be neutral, and proposed the nomination of Mr. Petko Kantchev from Bulgaria which was approved by the meeting.
   4. The Chairman, Mr. Kantchev thanked participants for their support. Mr. Kantchev observed that communications are becoming more complex and versatile. The Internet is now a basic commodity, embedded in many aspects of our lives, including the social and economic spheres. He therefore called for the IEG to look for pragmatic emerging solutions to the issues under consideration.

**2. Adoption of the Agenda and other organizational matters**

* 1. The [Agenda](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-WTPF13IEG1-C-0001/en) ([Doc. WTPF-IEG/1/1](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-WTPF13IEG1-C-0001/en)) was adopted. The Secretariat then outlined the timetable contained in the Secretary-General’s letter [Doc. DM12/1003](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-DM-CIR-01003/en). It is planned to hold WTPF-2013 back-to-back with the cluster of WSIS events, with a Strategic Dialogue on 13 May 2013. The Fifth WTPF will run 14-16 May 2013. A revised timetable will be submitted to Council in July in Council [Doc. C12/27E](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-CL-C-0027/en) seeking Council’s approval for the dates and location for WTPF-2013.
  2. Some experts suggested that the second IEG meeting could last two days considering the amount of work lying ahead. The Secretariat clarified that arrangements are flexible and this is possible.
  3. In response to a query about the membership of the IEG, both Dr. Touré and Mr. Kantchev clarified that the IEG is open, balanced and transparent and participants who can help advance the debate are most welcome.

**3. Presentation of the Report of the Secretary-General**

* 1. ITU Secretariat presented the first draft of the Secretary-General’s Report, [WTPF-IEG/1/2](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-WTPF13PREP-R-0001/en). In response to the Secretary-General’s letter [Doc. DM12/1003](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-DM-CIR-01003/en), contributions had been received from the [United Kingdom](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=S12-WTPF13PREP-C&source=United%20Kingdom%20of%20Great%20Britain%20and%20Northern%20Ireland) and [ISOC](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=S12-WTPF13PREP-C&source=Internet%20Society) (before 9 March 2012) and the [Caribbean Telecommunications Union](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=S12-WTPF13PREP-C&source=Caribbean%20Telecommunications%20Union), [Costa Rica](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-WTPF13PREP-C-0006/en), [Montenegro](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=S12-WTPF13PREP-C&source=Montenegro%20(Republic%20of)) and [Saudi Arabia](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-WTPF13PREP-C-0005/en) (after 9 March 2012). These contributions were taken into account in developing the first draft of the Secretary-General’s Report, which presents a preliminary overview of the scope of WTPF-2013.
  2. The first draft of the report compiles list of topics contained in Plenipotentiary Resolutions 101, 102 and 133 (without including material on the subject matter of the topics themselves, which should be included in future drafts). Section 2.4.1 contains paragraphs highlighting some of the issues in relation to IP-based networks (Res. 101, Rev. Guadalajara 2010). Section 2.4.2 contains paragraphs highlighting some of the issues in relation to Res. 102 (Rev. Guadalajara 2010) and references to Tunis Agenda on the issues raised in this resolution. Section 2.4.3 contains paragraphs highlighting some of the issues in relation to Internationalized Domain Names (Res. 133, Rev. Guadalajara 2010). For readers’ convenience, a list of topics under consideration is presented in the Annex of the first draft of the Report.
  3. The Chair requested comments from the floor. It was suggested that non-discriminatory access to the Internet could be added in the second draft.

**4. Presentation of Written Contributions**

* 1. Contributions on the first draft of the Secretary-General’s Report were received by the Secretariat from [Brazil](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-WTPF13PREP-C-0009/en), the [Russian Federation](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-WTPF13PREP-C-0010/en), the [United States](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-WTPF13PREP-C-0007/en) and the [American Registry for Internet Numbers (ARIN)](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-WTPF13PREP-C-0008/en) (before 15 March 2012) and from the Internet Society (after 15 March 2012).
  2. In the absence of the delegate, the Secretariat drew delegates’ attention to the two additions proposed by the Russian Federation ([WTPF/IEG/1/3](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-WTPF13PREP-C-0010/en)), which are included in the second draft.
  3. Presenting [contribution IEG 1/4](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-WTPF13PREP-C-0009/en), the delegate from Brazil noted that ITU and its membership have been discussing Internet Governance for a long time. He presented the high-level principles developed by Brazil through a multi-stakeholder process, including: freedom, privacy and human rights; democracy and collaborative governance; universality; diversity; innovation; neutrality; unaccountability of the network; functionality, security and stability; standardization and interoperability, legal and regulatory environments. Brazil has three main objectives in presenting their contribution – to highlight the multi-stakeholder process involved; to encourage ITU to develop its own principles based on a participatory and inclusive process; and ask ITU membership for their views. In this regard, the theme “*Global Principles for the Governance and Use of the Internet”* was proposed as a possible theme for WTPF.
  4. The representative from ARIN presented [contribution IEG/1/5](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-WTPF13PREP-C-0008/en) seeking to develop the themes of WTPF-2013 and expressed their willingness to collaborate with all ITU’s membership.
  5. The representative from the U.S. presented its [contribution IEG 1/6](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-WTPF13PREP-C-0007/en) based on three central premises:
  + Resolutions 101, 102 and 133 speak to the fundamental value of the Internet as a platform for innovation, democracy, access to information and scientific progress, which grew within an environment facilitated by voluntary, decentralized and consensus-based processes.
  + IETF, ICANN and W3C have been central to the Internet’s growth. These organizations operate consistent with the multi-stakeholder model, so these organizations should be invited to participate in the preparations for the WTPF.
  + The U.S. proposes that the principal theme of WTPF-2013 should be the *“Development and Diffusion of ICT Globally*” and mentioned that they look forward to discussions with the group on this theme, and to the WTPF-2013 more broadly.
  1. The representative of the ISOC presented its [contribution IEG/1/7](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-WTPF13PREP-C-0011/en) and proposed that IXPs be the focus of the WTPF-2013, which is a good opportunity for debate on the multi-stakeholder model.
  2. The Chair noted that the issues for the WTPF-2013 should be based on Council Decision 562 and the resolutions from PP-10. The representative from the ITU Legal Unit concurred with this statement.

**5. Discussion on the Contributions**

* 1. Delegates welcomed the Brazilian contribution and noted similar governance principles under discussion by the EU. The importance of greater collaboration and co-existence were cited.
  2. Many noted active discussions on Internet Governance in various forums and cited that multi-stakeholderism is an important basic principle. Internet Governance is a multi-stakeholder process, with stakeholders taking their respective roles (Article 35, Tunis Agenda). Under multi-stakeholderism, each stakeholder should not try and do everything, but try to focus on those things where it can contribute most effectively. Collaboration and Coordination were recurring themes in the discussions. Many voiced their support for “*multi-stakeholderism”* as a possible theme for WTPF suggesting that the various issues could all be considered under this theme.
  3. While some experts expressed their intention to work on a focal theme for the WTPF, some others cautioned that the IEG stay within the Resolutions decided by Council, and we should follow the approach of previous WTPF.
  4. Another theme suggested was “*how do we develop an enabling environment for encouraging growth and development of the Internet*”.
  5. Enhanced cooperation was highlighted by some as an important issue for discussion. Some cautioned that the topic is already under discussion in other UN bodies and urged that duplication be avoided while discussing this topic. In response, it was stated that ECOSOC has requested that CSTD report to the General Assembly and the view was expressed that enhanced cooperation would not contradict CSTD’s work. The Chair clarified that CSTD processes will need to be considered, to make sure there are no contradictions, as all decisions are taken within the UN family.
  6. A few delegates called for a fresh look at the new Internet specifically with regard to public policy principles and asked universities to take a new, clean slate approach, rather than a patchwork approach. The need to maintain the conditions that support that innovation and interoperability and not to impose governance processes that may inhibit innovation was brought up during the discussion. The work of ITU and the Dedicated Group on the future Internet was acknowledged.
  7. Some of the questions of a procedural nature that arose included:
* Why a second version of the SG Report was released without IEG members having an opportunity to discuss the first version. The Chair said that the SG report was a live document and that comments could be integrated at a later time.
* How would IEG members’ collective views be integrated into the next version in order for the process not to be a “copy-paste” of individual contributions. The Chair said that there should not be “copy-paste” of individual contributions but the Report should reflect IEG discussions.
* Whether contributions had to de facto be relevant to Res. 101, 102 and 133. It was requested that comments and amendments be attributed to their source.
* Query about different versions and deadline dates, to which the Secretariat and Chair clarified that the various versions should be posted with easy to understand titles and versioning system. It was requested that revisions can be submitted in revision marks.
  1. The Secretariat clarified that: membership of the IEG is still open; deadlines are given in [Doc. DM12/1003](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-DM-CIR-01003/en) and WTPF-2013 will only discuss Res. 101, 102 and 133 per Council Decision 562. The Chair observed that he sees the Secretary-General’s Report as a living document to be digested and enriched, in several iterations with an easy to understand versioning system in place. The Secretariat will incorporate comments, and documents will be made available electronically before the next meeting.
  2. Delegates asked about the participation of the public and media at WTPF-2013, to which ITU Legal Unit responded that, based on the precedence and practice for previous WTPF, the public and media may attend, subject to the availability of infrastructure and logistics, but not participate in the meeting.

**6. Presentation of the preliminary Second Draft of the Report of the Secretary-General**

* 1. The Secretariat presented the preliminary [second draft of the Secretary-General’s report](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-WTPF13PREP-R-0002/en) ([WTPF-IEG/1/9](http://www.itu.int/md/S12-WTPF13PREP-R-0002/en)), including all comments received by 15 May 2012, posted on 1 June 2012. The report has been restructured to include additional material on the subject matter. Contributions have been clearly attributed. The content is based on factual information, with references provided.

**7. Discussion on the preliminary Second Draft**

* 1. One delegate raised questions on Table 2 including a typo, subscribers/subscriptions, handset shipments and broadband. The Chair noted that the differences between subscriber or subscriptions may partly arise due to multiple ownership of SIM cards. The Secretariat offered clarification of some of the data issues involved and committed to revise the Table.
  2. The work on IMSI Station Identifiers for multiple handsets was mentioned with multiple identifiers, pointing to pay-packets as the source of payment or subscriber identifiers.
  3. Some delegates noted that passages in this version relating to Internet naming and numbering were not factual and/or out of date. The Secretary-General and Chairman were encouraged to invite organizations with expertise on these subjects to participate and provide contributions..
  4. Some expressed concern over some of the conclusions on Internet naming and addressing. They stated that the needs based delegation model has been developed by the Internet community and has evolved as the current system of distribution. With regards to the argument that IPv4 address and migration to IPv6 may work against late entrants, they further clarified that there are policies in place that ensure that some blocks of IPv4 addresses will be available to new networks for many years to come.
  5. Many delegates noted that Correspondence Group 2 of the ITU IPv6 Working Group was formed to identify concerns and issues with the current IP address management system and that during its lifetime, CG 2 received no reports of any problems encountered with current IPv6 or IPv4 allocation mechanisms.
  6. It was also noted that ITU-T SG 2 also convened a Correspondence Group on IPv6, which received no inputs, so SG2 concluded their activity that bore those results.
  7. One delegate raised concerns over the statement about QoS on page 8, para (f), noting that IP-based networks may be able to provide for end-to-end QoS if they have been engineered to do so. The delegate also drew attention to section 2.3.3.2. para (d), stating that networks can use both IPv6 and IPv4.
  8. Another delegate concurred with the comments on QoS; the smooth migration of IPv4 to IPv6 is not compatible at layer 3, but all other layers are alright. In reference to Section 2.3.2, very few are aware of the charging models build into the Internet and their own ISPs. The Chair asked the two delegates to submit a joint contribution to the Secretariat for reflection in the report.

1. **Conclusion and other matters**
   1. The Chair asked delegates to submit their written comments to the Secretariat in order to understand better their verbal comments, which shall be attributed in the next version of the second report.
   2. Some delegates noted that internal approval and coordination processes are needed, before they can provide comments on the report. A deadline of 25 June was set for submission of comments by experts on the preliminary Second Draft of the Secretary-General’s Report.
   3. Some delegates requested an additional one-day meeting in October to advance the work of the IEG. Delegates agreed that the meeting last two days, as there may be many documents.
   4. The Secretariat clarified that the Chairman’s report will be available by 12 June 2012, and will contain revised timelines including that for the October meeting.
   5. Please note that a revised timeline is proposed in Annex 1 for comments.
   6. Bearing in mind that in accordance with Council 2011 Decision 562, the Policy Forum would discuss all the issues raised in Resolutions 101, 102 and 133 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010), the suggested broad themes (under which these issues could be raised) emerging out of discussions at the 1st IEG meeting are listed again below for the reader’s convenience:

* The multistakeholder model of the management of the Internet
* Global Principles for the Governance and Use of the Internet
* Development and Diffusion of ICT Globally
* How to develop an enabling environment for encouraging growth and development of the Internet.

**Annex 1: Revised planned schedule for the preparatory process of the fifth WTPF**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **9 March 2012** | Deadline for membership to submit materials considered relevant for the first draft of the Secretary-General’s report. |
| **13 April 2012** | Online posting and circulation to membership of the first draft of the Secretary-General’s report (drawn up on the basis of available material). |
| **15 May 2012** | Deadline for receipt of membership comments on the first draft and additional materials for the second draft.  Deadline for nominations for a balanced group of experts, to advise the Secretary-General on the further elaboration of the report and of draft opinions associated with it. |
| **5 June 2012** | First meeting of the group of experts.  Preliminary Second draft of the Secretary-General’s report. |
| **25 June 2012** | Deadline for receipt of comments on preliminary Second Draft. |
| **3 July  2012** | Online Posting of Second Draft *incorporating* comments received *(with sources clearly indicated)* |
| **1 August 2012** | Deadline for receipt of comments on Second Draft and request for contribution to develop Third Draft, including broad outlines for possible draft opinions.  Invitation letter from the Secretary-General to all stakeholders to participate in the group of experts |
| **31 August 2012** | Online Posting of Third Draft and broad outlines for possible draft opinions |
| **30 September 2012** | Deadline for receipt of comments on Third Draft. |
| **10, 11, 12 (am) October 2012** | Second meeting[[1]](#footnote-1) of the group of experts |
| **10 January  2013** | Online Posting of Fourth Draft including draft opinions |
| **Feb 2013 (During CWG Cluster of Meetings)** | Third meeting of the group of experts |
| **1 March 2013** | Finalizing the Secretary-General’s report, and deadline for its publication. |
| **13 May 2013** | Proposed date for Strategic Dialogue. |
| **Collocated with WSIS Forum 2013  (14-16 May 2013)** | Proposed dates for 5th WTPF on Internet-related public policy issues. |

1. Based on the Third Draft of the Secretary-General’s Report. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)