Agreed Minutes – AICF Teleconference

Meeting about an Australian Internet Community Forum (AICF). Teleconference, via Zoom.

11:00am – 12:30pm, Friday 20 April, 2018.

Present:
- Sandra Davey (Independent Chair)
- Michelle Scott Tucker, ACIG (Independent Secretariat)
- Lyndsey Jackson, EFA
- Alister Paterson, auDA
- Narelle Clark, ACCAN
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Internet AU
- Parris Burtenshaw, DCA
- Pablo Hinojosa, APNIC
- Peter Tonoli, EFA
- Luke Andrews, DFAT

Apologies:
- Cameron Boardman, auDA
- Craig Ng, APNIC
- Keith Besgrove, Internet AU
- Lachlan Musicman, EFA
- Liz Williams, auDA
- Paul Brooks, Internet AU
- Paul Wilson, APNIC
- Sae Ra Germaine, Internet AU
- Annaliese Williams, DCA
- Liam Nevill, DFAT

Quick Review

The Chair provided a brief reiteration of the group's reasons for coming together, including to find a way to reignite a mechanism/s for the Australian Internet Community to share, discuss and (where possible and appropriate) reach consensus views about Internet governance issues relating to technical, public and social policy.

The Chair commended the group's shared commitment and enthusiasm for achieving a practical outcome, and noted that all must work within various constraints of resourcing, time and finances.

Rules of Engagement

The Chair outlined some basic rules of engagement, for which there was consensus agreement:

- The group is here for the benefit of the Community as a whole.

- Referring to RFC7282 (IETF guidelines on consensus and humming):

  o The group is a proponent of multi-stakeholder engagement, and – through collaboration and respect – will strive for consensus.

  o Consensus was described as "everyone has been heard", "eliminating disagreement is more important than reaching agreement" and consensus will be reached when "we are sufficiently satisfied with the chosen solution/direction, and the group has nothing unresolved which would be considered truly problematic".

  o The Chair requested that participants consider objections as either "simply unappealing" or "truly problematic" and that for the sake of the Community, the group would work to resolve those only regarded as "truly problematic".

  o Any objections are to be expressed succinctly, elegantly and respectfully. The group will then attempt, together, to resolve the relevant issues with guidance and support from the Chair.

  o See https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc7282.

Draft Proposal

On Wednesday 11 April, the Chair sent an email to the group a proposal for discussion (See Attachment A).

Participants discussed the **proposal**, and there was general and positive support for it. The group agreed that they will aim to organise and convene a single day, face to face workshop/meeting in Canberra (in July 2018, at a venue to be decided). At that meeting, the group (and other, invited participants), will develop a strategy and action plan for the future of Internet governance discussions in Australia.

A change to the **stated purpose** was proposed, and after discussion, agreed:

The Internet exists for all. To ensure it remains open, secure and stable, there are many important issues to discuss and resolve. There is a key intersection between civil society advocates, private sector innovators, expert technical community leaders and our public policy stakeholders to support ~~end users~~ the entire Community who rely on the Internet in everyday life.

To facilitate discussion of key ideas and trends, to enable cross community consultation and to learn from best-practice, there is value in evolving an ongoing multi-stakeholder mechanism for idea exchange.

However, it was also proposed that during the Canberra meeting, participants should work together to agree the specific wording for the Vision and Purpose.

The group also discussed who (and how many) should be invited to **participate** in the Canberra meeting. It was noted that funding for travel support was not currently available, and for some this was a concern.

Some general principles for selecting participants were discussed, including:

- The need to ensure all participants have the relevant enthusiasm and expertise to actively engage in the discussion on the day.

- Participants should include people with enough authority and seniority to be able to make decisions, possibly even commit future resources and/or funding.

- The need for fresh faces (not the same people talking about the same issues).

- The need for all of the Community to take an active and engaged role including Government.

- Diversity and accessibility to be encouraged, while noting that self-funded participants with relevant Internet governance expertise were desirable. Having said that, the group will try to find ways to support some participants if $$ are required.

- Striking a balance between effectiveness and accessibility.

- A maximum of 40-50 participants (although it was noted that a smaller number of the right people could still be effective).

Suggested participant categories included: Civil Society, Industry, Academia and Government.

Actions Arising

Secretariat to:

- Send out Doodle Poll to determine a date for the proposed Canberra meeting (Done)

- Prepare shared documents for the group to collaborate online (using 'suggest mode'):
    - Canberra workshop/meeting – potential invited participants broken by typical categories used in multi-stakeholder fora
    - Canberra workshop/meeting – proposed agenda items
    - Canberra workshop/meeting – list of topics for discussion in future

- The group to meet via Zoom every 3rd Friday at 11am AEST.

Next Meeting

11:00am Friday 11 May, 2018 (teleconference, via Zoom)

Attachment A – Draft Proposal

DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR 1ST TELECONFERENCE OF THE AUSTRALIAN NTERNET COMMUNITY FORUM STEERING COMMITTEE

Hi again,

Hopefully you've had time to ponder my last email and perhaps you even have some thoughts on how we can move forward.

As you know, DFAT has provided a small amount of funding for this initiative – but that funding needs to be used by 30 June! Some of you have expressed concern at how little time we have, and I concur, time is tight.

Since I spoke with each of you, I've given this quite a bit of thought; please humour me whilst I pose what I reckon lies in front of us …

The challenge

We have had a model for internet governance; it's been great, but it doesn't work anymore. We know what we liked about it, what worked, what didn't work, and we know what we'd do differently if we did it again.

We now need to do the work to evolve to a different model.

The current proposal (thank you for those involved in finding and providing funding) that DFAT has lent its support to, is constrained in terms of budget and timeframe but loosely constrained in enabling us to explore where we can go together.

Many of you gave me ideas for how to run a great forum and I have captured these; I've also chatted with InternetNZ and they've offered to share what they've learnt and improved upon, with NetHui.

We have learnt a lot from the past, and there is significant experience built up over the last 20 years amongst the Community. Yes, we could host a small internet governance forum before June. But is this **feasible, viable or desirable** given our limited budget and people resource? Even if we could pull off a forum together, then what? How do we do one again next year?

I'm therefore loathe, as many of you have expressed as well, to rush into producing another forum when I believe we have a bigger challenge.

The challenge is we need to solve the "why" and "what" rather than just the "how" (run 1 forum in 2018).

Now ... because I'm a product person :) ... and see things through this lense … a forum, a mechanism for the Community to come together around internet governance is essentially a product, a service for our Community. So, we need to give rise to a product/service that is fit for market and is financially viable and sustainable (feasible, viable and desirable).

Purpose (aspirational: reason for existing beyond money)

I've had a crack at writing a purpose for us all to consider …

The Internet exists for all. To ensure it remains open, secure and stable, there are many important issues to discuss and resolve. There is a key intersection between civil society advocates, private sector innovators, expert technical community leaders and our public policy stakeholders to support the end-user Community who rely on the Internet in everyday life.

To facilitate discussion of key ideas and trends, to enable cross community consultation and to learn from best-practice, there is value in evolving an ongoing multi-stakeholder mechanism for idea exchange.

Vision (tangible: how we propose to reach our purpose)
To solve the challenge above, I'd like to propose …

The Steering Committee will facilitate a forward strategy workshop (please help me find a sexier title!) to enable a section of the Community to co-create the next iteration of internet governance discussions.

At this workshop, our approach to running the day will be predicated on the principles that underpin true multi-stakeholder engagement. We will work together in an open, inclusive, collaborative multi-stakeholder way to create the business model/pitch deck/funding proposal for funding the future of Internet governance in Australia. By walking the talk, we demonstrate the value and uniqueness of these approaches to solving problems.

We will look to the past to inform and guide us, we learn from the significant efforts of those who have already contributed, and we look to others who are doing it well. We acknowledge we need to work together to create our guiding principles, figure out how to fund and sustain the program and to figure out the format of future events.

Aims of the forward strategy workshop
The aim of the workshop is to co-create a plan outlining a way forward. I'm seeing the plan as a pitch for funding and could include:

- o The Why: why is it important

- o The What: what's the product, who's it for, the benefits it brings or problems it solves

- o The How: business/operational model

- o Budget / investment proposal

- o Team

- o Timeline

- o Ensuring we address the pain points articulated in previous communications (eg: not keen on a single funding source).

This is in line with the original proposal submitted by ACIG, and supported by Internet Australia, APNIC, ACCAN, EFA and auDA, which stated that:

> We propose that a one-day roundtable or workshop format would be appropriate for the new Forum (as opposed to the two-day conference format of past auIGF events). This is due to the somewhat exploratory nature of the event. For this same reason, we propose that attendance at the Forum should be limited to key stakeholders, by invitation only.

When
Hopefully June, in Canberra. We have budget to include around 50 people but do not have funding for travel or accommodation. The Steering Committee will select participants using criteria we agree upon.

Between now and then I will convene at least two teleconfs so we can figure out the invitation list, the aims, the agenda, topics, format, and outputs.

While the aim for the future will be to get something funded that enables wide collaboration and participation, the Workshop will be by invitation only because we have neither the funding nor the time to open it up to more attendees.

Participants

This is a unique opportunity for us to show genuine commitment to re-establishing a fit for purpose internet governance multi-stakeholder forum, so we'll want to ensure the Workshop is attended by a diverse range of people and organisations.

We want people who can meaningfully contribute to evolving what we've got now, and we've got to make sure we get peeps from the private sector, academia, NFP's, government and civil society.

Due to time, I had originally thought we could get each organisation to nominate 10 participants, but I'm nervous we may be criticized for being exclusive. A better way may be for each organisation to promote what this Committee is doing and call for Expressions of Interest for participants. We'll need to discuss this.

Government, in consultation with me, will also draw up a list of their own 10 invitees (bringing the total to 60)

A bit of work from you please

Here's some thinking and critiquing you could do that will inform our discussion next week:

The Challenge
(For discussion and decision)
- Are we in agreement with the challenge?
- Is this the best course of action, and use of funds?

Purpose – our Why
(For decision)
Can we agree to the purpose binding us?

Vision – our What
(For discussion and decision)

Aims of the workshop – our How
(For discussion and decision)

Participants
(For discussion and decision)
How might we get the most diverse 50 participants who also have a super willingness to contribute?

Thank you for working together, and with me, to make this initiative a success.

For the love of multi-stakeholder engagement and internet governance ☺

Sandra, Chair