

CCWG INTERNET GOVERNANCE FACE TO FACE (F2F) MEETING; ICANN65; 24 JUNE 2019

This is an informal Note of the above Session that took place in Marrakech. There were around 70 participants in the Room and 23 connecting virtually. A list of those participating in the Session will be lodged on the CCWG IG Wiki

<https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=43984275>

The Board members attended included Leon Sanchez, Chris Disspain, Becky Burr, Tripti Sinha, Matthew Shears, Ron da Silva, Sarah Deutsch, Avri Doria, Rafael Ibarra and Danko Jevtovic.

The Recording of this Session is at <https://65.schedule.icann.org/meetings/1058290>

Summary

A constructive, well attended and important discussion, agreeing to expand the work of the CCWG IG to allow it to have a role in the Legislative Tracking initiative introduced by ICANN Org. The meeting also agreed, in principle, to amend the Charter of the CCWG IG to remove the chartered status of the SO/AC membership. We also touched on the IGF (and importance of supporting it in light of UN SG Report), the ICANN ITU-D Application and work in WTO, UN and WIPO that could affect the DNS.

Detail

1. Introduction

Olivier Crépin-Leblond welcomed all participants (physical and virtual) to this meeting of the CCWG IG with the Board WG on Internet Governance. He noted, and welcomed, the significant numbers of Board members present. He also noted an agenda change; taking the Report from Board WG first, given other commitments of the Board WG Chair, Leon Sanchez.

2. Update on priorities for Board WG Group on IG - Leon Sanchez, Chair of Board WG;

Leon Sanchez

Leon Sanchez welcomed opportunity for this dialogue; which was more important at this time than ever before.

He noted publication of Strategic Plan with a specific Goal in Operational Priorities on IG issues; namely the part: “To develop a mechanism to address emerging issuesand evaluate...”

He wanted this Community Group to address these issues. Noted the agreed “three layers approach” on Engagement remains the same. So these synergies allows us to move forward on tracking initiatives, legislation and polices; something included in goals for CEO for this FY.

So, this is a top priority and cannot be done without the Community.

Important for this Group to work on strategic issues, not worry about process and form.

Board should meet with the CCWG on regular basis; this helping to re-vitalize the group

We do not need a single position from Community on. Issues, but do need to coordinate positions and not have surprises.

Will want to look at legislation emerging and to see how it affects DNS.

Matthew Shears - Noted that assessing legislations was also a Board and CEO priority for 2019/2020

Discussion

Marilyn Cade: Thanked Leon. Well received and important remarks; which welcome; but also want members on Calls as well as on these sessions; noted that assessing legislative initiatives already fall within the purview of CCWG IG; and just having a list (like at present) not that helpful.

We need discussion on what to do. We have to be careful though in looking at legislation is complex, as not all is announced for serious intent.

Leon: In Community we have valuable resource for signaling of legislation; also welcome analysis. Also keen to see *trends* emerging even in draft pieces of legislation.

Young Eum Lee – Pleased at focus on legislation. ccNSO also takes seriously, indeed we have set up a Committee in ccNSO to discuss IG issues.

Ron da Silva – So useful having experts across all three parts of ICANN.

Wolfgang Kleinwächter – Happy to see pendulum swinging back to looking at important events outside of ICANN, we went a bit backwards in last few years, but now emerging again; a big mistake for ICANN to be silent. We now have “cyber” and “digital” which includes DNS; so need to be involved. At WTO they are talking about DNS.

Holly Raiche– do not want to just talk on legislation. Does Christchurch Call affect what we think in IG?

Leon – we should indeed discuss Country Code Names in this Group.

Veni Markovski – At UN it is not just 1st Committee dealing with IG issues; with the GGE and OEWG dealing with cyber issues.

Lori Schulman – Supportive of Leon, and agree with ICANN “speaking up”; we do not always have to track this first GE; GE role;

Sarah Deutsch – Some legislation is direct hit on ICANN, while other legislation just chips away at Internet;

Olivier – Asked how proposed Charter (discussed in Kobe) fitted into this?

Leon – It was a codification of what we are doing so to speak. We need to focus on substance to have good interaction intersessionally;

Jim Prendergast – how will we foster interaction on legislation work?

Leon – has to be worked out in detail; but of course, we already have mailing list for input. We can look at what would be best tools for an interactive platform;

Olivier – we should be more interactive on list, not just at physical sessions

Chris Buckridge – we ought, on Calls, to discuss substance not process.

Marilyn – we ought to have a separate IT process; not just a list.

3. Update on Charter of Cross Community Engagement Group on Internet Governance (CCEG IG)

Olivier recalled positions of ccNSO; gNSO and GAC on Charter. As a result of this and dialogue in the CCWG the proposal on table was to have a form of “Engagement Group on Internet issues” without chartering as originally proposed. So would become a looser arrangement capable of supporting the new legislative tracking platform discussed.

He noted that staff support will not change; re resources or activity at ICANN Sessions or inter-sessionally.

In the discussion:

Matthew Shears – this was a logical way forward. It frees us up; good step forward.

George Sadowsky (remote) – Glad (CCWG IG) did not go away; we should still assume support from ICANN structures; need to focus on substance; should not worry about “shape of table”;

4. Review of CCWG IG Activities since ICANN64

Nigel Hickson briefly outlined a few issues that had been addressed in recent months:

- ITU – Gave brief update on the ITU-D sector member application, noting approval on fee-exemption basis by ITU Council last week; awaiting confirmation letter from UTU Secretary General (*this has now arrived*);
- WTO Plurolateral meetings at Geneva which touch on ccTLD use and governance of Internet;
- UN CSTD – Potential dialogue on DNS, governance arrangements;
- WIPO – Committee on Trademarks addressing Geographic Names; direct parallel with work in WT 5 re PDP on Subsequent process;

Veni – referenced work at UN, which he had referenced on List, namely in the UN Open Ended Working Group (OEWG) and Government Group of Experts on Cybersecurity (UN GGE);

In discussion

Marilyn – IGF will post consultation on the UN HLP on Digital Cooperation and thus anyone can comment on this; strong emphasis and interest on commenting on this; she noted Implications for

ICANN in the three Recommendations on Digital Cooperation; these will need to be an analysis in the CCWG IG; we should also flag these Recommendations to CCWG IG membership.

<https://www.un.org/en/digital-cooperation-panel/>

Pablo Hinojosa – Noted the “Norms” discussion at IGF in Berlin

There was also a concern that UTU-D membership could be a slippery slope to T Secor given their agenda – should this take place would expect a broad consultation with Community.

Wolfgang – Agree re importance of “Norm making”; such at taking place in Global Commission; current work on final Report; good working swith ICANN on this; will be delivered at Paris Peace Forum in September; will be talking to GAC on Thursday about it. <https://cyberstability.org/>

Look forward to any comments on the Norm re “Protecting the public core”; would like this norm to be endorsed in a global multi-stakeholder way; Sessions with GAC and RSSAC on this.

Andrea Beccalli – Noted EuroDIG initiative for an inter-sessional project re UN Report.

Paul Rendek - Is there enough ICANN energy being spent on collaborative issues; such as defending the IGF?

Mandy Carver – Noted how our collaborative work, for example at IGF, fits together within overall three-layer IG Strategy

Matthew – ICANN should certainly be engaged on HLP Report consultation, it is directly relevant to us;

Theresa Swinehart – Noted Board adoption of Strategic Plan, part of this is to discuss trends and risks.

Nigel –gave example of GE “Collaborative (2nd level) work, such as on Internet Collaboration List and at OECD CDEP Committee; re Going Digital; <https://www.oecd.org/going-digital/>

5. Future Internet Governance Topics (including IGF)

<https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/igf-2019>

Paul - on the IGF hope it has been a topic for some dialogue; very concerned about future; do we support or not? This has to be an I* decision;

Veni - mentioned venue. And real support for underserved regions etc coming from Germany

Chris - Is there a threat to the very existence of IGF because of Recommendations from UN Report - do we have a Community view here?

Danko – Will Germany be bringing Ministers to IGF in Berlin, including from global south?

Veni noted there would be a HL Ministerial Session at IGF.

Marilyn – This is very important; need new thinking; we can preserve IGF with changes; doing some things better and some differently.

6. AOB

Matthew – We ought to make sure we set up the collaborative discussion space for legislation tracking before Montreal. Chair agreed this.

Olivier – closed meeting and thanked all for coming

GE; 1/7/19