

**Report on the Activities of the Cross  
Community Working Group on  
Internet Governance (CCWG-IG)  
(November 2017 – June 2018)**

23 June 2018

# Table of Contents

<b>1.</b>	<b><u>INTRODUCTION</u></b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b><u>EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES SINCE NOV. 2017</u></b>	<b>1</b>
2.1	CCWG-IG engagement with wider ICANN Community	1
2.2	CCWG-IG participation in external events from November 2017 to June 2018	4
2.2.1	World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) Forum 2018	4
2.2.2	Internet Governance Forum ( <a href="#">IGF</a> ) 2017	5
2.3	CCWG-IG input into ICANN's engagement with, and in, external processes	7
2.3.1	Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation ( <a href="#">WGEC</a> ) of the Commission for Science and Technology for Development ( <a href="#">CSTD</a> )	7
2.3.2	Input on International Telecommunication Union (ITU) Council Working Group on International Internet-related Public Policy ( <a href="#">CWG-Internet</a> ) <a href="#">Online Open Consultation: Bridging the Digital Gender Divide</a>	7
2.3.3	Input on ITU Expert Group on International Telecommunication Regulations ( <a href="#">EG-ITRs</a> )	8
2.4	CCWG-IG internal work since November 2017	9
2.4.1	Face-to-face meetings	9
2.4.2	CCWG-IG teleconferences	11
<b>3.</b>	<b><u>THE INTERNET GOVERNANCE LANDSCAPE</u></b>	<b>12</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b><u>WORK ON DEVELOPING A WAY FORWARD FOR ICANN CROSS-COMMUNITY WORK ON INTERNET GOVERNANCE</u></b>	<b>13</b>

## 1. Introduction

This report to the chartering organizations of the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance (CCWG-IG) covers a number of issues including participation in events and contributions made to on-going Internet governance activities. It also briefly touches on the overall Internet Government landscape, an issue which is important for ICANN, as a significant actor, along with others, in the overall IG Ecosystem.

Discussion on the establishment of the CCWG-IG began in December 2013, well before the ICANN Community had developed [A Uniform Framework of Principles and Recommendations for Cross Community Working Groups \(CCWG\)](#). As a result, the original charter of the CCWG-IG did not include regular reporting from the CCWG-IG back to the chartering organizations.

The CCWG-IG is currently in the process of developing a new cross-community vehicle, known as the Cross Community Engagement Group (CCEG), for its future activities and dialogue.

## 2. Events and activities since Nov. 2017

### 2.1 CCWG-IG engagement with wider ICANN Community

#### ICANN 60, Abu Dhabi

#### [Internet Governance Public Session](#)

*1 Nov. 2017, 10:15-11:15 UTC*

#### Speakers:

- Olivier Crepin-Leblond (Chair)
- Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca, Brazil
- Chengetai Masango, Secretariat of IGF
- Dr William Drake, University of Zurich
- Nigel Hickson, ICANN
- Judith Hellerstein
- Salam Yamout, ISOC
- Markus Kummer
- Farzaneh Badii
- Christopher Wilkinson
- Marilyn Cade

#### Agenda:

1. Introductions – Olivier (Chair)
2. Noting 2017 Report on CCWG IG Activities - Olivier (Chair) (2 minutes)

3. Update on Key Internet Governance Activities since June 2017 (15 minutes)
  - ITU WTDC (October) - Nigel Hickson
  - G7 ICT Ministerial - Nigel Hickson
  - ITU Open Consultation on OTT / Internet Services –Judith Hellerstein
  - UN CSTD Enhanced Cooperation WG – Ambassador Fonseca, Brazil
  - ISOC Global Internet report on the Future of the Internet - Salam Yamout; ISOC
  - Preparations for IGF 2017; Geneva -Chengetai Masango, IGF Secretariat
4. Why is Internet Governance important for ICANN?
  - Noting agreed Characterisations of IG activities by ICANN Board of IG Engagement
  - Broader conversation on why IG important to ICANN
  - Preparing for a wider debate at ICANN61
5. Conclusions and Any Other Business (AOB) – Olivier (Chair)

## Summary

This was a productive and constructive session of the CCWG IG Public Forum, which both recalled the issues arising from recent IG events (such as in the UN or ITU) and discussed more broadly the relationship between ICANN and the wider IG Ecosystem and the role of the former within it. The session was also appraised about recent CCWG IG activities and briefly touched-upon the format of a more in-depth IG session at ICANN61. There was support for the IG activity characteristics (approved by ICANN Board) and thanks given to Markus Kummer who was leaving the ICANN Board.

## ICANN 61 Puerto Rico

### [Internet Governance Public Session](#)

*12 March 2018, 11:30 – 13:00*

#### Speakers:

- Olivier Crepin-Leblond (Chair)
- Matthew Shears
- Pablo Hinojosa (APNIC)
- Marilyn Cade
- Martin Botterman
- Jimson Olufuye
- Israel Rosas
- Greg Shatan
- Young-eum Lee
- Tatiana Tropina
- Christopher Wilkinson
- Anja Gengo (IGF Secretariat)

**Agenda:**

1. Introduction, welcome
2. An evolving Internet Political Ecosystem (Tarek)
3. Discussion of Challenges A. Coordination and Distribution of Internet Identifiers
  - a. IP address blocks (ITU - WTSA / Plenipotentiary)
  - b. Top Level Domains (ITU - WTSA allowing study groups on the nature of top level domains - what is allowed and what is not allowed.)
  - c. Identifiers in WTO e-commerce agenda
  - d. Geographical names @ top level B. Tension between multi-lateral & multi-stakeholder fora.
  - e. How do government stakeholders interact in ICANN and outside ICANN for example -
  - f. Other environments and fora: i) WIPO; ii) Enhanced Cooperation at CSTD; iii) ITU WTDC. iv) ITU plenipotentiary (PP-18) v) UN agencies (eg. UNCTAD, UNESCO, ECOSOC) vi) United Nations
  - g. Cyber Security initiative C. How ICANN interacts with other organisations
    - i. Eg. GSM Association MoU;
    - ii. I\* (I “Stars” - I.e. IETF, ISOC, IAB, W3C, RIRs);
    - iii. Laws on Data Protection affecting ICANN / i.e. GDPR issue - through WHOIS D. Lack of sustained engagement in Internet Governance Ecosystem (eg. Laws on Cyber Security have been defined as Internet Governance by WSIS; etc.)

**Summary**

This was a very well attended, constructive and informative IG public Session. It clearly showed a keen interest of the Community in understanding external legislative and policy initiatives that could have an impact on ICANN. The overall approach being taken by the Organisation to identify *themes* which were most relevant for ICANN was welcomed. It was recognised that there were challenges ahead but also opportunities for ICANN in enhancing the understanding of policy makers of our work. The GDPR and the potential limitation in registrant data publication on WHOIS was seen as a potential problem for ICANN more globally.

**Details**

The ICANN Wiki page for the CCWG IG is at <https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=43984275>

## 2.2 CCWG-IG participation in external events from November 2017 to June 2018

### 2.2.1 World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) Forum 2018

*19-23 March 2018, Geneva*

At the [World Summit on the Information Society \(WSIS\) Forum 2018](#), CCWG-IG organized a workshop, 19<sup>th</sup> March on “A Dialogue on different cooperation models for approaches to Internet Public Policy development”

<https://www.itu.int/net4/wsis/forum/2018/Pages/Agenda/Session/196#intro>

#### Speakers:

- Matthew Shears, ICANN Board
- Nigel Hickson, VP, Government Engagement, ICANN
- Louise Hurel, NCUC, ICANN Community, Brazil
- Joanna Kulesza, NCUC, ICANN Community, University of Lodz, Poland
- Preetam Maloor, Strategy and Policy Advisor, ITU,
- Torbjorn Fredriksson, Chief; ICT Policy Section, UNCTAD
- Hu, Xianhong, UNESCO.
- Wolfgang Kleinwächter, Professor for International Communication Policy and Regulation at the Department for Media and Information Sciences of the University of Aarhus, Commissioner for Commission on Security of Cyberspace
- Dr Tatiana Tropina, Senior Researcher at the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law

#### Agenda:

1. Introductions and Welcome
2. Brief outlines of processes of Engagement / policy development at ICANN, ITU, UNESCO, UNCTAD and elsewhere
3. General Discussion and dialogue
4. Any conclusions and wrap up

#### Summary

This was a very constructive and informative session on the first day of the WSIS Forum. It explored a number of pertinent issues and where, for many of the organisations present, multistakeholder approaches had made a significant contribution to their initiatives and successes. In contrast was noted that while there were effective multilateral solutions, in cyberspace there had been

problems. The WSIS Forum approach to inclusiveness was recognised as was the IGF (and NRIs) and the ICANN IANA Transition. Was thought that Cybersecurity was possible most significant Internet issue on which progress (and solutions) were required.

### **Detail**

Full details of the CCWG-IG's preparation for and documentation of the workshop is available [here](#).

### **2.2.2 Internet Governance Forum (IGF) 2017**

*18-21 December 2017, Geneva*

At the [12<sup>th</sup> Internet Governance Forum \(IGF\), \*Shape your Digital Future\*](#) CCWG-IG organized a workshop, [Multistakeholder governance of the Domain Name System, lessons learned for other IG issues](#), held 19 December 2018.

The CCWG-IG workshop proposal, [Multistakeholder governance of the Domain Name System, lessons learned for other IG issues](#), was drafted by ICANN staff based on input from CCWG-IG members during the CCWG's teleconferences.

#### **Speakers:**

- Mr Markus Kummer, Independent Internet Governance and Policy Consultant – Chairman
- Mr Keith Drazek, VP of Policy & Government Relations at Verisign
- Mr Larry Strickling, Technology Policy Expert
- Mr Matthew Sears, Lead Strategist at Global Partners Digital; ICANN Board member
- Ms Lori Schulman, Senior Director of Internet Policy at the International Trademark Association (INTA)
- Ms Arda Gerkens, President of the International Organisation of Hotlines (INHOPE)
- Ms Lilian De Luque Bruges, Information Security Consultant
- Mr Ayden Féderline, Representative of the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group (NCSG)
- Ms Grace Mutung'u, Associate at the Kenya ICT Action Network (KICTANet)
- Mr Jordan Carter; Internet NZ

#### **Agenda:**

1. Introduction of session (moderator)
2. Brief explanation of how the Domain Name System is governed in a multistakeholder manner

3. Perspective from stakeholders around the table
4. Could this model be used for other Internet Governance issues and topics?
5. Discussion with Audience
6. Conclusion

#### Key Issues raised

- How the IANA Transition at ICANN in 2016 had demonstrated - for a complex policy making process with the need for an agreed outcome –the effectiveness of the multistakeholder process;
- The transition’s success was attributed, partly, to the availability of ICANN resources and legal representation from many parties and the effective working together of stakeholders from various segments of the Internet community; the responsibility of the Community for devising Accountability mechanisms was also seen as salient;
- It was noted that a key outcome of the process was the breakdown of silos within ICANN, improved understanding of the work of the various constituencies, and the development of relationships across the Internet community;
- In such processes, the importance of compromise was also noted; with the need to avoid entrenched positions;
- A recent project (with Report) by ISOC (with Larry Strickling as editor) was noted as had led to establishment of capability / platform to advise on Multistakeholder processes;
- Discussion also took place on the need for all stakeholder inputs to carry the same weight; for this it was noted that capacity building was often important; for example, for civil society participants at ICANN,
- The roundtable also discussed the relative effectiveness and need for reconciliation between global multistakeholder processes (such as for IANA transition) and national or regional regulations such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR);
- In terms of applicability to other Internet policy processes, it was noted that trade negotiations (especially in technical areas) would benefit from wider stakeholder input (for example as widely recognised during the recent WTO Ministerial with respect to e-commerce discussions);
- It was also noted that issues pertaining to regulations or rules regarding cyberspace or cybersecurity would benefit from multistakeholder dialogue

#### Key actions / takeaways

While there were not any specific actions, the overall discussion did elicit:

1. That care needed to be taken when addressing processes; and that we had to be both honest and clear in not attributing simple consultative processes as multistakeholder processes;



2. That effective processes needed a defined goal, resources, trust and buy-in from stakeholder groups;
3. That Cybersecurity (because of its importance and impact) had to be discussed and deliberated on in multistakeholder settings.

### Background

Reference to the IANA Transition process can be found at <https://www.icann.org/stewardship-accountability>

## **2.3 CCWG-IG input into ICANN's engagement with, and in, external processes**

The ICANN Global Engagement Team sought, inter-alia, the CCWG-IG's input on the following processes:

### **2.3.1 Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation ([WGEC](#)) of the Commission for Science and Technology for Development ([CSTD](#))**

<http://unctad.org/en/Pages/CSTD/WGEC-2016-to-2018.aspx>

The ICANN Global Engagement Team sought input from the members of the CCWG-IG during the complete course of the deliberations and five meetings of this Working Group (starting in November 2016). Members of the ICANN Community also served on the Working Group.

Based on the input from CCWG-IG members, ICANN contributed [this document](#) to the meeting. The CCWG-IG also discussed other individuals' and organizations' input to the open consultation. The CCWG-IG also maintained a [community wiki page](#) for members who wished to follow the process.

The Working Group concluded its work in February 2018, without any agreed Recommendations. The Report of the Chair of the Group, the CSTD Plenary in April 2018; is at

[http://unctad.org/meetings/en/SessionalDocuments/ecn162018crp3\\_en.pdf](http://unctad.org/meetings/en/SessionalDocuments/ecn162018crp3_en.pdf)

### **2.3.2 Input on International Telecommunication Union (ITU) Council Working Group on International Internet-related Public Policy ([CWG-Internet](#)) [Online Open Consultation; Bridging the Digital Gender Divide](#)**

The Global Engagement team sought input into ICANN's position on the Open Consultation on "Bridging the Digital Gender Divide" which was open from September to December 2017.

The questions posed were as follows:

1. What approaches and examples of good practices are available to increase Internet access and digital literacy of women and girls, including in decision-making processes on Internet public policy?
2. What approaches and examples of good practices are available to promote the access and use of ICTs by SMEs in developing and least-developed countries, particularly those owned/managed by women, in order to achieve greater participation in the digital economy?
3. Which are the available sources and mechanisms for measuring women's participation in the digital economy with focus on SME's and micro-enterprises?
4. What measures/policies could be envisioned in order to foster the role of women as entrepreneurs and managers of SMEs, specifically in developing and least-developed countries?
5. What are the gaps in addressing these challenges? How can they be addressed and what is the role of governments?

The individual input of CCWG-IG members was taken into account when developing ICANN's submission to the consultation, which is available [here](#).

A [summary](#) of the discussions, which ICANN took part in, are at <https://www.itu.int/md/S18-OPCWGINT6-C-0003/en>

### **2.3.3. Input on ITU Expert Group on International Telecommunication Regulations ([EG-ITRs](#))**

<https://www.itu.int/en/council/eg-itrs/Pages/default.aspx>

In January 2017, the Global Engagement team sought input on how ICANN should engage in the work of the ITU EG-ITRs. CCWG-IG members discussed their views on the mailing list in January and February.

ICANN followed, as a member of the ISOC delegation, the four meetings of this Expert Group; which concluded in April 2018.

A Report was submitted to Council (not public) which essentially concluded that while there were practical issues in having in force two sets of International Telecom Regulation (1988 and 2012) there were no substantive legal or technical issues.

The Report also noted differing views of member States as to whether there should be a further process under which preparations could be made for a further WCIT meeting to define an updated Regulation. The issue will, in all probability, be taken up in PP-18.

## 2.4 CCWG-IG internal work since November 2017

The Chair, and other representatives, of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance ([BWG-IG](#)) were present at the CCWG-IG's face-to-face meetings.

### 2.4.1 Face-to-face meetings

#### ICANN 60, Abu Dhabi

*31 October 2017, 10:15-11:15 UTC*

##### Speakers:

- Olivier Crepin-Leblond
- Bill Drake
- Markus Kummer
- Nigel Hickson
- Wolfgang Kleinwachter
- Tarek Kamel
- John Laprise
- Richard Hill
- Rafik Dammak
- Young-eum Lee
- Matthew Shears
- Collin Kurre

##### Topics discussed:

1. Introductions
2. Update on work on a new "Vehicle" for IG Engagement
3. Report from and discussion with Board Working Group on IG
4. Brief Flagging of Key issues on IG for rest of year
5. General Discussion and AOB

For more information and links to the transcript, see the [Public ICANN 60 Sched page for the meeting](#).

## Summary

Despite logistical issues (room and time) this was a constructive and informative meeting; giving, importantly, supportive guidance, on the establishment of a new Engagement Vehicle to replace the CCWG IG. The importance of continued involvement of the Community in opining on IG issues was stressed in (what was considered to be) a challenging external environment for ICANN.

Was noted that there were unforeseen difficulties at ITU WTDC (concerning proposals on DNS) which will make PP-18 even more important to engage with. The meeting endorsed the need for further development of the “vehicle” to replace the CCWG IG and for it to be adequately resourced by the ICANN Organisation and for it not be too rigid in structure.

The meeting was chaired by Olivier Crepin-Leblond.

## ICANN 61, Puerto Rico

*15 March 2017, 12:45-14:00 UTC*

### Speakers:

- Matthew Shears
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond
- Marilyn Cade Christopher Wilkinson
- Jim Prendergast
- Rafik Dammak
- Young-eum Lee
- Nigel Hickson
- Tatiana Tropina

### Topics discussed:

This Session discussed on-going, and up-coming, issues at the CCWG IG, including updating Community on the new “vehicle” that replaces the Cross Community Working Group.

1. Welcome and Introduction
2. Discussion with Board Working Group on Internet Governance - Chair Matthew Shears
3. Discussion of feedback received from Chartering Organisations on new Cross Community Engagement Group on Internet Governance new vehicle.
4. Planning until June 2018 (including WSIS Forum workshop planning)
5. Any other Business

## Summary

This was a constructive face to face session of the CCWG IG, the highlight of which was the productive exchange with the Chair (Matthew Shears) of the Board WG on Internet Governance.

## Detail

For more information and links to the transcript, see the [Public ICANN 61 Sched page for the meeting](#).

### 2.4.2 CCWG-IG teleconferences

Date	In Attendance	Topics Discussed
<a href="#">6 Dec 2017</a>	15 (17, inc. staff)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction, Roll Call, Adoption of Agenda (5 Minutes) Follow-up to ICANN60</li> <li>2. IGF workshop preparation               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. IGF 2017 Workshop: Multistakeholder governance of the Domain Name System, lessons learned for other IG issues</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Latest IG news</li> <li>4. AoB (5 Minutes)</li> </ol>
<a href="#">15 Dec 2017</a>	5 (7, inc. staff)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction, Roll Call, Adoption of Agenda</li> <li>2. Review of latest version of <a href="#">new vehicle draft</a></li> <li>3. Next steps</li> </ol>
<a href="#">19 Jan 2018</a>	9 (14, inc. staff)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction, Roll Call, Adoption of Agenda</li> <li>2. Review of latest version of <a href="#">new vehicle draft</a></li> <li>3. IG updates</li> <li>4. Possibility of a session at WSIS forum</li> <li>5. AoB               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
<a href="#">9 Feb 2018</a>	10 (15, inc. staff)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction, Roll Call, Adoption of Agenda</li> <li>2. Finalization of <a href="#">draft for new vehicle</a> to replace CCWG-IG</li> <li>3. Follow-up on WSIS Forum Workshop Proposal: "<a href="#">A Dialogue on Cooperation Models for approaches to Internet Public Policy Development</a>"</li> </ol>
<a href="#">2 Mar 2018</a>	6 (9, inc. staff)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Welcome and Roll Call</li> <li>2. Review of <a href="#">CCWG on IG Teleconference - 2018.02.09 - Action Items</a></li> <li>3. Designing the agenda of CCWG IG Public Meeting               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <a href="#">CCWG on IG Public Meeting in San Juan</a></li> <li>b. <a href="#">CCWG on IG F2F Meeting in San Juan</a></li> </ol> </li> </ol>

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Designing the agenda of the WSIS Forum Session             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. WIKI page for <a href="#">WSIS Forum at ITU 2018</a></li> <li>b. WIKI page for <a href="#">WSIS Forum at ITU 2017</a> (for reference)</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. AoB</li> </ol>
<a href="#">23 May 2018</a>	7 (17, inc. staff)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction, Roll Call, Adoption of Agenda (2 min)</li> <li>2. IG Activities Update (including UN, IGF, ITU, OECD and WIPO). (20 minutes)</li> <li>3. Update on Cross Community Engagement Group (CCEG) proposed charter feedback from SOs/ACs (10 minutes) Discussion for preparation of IGF 2018 Workshop proposal (15 minutes)             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Reference: past Internet Governance Forum workshops organised by the CCWG IG</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Preparation of CCWG IG face to face meeting in Panama - ICANN 62 (10 minutes)</li> <li>5. AoB</li> </ol>

### 3. The Internet Governance Landscape

ICANN, like many other organisations in the Internet Ecosystem, is affected by external developments that might be regionally or globally based. As we have found, for example in relation to the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), legislation not intended to affect the operation of the Domain Name System (DNS) can do exactly that. No doubt there may well be other legislative proposals in Europe and elsewhere that could affect ICANN and its Mission.

The DNS is also affected, albeit perhaps on a more localized basis, by national decisions taken to restrict access to the Internet (and thus the DNS). The imposition of such restrictions, whether on complete access or partial access potentially affects the security and stability of the DNS and thus is of concern to ICANN and the wider Internet Community.

ICANN can also, of course be affected by decisions taken globally by International Governmental Organisations. Proposals have been made, both historically and more recently, in the UN, ITU and WIPO that could have resulted in work and decisions on domain names being made outside of ICANN. An example of this were proposals made at the ITU WTSA Conference (in 2016) for the ITU to work on Generic Top Level Domains (Resolution 47).

As we look forward to discussions at the ITU Plenipotentiary in Dubai in November (PP-18) we may well again see proposals by some governments for ITU to work on certain types of naming and addressing issues.

In all of the above the work with, and dialogue between, the ICANN Organisation and the Community is increasingly important. The ICANN Community has a depth and breadth in the overall Internet Ecosystem which is paramount in both enabling understanding and knowledge of national and regional proposals and facilitating the appropriate dialogue required.

#### **4. Work on developing a way forward for ICANN cross-community work on Internet governance**

After ICANN 59, the members of the CCWG-IG began work on a new “vehicle” following concerns from ICANN Community – particularly, the gNSO – on the structure of the CCWG-IG and its engagement with Supporting Organizations (SOs) and Advisory Committees (ACs).

In August 2017, the GNSO Council [resolved](#) to withdraw as a chartered member of CCWG-IG ahead of ICANN 61. Following this decision, the CCWG-IG established a working group to develop a proposed new vehicle that would meet the needs of the ICANN Community. The working group has been focusing on:

- How the new vehicle can interact effectively with SOs and ACs, the ICANN BWG-IG and the ICANN Organization
- How the new vehicle can be resourced

A Charter has been thus drawn up for a Cross Community Engagement Group (CCEG).

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1hnr5r1V-WDUxNswlVxqUUarQRCKc1YqdDvmkeX49Fd8/edit#>

The GNSO withdrew from the CCWG IG in March 2018, at ICANN 62.

The proposed Charter for the CCEG has been socialized with the SO/AC leaders and initial feedback has been obtained from the CCNSO and the gNSO.

Further discussion with the Community is planned at the Face to Face Meeting at ICANN62, <https://62.schedule.icann.org/meetings/703309>

**ICANN; GE; June 2018**