

ICANN66, IG Public Session – Cross Community WG on Internet Governance; 4/11

Summary

This was a well-attended, constrictive and important dialogue of the ICANN Community on issues including the UN High Level Panel on (UNHLP) in Digital Cooperation, IGF 2019 in Berlin, the current UN Cybersecurity dialogue in New York, the WIPO discussions on Geographical Names and on the current Organisation Initiative on Legislative Tracking.

On the UN HLP Recommendations there was considerable interest, support for initiatives to secure a broader stakeholder base but also concerns, with respect to specific recommendations on potential effects on IGF. There was widespread support for enhancing and strengthening IGF and in securing more stable funding.

On Legislative Tracking, there was general support for use of the “Engagement Group” for flagging potential issues of concern and being a source of information on flagged initiatives.

During the IGF Update main focus was on the (highly relevant) UN discussions on Cybersecurity in New York and on the on-going dialogue on restrictions on use of geographical names (in DNS) at WIPO.

Detail

See the CCWG Wiki for agenda and other Papers
(at <https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=43984275>)

1. Introduction

Olivier Crepin Leblond welcomed all to this IG Public Meeting.

Nigel Hickson asked delegates to complete sign-up list and to indicate whether they wished to be on mailing list.

2. Presentation and discussion of the proposals made by the UN High Level Panel on Digital Cooperation - Continuing the evolution of the IGF - perspectives from ICANN participants

Olivier introduced this Session, noting the objective was not to produce any opinions but to give opportunity for discussion and debate ahead of further dialogue at Berlin IGF.

Switzerland (Livia Walpen) spoke about the work of the HL Panel noting their involvement with

the Panel (their ex-President Doris Leuthard was on the Panel) and their overall support for the Recommendations made. She noted need for better digital cooperation globally and thus support for Panel recommendations in this respect. It was a multistakeholder panel, independent of UN, with a separate secretariat, with 22 members (diverse make-up).

She noted that most substantial part is Chapter 4 (Models of Cooperation) though also noted important focus on security and inclusion. She noted that generally the “3 Models of Digital Cooperation” were main focus with all having same aim in mind, and all supporting multistakeholder mechanisms. The “IGF plus model” is our favourite she noted; allowing for evolution and improvement of IGF, with more decision making and more focus.

Finally, she recognised that while ICANN did not directly contribute; it does, she believed, have an interest in the overall issues and the IGF “plus” Framework.

Marilyn Cade noted her work on the UN CSTD Group on IGF Improvements (some years back) and how the consequent Report has been important in improving IGF; it now, she noted, needs to be *strengthened and enhanced* and not improved so much. IGF serves such an important role, especially given enhanced use and importance of Internet.

She noted the CSTD work on Enhanced Cooperation also looked at digital cooperation. Noted Panel Report was comprehensive and was in important that stakeholders commented on in, such as during Main Session on Day 1 of IGF, where there will be opportunity for oral comments.

She noted some concern on specific ideas from Report; such as hot-lines, while the idea of Observatory of successful examples is interesting though has practical difficulties. IGF Plus model is the most relevant and we should focus on that. IGF can *already* make Recommendations.

Finally, she noted that Secretariat also needs to be enhanced and NRIs have to be championed and encouraged

Sam Lanfranco reflected on growing importance of economic and social issues with respect to Internet. On HL Report, the IGF, he said, now has to take up challenges in recommendations and run with it. Thought Report was mainly aspirational rather than analytical and tended to reflect author views; we need, he noted, to judge Report against wider UN agenda on Sustainable development.

We need to reflect on what social contract we need; not enough in Report to see any real signposts; which is where IGF has to come in.

In discussion

Agustina Callegar (ISOC) referenced their contribution to the Panel. It focussed on Internet being a driving force for change. They also recognise IGF+ model as being most relevant. We also want to see evolution and strengthening of IGF and not have new mechanisms, while not having IGF as negotiating model. We also want to see IGF enhance private sector and government engagement.

Lousewies Vanderlaan (remote) questioned the government role in the Report, and on adoption of Recommendations.

Marilyn noted governments do have a role; Internet has always been, to an extent, a regulated space, and security threats will make it more relevant.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter recalled noted the “Clinton remark” (at ICANN San Francisco Meeting) about “stumbling forward”; so as long as progress is forward it is not bad. After 15 years, he noted, we have realised we need all stakeholders with a counter culture of digital nationalism. Thus, importance of Report. ICANN is no longer a lead actor, and that is wise, but it will be risky for them to ignore what is going on. We have to be able to contribute to DNS abuse issues, as will be in security issues where the (likely) regulation will be.

Chris Buckridge (RIPE NCC) also responded on Panel Report, noting they also back “enhancing” of IGF, through the IGF+ model. We should not be too critical of IGF, it has produced good work. Also, important to have solid financial base and to champion the regional and national Initiatives.

Jimson Olufye also noted he was (like Marilyn) involved on CSTD IGF Improvements work. Said it was critical we all were involved in future of Internet. See no reason why IGF cannot do more in discussing public policy issues. Also noted importance of IGFSAs – has broken new ground.

Ben Wallis (MAG, MS) noted Microsoft also contributed to Report. Noted how unique and important IGF is. We need to have IGF as a forum for discussion though Recommendations can also play a role. More resources needed for Secretariat and a more stable funding environment needed. If IGF was moved to Office of UN SG then perhaps that would help focus on importance.

Lousewies Vanderlaan – said discussion on IGF goes on for ever but IGF is so important given breadth of stakeholders; how many minds have been changed and how many policy makers influenced over years? So, strong support;

Nurani Nimpuno reflected that some of this discussion goes back to 2011; but not bad we are discussing again. It needs to respond to evolvments in Internet.

Olivier welcomed discussion and asked us to flag IGFSAs to Community as a vehicle for supporting IGF.

3. Update on the CCWG-IG becoming an Internet Governance Engagement Group (IGEG)

Olivier recalled that we will, following this Session, rename CCWG IG to “IG Engagement Group” given the change to nature of a CCWG governance arrangements.

Mandy Carver reflected on the use of the Engagement Group as a vehicle to discuss how external legislation, polices and regulations affects ICANN’s Vison and Mission. We hope IGEG

can be a vehicle for this dialogue. It would not, she noted, neither develop policy nor speak on behalf of ICANN.

4. Internet Governance Updates

(i) UN Cyber Security discussions – Veni Markovski reported on the two UN Groups; GGE and OEWG. Former with 25 member States (closed) and second with all UN member States involved (if they so wished) and also with stakeholders.

Reflected on OEWG September meeting which mainly had Statements. Will send relevant links to mailing list. ICANN has not been referenced directly in discussion but China has noted the *imbalance* in governance of the Internet's critical resources.

Reflected on disagreements on how existing law is applicable in cyberspace. Also, discussion on whether there should be a new "body" as such. Noted that on 2-4th September; there will be stakeholder sessions in NY for OEWG.

(ii) WTO Public Forum – Vera Major noted relevant discussions at public forum, while in the main the Internet was not a critical part of it. Of more importance, she noted was the prospect of plurilateral discussions on e-commerce. She also noted questioning of moratorium re taxes / duties on electronic commerce; could be important for future shape of Internet market.

Finally, she noted s submission to WTO (for discussion at WTO Ministerial) on proposals for corporate taxation (as has been developed at OECD).

(iii) Nigel briefly touched on ICANN involvement at IGF 19 (noting that details would follow on list) and referenced involvement of Board, Organisation and Community in a range of sessions.

He mentioned ongoing WIPO discussion (in Trademark Committee) on Geographical Names (a multi-country proposal that was introduced last year) and also work at ITU in preparing for the World Telecommunications Standardisation Assembly (WTSA) in November 2020 and the World Telecommunications Policy Forum (WTPF) in 2021.

Wuzhen Cyberspace Conference – Leonid Todorov referenced this annual Conference that took place last week; again, portraying China as a dominant Internet power. He noted it was a significant event in terms of numbers and promotion though perhaps less high profile than in previous years. Subjects included cybersecurity, privacy and even China – HK relations. Sessions were closed, with no real discussion as such (very scripted interventions).

He concluded that after 5 years there are signs of weariness in the event, with a lack of large names and of declining significance. There were no specific references to ICANN.

5. Any Other Business

Marilyn noted and flagged NRI / IGFSAs Session in Montreal at 12 noon on Wednesday.

Olivier noted the CCNSO Internet Governance Session on Wednesday.

Wolfgang noted the Global Commission presents its Final Report on 12th November in Paris; with reference to the Public Core Norm.

Ellen Strickland (.NZ) referenced Christchurch Call and continuing relevance of this with advisory group established. (Christchurch Call.com)

GE; ICANN, November 19