

## EIGHTH INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM

BALI

BUILDING BRIDGES - ENHANCING MULTI-STAKEHOLDER COOPERATION  
FOR GROWTH AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

OCTOBER 24, 2013

4:30 P.M.

UPDATE: INTERNET OF THINGS 2013

---

The following is the output of the real-time captioning taken during the Eighth Meeting of the IGF, in Bali, Indonesia. Although it is largely accurate, in some cases it may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the session, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

---

>> WOLFGANG KLEINWÄCHTER Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to this meeting of the Dynamic Coalition on Internet of Things. It's labeled an update on internet of things but de facto. This is the annual meeting on the coalition of things. If there's just background with the Dynamic Coalition came from. Internet of things was raised for the first time in the third IGF in India, and after this discussion on IoT, a guy from France, Francis McGeary decided to establish a Dynamic Coalition on Internet of Things.

One the first steps was to organise a workshop. We did it with 20 or 30 people where we discussed a number of issues, policy issues, governance issues, related to the Internet of Things including questions like do we need an institution and a framework, do we need special policies. So we discussed federation within the ONS and some other issues, but the discussion more or less was not so very clear where it should go and so unfortunately then after the meeting, Francis McGeary passed away and there was a silence for a couple of months. And so we more or less reestablished it in the meeting in I think it was Nairobi where we said, okay, internet of things remains an issue. It's unclear what it is. So it's a new subject but it's worth to use the framework of the Internet Governance Forum to discuss the Internet Governance -- the inTet governance issues related to the Internet of Things.

One of the main conclusions from the discussion in Nairobi was the Internet of Things is not separate from the Internet. There was a discussion before the Nairobi meeting whether we should separate the Internet into the Internet and then the Internet of Things and then Internet of something. And we discussed this in various groups and the conclusion was even if the Internet of Things produces some special problems for privacy, security and something else, but there is no need to have special institutions nor special top down drafted policies for the Internet of Things. It's just an application

on top of the Domain Name System, and even issues which probably would need some policies like the allocation of IP numbers could follow the existing mechanisms. So we had APICNIC and I said would they allocate IP addresses in different way to service providers who offer services for the Internet of Things and the answer was, no.

So that means you need IP addresses. Here you have it. Whether it's for objects or for ISPs or what else, no difference.

So this is important to remember, because in the year 2009, '10, '11, in particular groups in the European Union had the idea to create a body similar to ICANN for the Domain Name System, for the Internet of Things. So I think this came to an end in the last IGF in Baku. We had a similar small discussion and we all concluded this is not needed.

We organised a workshop in early August, and again in Leipzig, that's the city where I'm at home and so far the manager of the IoT lists over there and we had a small meeting of around 30 people, and came to the conclusion that while the policy dimension remains on the agenda but in the middle of the discussion should be the opportunities, what we have for opportunities with the Internet of Things. And we also concluded that Internet of Things is discussed now in so many isolated circles, the transportation community, the car community, the technical community, some other business groups, civil society group who have a lot of fear in all of this, that the challenge now is to try to pull them out of the silos and to offer an opportunity to discuss this issue, more or less in a multistakeholder environment.

And so far, the conclusion was, okay, we should continue with the discussions within the framework of the IGF because the IGF offers the best opportunity to have a multistakeholder discussion on it. I was recently in conference in Washington, D.C., around 400, 500 people, mainly from the US, discussed the Internet of Things but it was mainly business. That means government people were there, but the government was down at this time so they could not speak officially. Private sector, civil society was not represented and the technical community is more or less disconnected from the business opportunities in the US and this is bad.

So our office is here in the framework of Internet Governance Forum to provide an opportunity for this multistakeholder around the Internet of Things. We have produced in the discussion in the last four and five years and one of the results of the discussion, which I call achievements is that was discussed over in the workshop yesterday was that the first thing we should discuss here are the opportunities, being aware that opportunities have always some risks and that means we should not ignore that risks exist in the further deployment of Internet of Things services. But the opportunity should be discussed in the first place, taking into account there are some risks.

The second thing is there's no need, at least at this very moment, to discuss, you know, top down policies on new institutions.

So third conclusion from the workshop was, okay, there are some public policy issues, which needs specific consideration but needs specific consideration in the context of the general Internet debate. One is privacy, one is security, one is competition, and one is consumer protection. So these are four public policy issues but these are not specific issues for the Internet of Things because we also agreed in the discussion that privacy protection is needed in the Internet of Things, in social networks, in search

engines. And a lot of other applications and it would be stupid to say, okay, we need special privacy regulations. For search engines, for ISPs for each of the applications.

It would make no sense. That means we have identified this for arrears which are relevant for public policies but we would put this in the broader context of Internet Governance.

And next to other smaller conclusions the final conclusion was we have to face future discussions on facts and not fears. There's a lot of fear around Internet of Things. People say, of course, objects will know more about me than any than I myself and if somebody can go to all of this data which are collected by the objects about me then I will lose totally my privacy. I will lose the control over myself. The objects will, you know, determine what I have to do and so there's a lot of speculation. Some of the speculations are real, others are not real. But there's still a lot of speculations and we have not yet the full knowledge about the facts and that means we should move about a fact-based discussion and not a fear-based discussion, which could lead also to fact-based policies and not to fear-based policies.

This is where we are. The report on from the Leipzig meeting is online and you can find it from the Dynamic Coalition and the purpose of this meeting is here to discuss what could be done in the next year. In the workshop, I called in the IoT roadmap, 2014. And so we are open for proposals. So the very simple proposal we have for the roadmap is two things. So we invite you to make more use of the existing mailing list to start the discussion, whatever you want in the IGF style. That means if you have an issue, and you have a proposal, how to discuss this, then feel free to put this on the website and we will try to help you to stimulate the debate and to get answers. And the second thing is we should have another workshop between the IGFs and what we propose is to do it in connection with the EuroDIG meeting in Berlin in June 2014. It would be a half day or one day event before the EuroDIG in Berlin. And in Germany this will be an open meeting where everybody in the coalition can participate. So we had already three of these meetings but this time, we will do in Berlin because the EuroDIG gives us a nice environment and people who go to the EuroDIG and in the Internet of Things can do two things with one trip, and that's money savings and time saving.

Then we will start with the preparation for the next IGF. So we have in the next IGF also a work shop and another meeting of the Dynamic Coalition.

We certainly have to discuss also a little bit and if you have any proposals or ideas let us know, the structure of the Dynamic Coalition. So far, it as loose structure. So we have, you know -- we started with interim solutions and we are still interim solutions. So that Abry and me, we are the interim cochair and we had an interim steering committee, which never really worked. We produced some results. So it's very flexible.

And everybody hates big bureaucracy. So it means we are not interested to produce big bureaucracies but you know to make the whole process a little more sustainable and serious, it would probably be good if we can move forward towards more stable structure, so that at the moment, it's still unstable.

Last year in Baku, we asked, should we close the Dynamic Coalition or should we continue? The majority said, okay, let's give us another year. We are here in Bali and my discussion from yesterday, the majority says, okay, it's worth to continue. So this will be not a big a very big element in the IGF, but an important element. As long as it's important, we should continue to do it, even if we done really know what is the

outcome in two or three years from now. But to have a continuation of the debate, gives sense. This was my introductory remarks.

Probably Avry can say.

>> AVRY DORIA.: Yeah, I've got to say last year when I was one the cochair, I said kill the group and so my reward to was to become the cochair. So we had a balance between someone who didn't think there was a reason to continue and someone who thought there was a reason to continue. And I really continued in that frame of mind until yesterday. And it was listening to a discussion yesterday and I hate to it, it was listening to people who used the arguments that I had used for the last couple of years that convinced me that I was wrong.

And sometimes you really have to hear people saying what you have been saying before you go, oh, wait a second. And the thing that occurred to me yesterday, which I confess to having been rather slow to come to it, is that by saying it is just what we've got now, that it is just Internet, that it is just addressing, that it is just names, misses, I think the point of there is a complexity that this adds to the network and while, indeed, it does start as just the Internet as we know it being applied to objects that humans only deal with, but not actually you know, interact with to a certain extent that we miss the point of looking at sort of the long-term trends what if any -- and I will still admit that it's certainly not certain. But what if any does the complexity that this adds, what kind of effect does that have? Does it have an effect? And is that effect something that needs to be taken into account early enough in the process? Do we need to prepare for any possible -- any possible effects of the complexity?

I mean, one of the things that you know, I was toying with and it was a sillyism, but I was thinking that the internet of things makes our current view of big data teeny tiny data and that explosion. We are only now beginning to be at the dawn of the age of big data and I think that the Internet of Things pushes that boundary to the places that I certainly don't understand yet. So in terms of die familiaric coalition, are there any governance effects, whether it's extra privacy, which it's greater, you know, effects on the governance, not that it calls for a completely new form of Internet Governance, but I have come to think that perhaps it does put stresses on our governance system, Internet Governance system that we haven't thought through yet. So that's when I started the shift from, there's nothing to be done here, and we should just give up on it, to coming to a realization that maybe there is something to be looked at and it is a notion of how does the Internet of Things play into complexity theory? Or how does complexity theory play into Internet of Things and how does that affect Internet Governance, if at all? And so that's the question I started to ask and wondered whether, in fact, the Dynamic Coalition has something that it can do, has, you know, carrying on with more conferences or going beyond just the conferences and actually thinking and working on that.

Other than that, the only thing I do is add people's names to the mailing list.

>> Okay. Go ahead.

>> IAN FISH: Ian Fish, BCS, one of the reasons I was on the yes side on Baku in deeing with the Dynamic Coalition, well, three reasons, really. One of them Abry just stated and the other is the possible emergent properties that will come out of the system that actuates and reactuates and more and more actuates things which don't actually have human intervention, and there may well be unexpected emergent properties which need to be thought about.

And the third is the -- it was mentioned yesterday, as well, was the business model issue, because privacy, for example, relies a lot on security. It says the same thing.

It relies on it in certain ways in these systems and it was pointed out yesterday that the business case for, connecting things to the Internet relies on doing it and leaving them alone for 15 years and not doing anything about it. We all know how quickly the cyber security world changes and how much you have to update and that may be a problem, which needs to be dealt with. Thank you.

>> We do not have any formal procedures for this. So everybody can make a comment or an intervention, but I think the purpose of this meeting is really to discuss what we should do in the coming year, based on the more or less common understanding or the consensus that we should have an IoT workshop and Dynamic Coalition meeting next year, 2014. So I think this would be the final point in the roadmap to have the workshop next year, but what we do between here and now?

>> Let me ask a question, I'm not familiar with the rules of IGF because it seems to me there's nothing to talk about. We agreed that there's not any issues and points you made and people have got some -- you talked about fears but we are not afraid of anything in particular. What does the IGF require by -- in terms of level of activity, if we want to speculate about what might happen in the future and you needed to have a Dynamic Coalition to have a speculation, that's fine. But if there's actual topics, actual work to do. We don't seem to have any around this. I guess that's what I'm looking for.

We agreed we don't know what it is. The European initiative that started it has died. It's not any different from the Internet of anything else. We went through all of these sorts of points yesterday and we seem to be sort of struggling to find a reason to exist. So what's the minimum threshold requirement for a Dynamic Coalition to exist? And if it's just looking for things to think about, and looking for things to talk about, then you could have a Dynamic Coalition on anything.

So did this meet the threshold requirements?

>> AVRI DORIA: First of all, I would say that you are claiming decisions that were not made. You are claiming -- certainly, there are some of you were saying exactly what you are saying but I think there were other people in the room that said no. And I don't think it's fears. I don't think it, there are can be ascribed almost to FUD as I think you were directing us to. But there is a complexity there that we don't understand.

Now, the fact that you don't understand something, but can see that it's there, we can see that there is a complexity problem. We don't fully understand it. Some people deny that there's a complexity issue, yet, I would argue that that's patently not true because there is obvious complexity. We are already seeing effects.

So to be a Dynamic Coalition, actually has a very low threshold.

It means there's a bunch of people who want to talk about something and it means that you do something, that you have meetings, you have conferences, you publish papers, you publish reports on them, which is about the threshold. It's a place where people who think there is an issue explore that issue. So -- so I think if we have got people that say, there are complexity issues, there are emerging property issues that we don't understand yet, we can deny that they are there, but some people denying they are there, and others who think they are there, brings us to something to discuss. I don't think yet brought us to a point of saying there's nothing, but to say that we have a

disagreement on whether there is something there or not and whether it affects the governance.

But I think something that is also just in the real last year started taking off to the point where we are really starting to see more things. We are starting to see Cisco's world of things start to explode that we're really just now at the dawn of the age of the Internet of Things.

I think when you say we don't have a definition for, it I think that's true, but I think an issue -- a definition is emerging. And so actually, given that this is a term that is being used, it's a term that an immense amount of money and effort is being put into, then I think it's something that has some merit being understood.

Now, if we spend a year or two studying the implications to get to your point and sort of say, nope, you know, those who said there was nothing here in the complexity and in the emerging properties were right, then, indeed, there is nothing but at this point, I think there is a sufficient amount of concern that it meets at least a minimal threshold.

>> PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Okay, well, can you articulate what that concern is and say how -- I mean, tell me what the concern is and how would you frame that into perhaps a question that could go away and be researched. There's a low threshold, it's just a discussion and that's all that is required, I'm fine. What is the concern? What is the issue so that we can direct attention to and put research in and come back and report on, for example?

>> AVRI DORIA: I think that's a good discussion for this meeting. I have my own notions that sort of says there's a complexity here and there's a complexity in growth and he's added the emerging properties that we don't understand. But going beyond that, people can add.

>> PARTICIPANT: Okay. With Abry, I must take your conclusion of yesterday was not mine. So -- and I am sure there was no official conclusion drawn, nor is there a report on that meeting that has been handed out. Nevertheless, for me it was very clear that there was a general realization that all of these things on the Internet collecting data, storing data, at all kinds of places, I think the cloud was mentioned -- we see the cloud comes in as well, and even more so, the more we are on the Internet and the more data is stored in places that people don't control. And another point is also that actuators -- things are going to do things without the intervention of people, partly based on how they are programmed and partly based on the signs -- how do you call it in English? The incentives to get the smells, the sounds, the things.

Realizing it will go better and realizing it's part of the Internet and realize it will codetermine how it will go forward. We were particular about it, big data who is responsible, and elements like that. I think it's very relevant to consider those factors and say what they mean for the rest of the world.

Without having to resolve the rest of the world within that meeting. But leave that to the IP lawyers. Leave that to the security people. Leave that to the those who build clouds and things like that. Does that help?

>> Okay. Thank you. Go ahead.

>> PARTICIPANT: My name is Amman dark I'm a member of the European parliament for the Parrott party. I don't work with internet of things much, but if I understand this, it's something like smart meters in electricity grids would be an

integral part of this system and so in Sweden, we took to mind, we have 4.5 million smart meters in all the households and most of our major industries and the hospitals and critical infrastructures only they are Internet connected and therefore also vulnerable to all the risks and dangers in the Internet activities, and some militaries are looking at investing money in the internet. The inspire Swedish grid can be shut down remotely. And so they let the National Security Agency of Sweden start monitoring traffic in and out of smart meters so that we can detect attacks against the system.

After they have happen because it's difficult to stop it beforehand. Putting tools on the Internet, being a two-way communication space can have a lot of problems affiliated with it. This is an issue that I have been thinking about in terms of the ecall system, the system for calls that the European commission wants to make. We have a lot of electronic devices being deployed in automobiles now and mostly they are being deployed for safety reasons to help the generic citizen as it were have a more safe environment to be in but as soon as you make it remotely accessible by other actors, even though that can create service functionality for the vast majority of people, you create specific risks for specific vehicles at specific times., some will say if the person inside of them are killed that will have a much larger impact on society if anyone in general is killed. For example, the Lady Diana car crash is much more traumatic for the world than most traffic accidents that happen on a Friday evening.

We are creating a specific setup for these types of risks and we are creating a necessity for there to be some black box agency to be keeping control over our utilities and maybe we should think whether the Internet is the optimal tool to solve some of the challenges that we're facing in utilities or in automobiles or maybe it's that the Internet is a good tool for a lot of other things that aren't utilities and that we should question whether we are really just being enthusiastic about gadgets and if that's the best policy road to go ahead.

And so I would like to hear the other panelists' views on that phrasing. Thank you.

>> Things are concrete. There's no one size fits all solution. You have to go case by case and in particular, you have the car scam. That you mentioned. I mentioned it also yesterday. The car is on the one hand a driving computer now, but it can be divided in various parts, probably the entertainment element in the car is low risk and the engine element is high risk. And you have to go on a case-by-case application basis to find the right framework, the right solutions for. This.

And the Bev thing to do this is in a discussion process and by starting to write some issue papers on that. And I think this is what the -- the Dynamic Coalition could be that we invite volunteers to write one or two page paper with, you know, very condensed information that would help the broader community to understand the issues better, so that we get the various perspectives from the various stakeholders and the Dynamic Coalition could function like a hearing house. I think this is what the IGF is about. We will find out what is going on who does what, and what we can do. Though we are not yet here that we can say, what we should do. So we have not yet the full picture. We say, okay, what is going on and would does what? And the next step would be to come up with probably recommendations, I would say next year and two years from now. That means the function of the Dynamic Coalition is really -- that's why it's good to have a low threshold, that it can -- it's free to determine what it does, as long as it's does something that is useful, and I think the room was fully packed. We have nearly 70 people in the room. So that means, that there's an interest.

>> PARTICIPANT: Thank you very much for the opportunity. I participated in yesterday's session. I agree that it was an interesting session. The points of view were diverse and it makes the discussion even better.

I think moving forward, my point of view is Internet of Things is a reality and experiences are starting to happen. Moving forward, we need to aggregate. We need to hear about case studies positive and negative, risks and accomplishments, and different sectors of the economy, transportation, particularly cars as mentioned vigorously but this is not the only thing. Smart meters is mentioned again rigorously. It's very important and very useful but that's also not the whole thing. We need to look outside of transportation, health, medicine, and not only in the developed part of the world but also in developing countries. I know yesterday in one of the winning projects was an agriculture-related experiment, a project from India. I think it's very important to see how these are actually utilized in developing countries to resolve, as I mentioned yesterday, actual problems with -- dire economic impact. This way we make people believe more in the Internet of Things and come one solutions to the problems that we will face, certain issues of privacy, big data, personal information, this will have to be addressed. There was an example again the day before yesterday and they talked about, again, transportation and the buses and taxis and so on and they are used on the vehicle it does not feed all the information to the network but it has smartness to keep some information and a small part of that is using the 3g or the Wi-Fi to upload to the central point of control. So this kind of understanding quite helpful. If somebody did the experiment and has got the experience, it's very important for us, for the rest of the community to understand, it's to benefit from it and do something more advanced.

And what happens in Europe, does not mean it has happened exactly the same way in the third world or in Egypt or in India or somewhere else. There's a fine tuning process there, but learning from experience, I think that's what the coalition can do very, very well. And we are now at the phase where we have this kind of experience, it's starting to creep out but it does not have a forum to be represented in and I think the coalition can do this very well and I agree with you on the point of having two paper write-ups. Based on experience, such experiences, it can be summarized in a document, it would be very useful or a challenge of this would be very useful to circulate. Thank you.

>> PARTICIPANT: Yeah, I'm from the department of telecom India. I want to share some experiences that India is doing with machine-to-machine. As part of the telecom policy of 2012, machine-to-machine communication was given due importance to the government of India. Accordingly, we are in the process of formulation, machine to machine policy in our country and I want to share some of the few things which we have received some inputs on from the friendly stakeholders. It will be prepared to 25 questions with the consultation of industry and the important stakeholders including the friend of friends, and then we have sent the discussion as to more than 1,000 stakeholders in the country, as well as to the friend to friend important persons in the world. And some of the very important inputs we have received and we have -- we have seen some of the issues which I would like to share with you so that at least it's very important for some of the countries.

So first of all, first of issue is -- the first issue is the M-to-M standards we should have some standards and then adopt global standards. The second one is locating a spectrum for M-to-M, local area networks. Basically, we have seen so many options because M-to-M have different applications. One size does not fit all as already

conveyed. So we will be needing a different requirement in the friend to friend applications. So we should have vetting -- maybe some policy on the M-to-end issues and devices.

And, of course, because current mobile number scheme would not work for M-to-M devices so we need to revisit the wireless numbers. It may be the case or other countries also.

And, of course, okay, always on the requirement. So it is a big bandwidth and it has to be visited. It has to move from one country to another country and so all the countries need to talk together. This case we do work to isolation, that one successful case. So I think this is a very tight forum, where all the government must come together and must decide the common finds and, of course, as yesterday also pointed out, we need to do it fast because all the vendors are doing it very fast and if we do it after two years after this time, then so much water would have thrown in the issue. And so that may be an issue later on.

And guidelines for the bundled services, it was also the point, and interoperability among the different service providers and the friend-to-friend devices. And there's data protection as already has been pointed out by some of the persons.

And, the norms and the end customer privacy issues. Right now the government of India has come 9-with some guidelines to the individuals. Once the sim cards are issued for the devices, what are the norms against those devices and what are the norms again those things. And, of course, the security and the lawful machine-to-machine communications and being of course, to have policy around the customer ethical issues. So these are the major issues that we have taken from the stakeholders and we are working on these things. I understand through this forum, some of the issues. Maybe they are applicable to other countries also.

Until and unless the other issues are declared or at the moment, it may lend to all of us. Thank you.

>> WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: By the way, we can announce a coalition, we could use the email or the website and we could put material or articles, whatever, that we have collected on our country on this Dynamic Coalition website or that we just, you know, share, experience, information on a national level.

I think a lot of things, of the research is already done in various countries, but it's not known. So that means for instance, the European Commission has started a similar questionnaire. They have produced an interesting result, but unnoticed in the broader world but we can learn from each other and we are in the early stage here and always starts with communication, so that you communicate to each other and share information and then you can go the next step and to say do we need some action or coordination or whatever, and then you can share your concrete results. We are not there.

I would encourage everybody to go to the website, to give your business card to Sandra, and then lets use the last minutes of this meeting for how we can do the internal business things within this Dynamic Coalition.

You have asked for the floor.

>> SATISH BABU: Thank you very much, my name is Satish babu from India. I think there are already standards bodies in this domain, from ITU and others. So the technical aspects I'm not very sure this is the right forum to address those things,

standards and so on, but the point that there is a development component to Internet of Things, and these are not all controversial kind of applications, there are also noncontroversial as has been pointed out and the culture, disaster management and a bunch of other things. So I'm in part agreement by what is proposed by you earlier, that the Dynamic Coalition should be -- the threshold should be fairly low. We should be starting out with a very simple thing first and I certainly see a room for a kind of orientation, for a guard stakeholder that they are here, but it's not there for any other ITU, or whatever, that only we can provide.

Therefore, I distinctly see a room for the Dynamic Coalition on the kind of lines of what you have proposed. Thank you.

>> PARTICIPANT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think my opinion is quite extends to the opinion of the Indian gentleman over there.

>> WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Can you introduce.

>> My name is Hong key Cha and I work at a research institute called Retri. I think IoT, the concept exists already. Everyone all knows Samsung/LG it's a little bit famous company and they produce TVs and refrigerators which can actually communicate with our smart devices and we can access the Internet with those devices. They already have their own IP addresses. So those kind of technical things are done by other technical committees such as ITUs and JTC1s and things such as that.

So what IGF should do I suggest that we first analyze what those existing standards are. It's because without those technical things, it's really difficult for us to understand what we should really talk about. And the reason why I'm talking with this is that I think IGF can really address the safety issues of Internet of Things, because I remember yesterday some -- a gentleman mentioned that suppose some hacker intrudes to your -- suppose your car and you cannot drive your car by yourself. Then that can be a very serious problem. So that directly relates to security problems.

So I think IGF can resolve or find some good ways to solve how to protect users in terms of IoT.

And in addition, if possible, I would like to suggest to make a terms of reference, if possible, because I'm sorry if there is already a terms of reference, then it's okay but I couldn't find the terms of reference of the Dynamic Coalition of this group, and it was quite difficult for me to actually make up my mind to participate in this group. And I think this group is very interesting because I'm from the technical side and I think this group can actually really do, to protect the future users of IoT, but easiest way for everyone to access this information is to make a terms of reference.

So how about the -- what do you call that? The members of this Dynamic Coalition can produce a terms of reference.

Yes.

>> WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Who else?

Okay. There's no need that we use all the 90 minutes for this. I think it's clear. My conclusion from the debate so far is, yes, we should continue with the Dynamic Coalition. Yes, we should start thinking and doing some concrete work, and what I have heard is write some issue papers. Share national experiences via the website and prepare workshop in between, and prepare another workshop and an agenda for the 2014 IGF, which is probably in Istanbul.

And if this is an agreement, then we have the main elements of roadmap for 2014, there's no reason to pack this train with too many things, which is a small train in unchartered territory. But what we need also is to have more volunteers who would be more engaged in this.

We have to apologize for this, you know, we are just a small volunteers and saying, okay, we are doing things which we think is needed but there's no resources and nothing really behind it. That means if we have some volunteers here, we would say, okay, I see this as an opportunity for me or for my country or for my company, or for my civil society group and we could form, let's say, a small -- a small group of engaged volunteers. A group of five or six so that we can distribute certain responsibilities that we have something like -- I would still call it interim, an interim steering committee, so that we could work a little bit more seriously on the website and the mailing list and the preparation of the first coming two meetings and the issue papers. This would be wonderful.

My question goes to you, do we have volunteers in the room?

One, two. Three, four. So that means more. And Rafiq.

So could you give your details to Sandra. So that means anybody else, because then we -- I would ask for something like rough consensus in the room so that you agree that this is the steering committee for the -- the interim steering committee for the Dynamic Coalition for the year 2014.

>> AVRI DORIA.: And before people leave, if you want to keep track of this and be on the mailing list, do let me know.

>> I would like to participate but I'm not quite sure yet because I need to ask my boss, to be very frank.

>> WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Okay. Then you are an interim, interim member of the steering committee. So we are waiting for confirmation. So it's pending.

And so that means the small group would then communicate about, you know, a website and mailing list. Those are the two practical things that we have to do and then we would announce the agenda for the workshop in Berlin, seven weeks from now. --

>> Months.

>> WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Seven months from now. And then we could start the preparation probably in some for the workshop in Istanbul.

Maarten.

>> PARTICIPANT: Yes, one suggestion is to come with a draft terms of reference to the group rather early so that gives us a better ground for moving ahead in a direction we understand together.

>> AVRI DORIA: I think that is a good idea. That's a good suggestion. That would be a really good thing to do first. Now, are we staying on the interim committee or are we leaving it and leaving it to these guys?

No, we are staying on it. Okay. Okay. Just wanted to check because, you know, we are interim, so the interim could have ended. I'm always looking for my interims to

end. You know there's nothing so permanent as a temporary situation. I just wanted to make sure.

Yeah. We're stuck.

So anything else anyone would like to add? 9 --

>> PARTICIPANT: You know the point the lady from Sweden has made. So, you know, I want to come back to the point made by the lady from Sweden because while governments are not focusing as much on this aspect yet, but it's only a matter of time, one or two incidents where the security of the Internet of Things will attract a lot of government attention, and probably, you know, the IGF I don't see whether the IGF actually focuses on security-related matters. I see a lot of discussion on cybercrime and stuff like that, but I know at the ITU they are not doing it. ITU is more about standards. So in terms of policy, because in the Internet of Things, like you have the OTT, you know which runs across the networks, and if you have legal intercept and, you know, you want to control things or get down to the bottom of things, how will it be handled.

So I hope we add her point into the terms of reference.

>> AVRI DORIA: It will be interesting to three because the IETF when it meets in Vancouver in two weeks is starting to explore many of the security issues. I will be at that meeting and he will explore whether it's being explored and get back to this group to see if there's something that pertains. So I can certainly report back to the group on whether the IETF is picking it up. Participate that's one of the things from the security side that I brought up, obviously more and just three that came to mind. I would be fine within the committee, the steering -- whatever it is. The interim something. Thanks.

>> PARTICIPANT: Can I make an additional point on that. I think the issue is not only with the privacy. The smart meter issue in Sweden is if we allow for the network -- for the National Security Agency to monitor all the traffic in and out of these meters, because we are dead scared of one of them being shut off remotely which is at a hospital or so, that has clear privacy implications because they also can find out everything that all the private households are doing in Sweden. But then you have the additional issue of actually a lot of governments aren't only doing passive monitor but we see a lot of investment in cyber offensive capabilities while we are putting the utilities online.

And so it's very clear that households in a normal, stable, country need water and gas and electricity and all of these things and so putting those devices at all, Internet connected has some implications that are very bad for the stability of society, I would guess, not because they are merely privacy invasive but also because you are actually making them vulnerable to specific attacks from the outside and the Internet is a big place.

We talk about how there's 2 billion people there. We want to put you will the 6 billion people on the planet on the Internet. And there's some types of systems, I guess, where we could question whether we need them exposed to the attention of 6 billion people. And I think the utilities clearly are maces where we want to have a larger reliability than can be granted, actually, by the Internet. Actually the Internet.

>> Absolutely. You are absolutely right. I didn't see that you volunteered to join the interim steering committee. Would you be ready to join? Because you have good

arguments and this would be extremely helpful to have you in this small group to draft the agenda for the next -- it's just for the commitment is just for one year.

>> PARTICIPANT: Can I get back to you?

>> WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Okay. Thank you.

>> PARTICIPANT: I don't want to be nasty but I doubt that the meters are designed so that you actually can close down the connection by -- in that's the case, its a real bad design.

>> PARTICIPANT: We have 4.5 million of them in Sweden and a crisis group in the government forum to deal specifically with that problem. I know that it sounds strange, nevertheless, we find ourselves in this situation and this was a feature. It was not a bug. It was a feature.

>> AVRI DORIA: Sometimes called a misfeature.

>> WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Let's move forward to clarify what the facts are and whether the fear is justified or not justified.

>> PARTICIPANT: I think it's a very good point that you brought, whether you join the interim interim committee or not, but it seems to be a nice subject for this terms of effort, something like do we need the taxonomy for what can be online and what can't be. Just a suggestion.

>> WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Okay, ladies and gentlemen. There's no need to fill the 90 minutes. I think it was very constructive, very condensed meeting. I thank everybody. I thank the outgoing interim committee and I welcome the incoming committee and I declare this meeting closed.

>> Thank you.

(end of meeting 5:32 a.m.)

**Details**

Parent Category: [IGF 2013](#)

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/2013-bali/igf-2013-transcripts/121-igf-2013/preparatory-process-42721/1423-update-internet-of-things-2013>