MONTREAL – IG Public Session – Cross Community WG on Internet Governance
Monday, November 4, 2019 – 15:15 to 16:45 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Let's start the recording.

Well, good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the meeting, the public session of the CCWG, Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance public forum here at ICANN 66. We've got an interesting agenda today for you with first the discussion around the UN High-Level Panel on Digital Cooperation. Then we'll be briefly speaking of the evolution of the CCWG into an Internet governance engagement group and then afterwards, we'll have some updates on Internet governance from various organizations.

I can see here, ICANN Org, but no. We'll be speaking about the public forum at World Trade Organization, the UN Cyber Security discussions, IGF, etc.

So first, I will hand the floor over to Nigel Hickson for some housekeeping.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much, Olivier. Nigel Hickson, ICANN Government Engagement. Just to say, first of all, welcome and please, come sit at the table if you can find a space, as Olivier.

We'll hand round a sign-up sheet. We like to know how many people we have here and if you want, if you're new to the Cross-Community Working Group or the Cross-Community Engagement Group – we'll explain that – and you would like to be on our mailing list, then please put in your e-mail address and we'll make sure you're added to the mailing address, to the mail. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Nigel.

So our first topic for today is the UN High-Level Panel on Digital Cooperation. This is quite a long process. It started quite a while ago and we've got three distinguished speakers with us today. And what we'll do is to have them take us through the different parts, the different perspectives that they can share with us and then we'll open the floor for an open discussion on the topic.

So first is Livia Walpen from the Swiss Federal Office of Communications, OFCOM. We also have Marilyn Cade, President of ICT Strategies and Cade LLC, and Sam Lanfranco, Professor Emeritus of Economics at York University in Toronto, Canada.

So let's start with Livia who was not directly involved with the process, but your government was. So let's, first, I guess the start really is give us a little bit of a background of what this whole high-level panel is about and then positions that your government has been having on this. Over to you, Livia.

ICANN 66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

LIVIA WALPEN: Yeah. Thank you very much, Olivier, and hello, everybody. I'm very glad to be here and I would like to share a bit of the perspective of Switzerland on the report of the High-Level Panel on Digital Cooperation because actually, we, as the Swiss government, we really supported the establishment and also the work of this panel from the very outset. And our former president, Mrs. Doris Leuthard, she was also a member of the panel.

And perhaps I can just quickly explain why we think this was really important, why we supported this work. I think we probably all here, we've been observing for quite a while that there are gaps in the current ecosystem of global digital governance because there are many parallel, not coordinated processes at regional and local levels, and they don't know from each other. They are very complex, sometimes not efficient. There is no simple entry point. There are many cross-cutting issues that are still addressed in policy silos and I could continue.

And so we really think that there is a need for a better and an improved digital cooperation system. And from the Swiss perspective, we actually, we did not just want to watch and wait, but we tried to act proactively, and therefore, we initiated and supported the creation of this panel, which is a multi-stakeholder panel that is independent of the formal UN structures which is really important because within the UN, there are many blockades. But it still does have the legitimacy of the UN Secretary General.

And just by the way, it was also actually the first panel by Secretary General Guterres and I think that also gave relevance to the topic of digitization.

So yeah, in July 2018, Secretary General Guterres established this panel with 22 members from multi-stakeholder approaches from all over the world and it worked over 11 months, also holding many public events and consultations, and then in June this year, it presented its final report. I don't know how many of you have seen it. It's 32 pages and I mean, from a Swiss perspective, I think the report, it's probably not perfect and it does not have all the solutions. But I think it really presents a very good basis for informed discussion and it also creates a momentum and it triggers a debate, and I think that's really what we need at the moment.

So we see this report as a step into the right direction and I mean, I don't know how familiar you all are with the content but I think the most substantial part is Chapter 4 that outlines different models for cooperation and then there are also five concrete recommendations in Chapter 5, particularly also Recommendation 5A on the IGF Plus.

And the other recommendations, 1, 2, 3 and 4, they actually focus more on the substance, so inclusion, capacity building, human rights, security. And I think they are also very good and important. But actually, from a Swiss perspective, we think that the "how" is even more important than the "what". So in the panel, they also used [inaudible] because they said we actually have to design the kitchen and not the

menu. So the kitchen should serve as well for cooking different menus also in the future.

And perhaps, now on the specific mechanisms of cooperation, there are three different models proposed in the report: the so-called IGF Plus model, the COGOF and Digital [Commons], and I think I don't want to go too deep into this because it's also very technical. But I think in the end, the three models are actually three different flavors of the same idea kind of because in the end, all mechanisms are decentralized, they are network-based and they are multi-stakeholder. And I think, therefore, we actually can support all of them.

But still, the three different mechanisms, they have varying degrees of state and UN involvement. And also, what I think is really important, we should build on existing structures as much as possible. And therefore, for us, from the Swiss perspective, the IGF Plus model is clearly our preference and I think it's also the most promising model out of the three because it's a middle way regarding state and UN involvement. It does have the UN legitimacy but it's still open to all stakeholders and I also think that the IGF has really served us well in the last years by identifying emerging topics and providing a [fertile] ground for many, many networks, all the national and regional initiatives. And it also has the trust and the acceptance by the stakeholders.

But I think we also would all agree that the IGF needs improvement. It needs to be more politically relevant, more inclusive. There is, in fact, a lack of actionable outcomes because the dialogue really has to be linked, in the end, to decision making and here, that's actually exactly

what the IGF Plus model suggests with the so-called policy incubator and cooperation accelerator that should fill these gaps.

And what's also very important, the IGF needs more money because without money, nothing will be implemented and there is also recommendation in the report to strengthen the IGF trust fund.

Yeah, so to look into the future, I think we should really build on the Recommendation 5A and the IGF Plus model and of course, there, as Olivier already said, the upcoming IGF in Berlin will be a very important moment as there will be really substantial discussion with the whole community on these ideas. And yeah, of course, Switzerland we will be ready to also support the follow-up of this report, particularly with regards to the IGF Plus model.

And perhaps, just to close, let me say one word also on ICANN's role within this process because, of course, ICANN is not directly impacted and it also, it did not contribute to the consultations that are, I think they are now closed, but that the IGF and also EuroDIG conducted on the report of the panel. But I think ICANN still does have an interest in the overall stability and efficiency of the wider government system, and therefore, I think ICANN also would have an interest in a strengthened IGF Plus framework. So I think I'll leave it here for the moment and look forward to the discussion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Livia, and thank you for this extensive outlook on the report itself. For those people that haven't downloaded the report,

it's downloadable from DigitalCooperation.org. So just go on there and you can flick through it during this session.

Of course, I should have in my intro, and I've done it very badly. I should have mentioned that we are not looking here at putting together a statement of some sort or any kind of points that ICANN would contribute to the debate. This is not in the mandate of this working group. We're just providing here a platform for discussion, and as you've heard, there is still a consultation going on within the IGF and there will be actually a main session in the IGF. So it's, perhaps, meant to jog your memory and get you to hear maybe other perspectives that some people might have in the room, and then file your own thoughts and your own contributions using the process.

Let's turn over to Marilyn Cade who has been working with business for quite some time and certainly, on these topics, has quite an extensive experience on that. So I think we'll hear from her, from your perspective, Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Olivier, and thank you so much for that great overview.

I was privileged to be appointed by the UN Secretary General to the first UNCTAD Commission on Science and Technology for Development Working Group on Improvements to the IGF and I saw Jimson, Olivier come in and a few other people who were also on that group.

So there was an extensive discussion even at that time about improvements to the IGF, and eventually, a report was published,

approved by the UN General Assembly and has continued to provide something of a framework for changes.

So I'm going to personally promote the use of "strengthen and enhance the IGF" as opposed to "improve the IGF" because I think that we ought to always remember we are on a journey and as circumstances change and we continue to expand the integration of the online world and the Internet into daily life, Internet governance in the very broad sense has to be viewed as something that we all think about. And we must respect that given the percentage and the dependency of economic life, cultural life, personal life on online communications, of course governments and multi-lateral organizations are going to be increasingly engaged.

So I was also on the two follow-up working groups on enhanced cooperation and I will challenge anyone who says that working group failed because it came up with many good ideas, some of which are being implemented even though it didn't come up with a single consensus report to the UN. But it continued and I think influenced the understanding and thinking of the UN Secretary General about the importance of digital cooperation and the integration of the digital world and the transformation that is going on.

So I have a few models here of enhanced cooperation. I'm joking. But one of the interesting things, and if you haven't read the report, do try to find time to at least skim it. There are over 600, according to the report, documented activities and some of them are fully global in nature. Some are regional or sub-regional in nature. Some are largely

multi-lateral with observer status from other stakeholders. Some are driven primarily by the business sector or by the NGO sector with some engagement and pollination with existing multi-lateral organizations or national organizations. But it's impossible for even me to follow over 600 activities, although I do try, Olivier keeps saying.

But the IGF Secretariat has kept their platform open for contribution and so you can go on the INTGOVForum.org website and you'll see that there's a link there where the link to the various segments of the document and you can just insert your comment. So it's not too late to provide comments. And I spoke with them just a day or two ago. They're very interested in further comments. Your comments could come as an individual. They could come as a company. There are some trade associations. There are more governments.

Let me lay out a challenge here. There are more governments than stakeholders who have submitted comments. So hey, let's get our competition blood up here.

Even if you can't comment on every section, do look at the sections you can comment on and I am going to share a couple of perspectives from my many, many years of working in this space. There will be a short opportunity on Day 1 to participate in what was said in the public comments and take further comments. But you really need to make your voice heard by submitting written comments.

I have some concerns from being around forever about some of the ideas. I think some of the ideas are a little silly, like the idea that you can have a hotline, that somebody is staffing 24/7, "Hi, I'm having a problem

EN

with figuring out how I implement change in spectrum law in my country," etc. So some of the things, I think, are extremely aspirational.

The idea of an observatory that would gather more concretely and in a more organized way successful examples of things that are going on could be a very, very useful endeavor. The question then comes down to who curates it, how do you validate it, how do you make sure it's not fraudulent or how do you pick the expert who might actually be a scammer, etc. So that's a very complicated suggestion that needs a lot more thought as well.

I agree that the further elaboration on strengthening and enhancing the IGF Plus model is the one that I think is most relevant to most of us and the one where we can make the greatest contribution. And I think we need to get over this idea that you can't make recommendations. You can. You can make recommendations without those recommendations being binding. You can make aspirational recommendations. You can present well-documented fact-based recommendations that then can be considered by multi-lateral organizations and national organizations and entities about implementing.

And I think we would have to think about what that means in terms of what are the additional processes at the IGF. And I know it's not easy. Not everybody is on the same page about this. But I do think it's time to look hard at it.

I'm going to wrap up with just one other point here. In order to be relevant, you have to lead. The Secretariat needs to be substantially strengthened into more of the model of the professional Secretariat

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

EN

such as at the Commission on Science and Technology for Development for their economist. They're our sociologist. That is the model that's followed in most of the multi-lateral organizations and by the way, it's the model that's followed in trade associations as well.

And I think we have to get past the idea that just coordinating is enough and that we ought to be serious about substantially strengthening the Secretariat, both in numbers but also in skills and background, etc. And the issue of funding is an extremely important one.

Now real quickly, this is my final point. Many of you know that I spend a lot of time with the national and sub-regional IGFs and there are many, many people here at ICANN who are in coordinator or steering group or participant roles and we need to be also thinking about how we strengthen those mechanisms because you can talk globally. You change laws locally. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Marilyn. Now, of course, the civil society has been very much involved with the IGF. They've been a prime supporter and actor in the IGF. Sam, what's the civil society perspective on this report and on the solutions, the projected solutions there?

SAM LANFRANCO: Thank you, Olivier. I'm going to come at this at a couple of angles. First of all, I would declare myself. I'm a development economist. I first got interested in these topics working on mainframes and then with UNCTAD and Geneva in the 1960s and with the UNDP in the 1970s. And

ICANN 66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

for most of that time, all we were told was, "Go away. You're not dealing with anything important." It's only been really since the 90s on where this has, people have begun to realize that this is important. And I'm an economist but also in the social sciences.

The first thing I'd like to say is with respect to one of the titles here. That's the IGF. I think that the IGF has the obligation to take what is an aspirational and inspirational document. The high-level document is not a road map. It's a kind of declaration of wishes and hopes and intentions that somebody else will implement and I think that the IGF rightly should be the vanguard on this. And if they're a successful vanguard, they'll get run over by a bunch of other people that start running in the same direction and run faster. There will just be thousands of things going on.

The high-level panel, I read it both as an economist and as somebody working in this area. As I said already, it's inspirational and aspirational. It does carry a bit of the flavor of the two lead people in it: Jack Ma and Melinda Gates. It's a kind of blend between an Ali Baba view of the world and a [Gavay] view of the world in terms of how you make things happen, and that's the real question that's before us now. How do we make things happen?

We're at a point in the life of the planet where we've spent hundreds of thousands of years coming to terms with the natural ecosystem and we have screwed it up really badly. We now have this Internet ecosystem that has sprung to us with the invention of the IP protocol and what we've built from that, and the question that this high-level

commissioner is basically asking is, "How do we take this digital ecosystem or the social ecosystem and put them together into something that, in the language of the high-level panel and the UN, is inclusive, is equitable, respects human rights, and serves the goals that are summarized in the sustainable development goals of the UN?" That's the language they come back to because that's the language that was used to basically charter the panel to begin with.

And the real question for me in terms of all of this is I go from civil society constituency to civil society constituency or to business constituency or government constituency is I get the same thing. Whatever it is that's bothering them, aspirationally or under threat, they go, "Somebody should do something about that."

In the Internet ecosystem, whether it's integrity, whether it's security, whether it's privacy, whether it's energy consumption, whatever it is, and at the beginning, we call this the knowledge age. If you remember when the digital economy or digital reality became to grow, we said, "It's the knowledge age." We argued information age, knowledge age. We backed away. We're just calling it the digital age because there's a lot of bad knowledge out there as a result.

Well, the question for us now is how do we take where we are, where we want to get, and use this new and emerging Internet ecosystem that has regulations and procedures to be built in. It's got a social fabric to be built in, one that governs our behavior the way [inaudible] governs our behavior every day. We don't just check the regulations and see if we can do things. We know what we should and shouldn't do.

What kind of social contract do we rebuild that both prevents us from destroying the natural ecosystem and takes this digital ecosystem, the Internet ecosystem and builds that fabric in which we build a society that we want to go into, that takes us forward?

And back to the implementation stage, which is not here – that's why I view this as Version 1 of this and this is what the IGF will be doing as far as I'm concerned – is saying, "Okay, how do we begin to think about who are the actors, what should their roles be, what are the next moves?"

Years ago, we used to say we needed information to turn it into knowledge to make people aware and to get them engaged. And then we'd be in good shape. In recent years, we've said, "Well, we need to get them engaged but we need two more things. We need integrity in the engagement and we need a little bit of courage."

And so I'm going to close on that. What we need going forward with this is not just a whole lot of ideas, but some ideas that are backed with a bit of courage. I'll stop there and I hope people have a lot to say.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sam. So now we're going to open the floor for perspectives of people who are in this room, and also who are watching us remotely.

But before that, I wanted to turn over to Agustina Callegari from the Internet Society. And the Internet Society has sent in a contribution to

this consultation so it would be interesting to hear the main lines of what the Internet Society has come up with.

AGUSTINA CALLEGARI: Thanks, Olivier. Can you hear me? Yes, right? Yes.

I work for the Internet Society. Well, I come. I would like to share with you some of the comments that the Internet Society have recently submitted to the High-Level Panel on Digital Cooperation. Well, the Internet Society has supported the panel [F4] from the beginning of this work and as I said, we have recently submitted a contribution that you will be able to find on their website.

In the submission, we specifically examine the recommendations that are relevant to our priorities and mission. While the report addresses technologies in general, our submission focuses on the Internet as the driving force of many of the changes that the panel was mandated to address.

That said, if I'm not saying wrong, Livia and Marilyn were saying, we believe that the IGF model is the place where we can made better and strong recommendations so I would like to share some of our contributions to that model, to the Internet Governance Forum Plus model that is highlighted in the report.

And as you know, the Internet Society has been closely following and supporting the IGF since its inception. Of course, we think that the panel proposal for the IGF Plus is interesting, but we also think that this is an

opportunity to strengthen and enhance what we currently have at the IGF.

As I said, we believe that now is the time to strengthen the IGF rather than reinventing [inaudible]. The objective should be to deliver more tangible outcomes while maybe transforming the IGF into a negotiating body. Then the panel, I don't know if you had time to review the report, but the panel [inaudible] that new mechanisms such as the advisory group and help desk and corporation accelerator to be creating [inaudible] like the IGF what we would like to see and I think this is a good time to do it. And also, at the IGF, to have a discussion on how the IGF community that has been working for a long time on these issues can define and help to define these functions.

So that said, we think that in order to serve as the main forum for setting the Global Internet Governance agenda, the IGF also needs to increase its value to all stakeholders and to enhance government and private sector engagement. So this should be one of the key drivers of the implementation team working and collaborating with all stakeholder groups.

Well, as I said, you can find the contribution on the panels and on the IGF website. We are looking forward to continue the conversation here and at IGF.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Agustina. So now we have a remote participant who is commenting and Vera Major is going to be able to read her point to the record.

VERA MAJOR: Hello. Good afternoon, everyone. So we had a question from Lousewies van der Laan, former Board member of ICANN. She missed part of the beginning of the session, and upon answering what she missed, she asked, "Isn't the key objective to keep governments out of the governance of the Internet? Oops, I mean as a key partner, of course."

SAM LANFRANCO: Thank you very much. Thank you for this comment, Lousewies. I'm not sure if Olivier wants to speak to this. Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: I'll be a brave soul and jump in here. And so I didn't hear where the question came from.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Lousewies van der Laan.

MARILYN CADE: No, I don't think the goal is to keep governments out of the governance of the Internet, just I don't think the key goal is to pretend that we've never had rules and structures and laws that have affected the Internet from the very beginning. In fact, in the United States, the growth of the

narrow band Internet would have been completely stymied had we not had an extremely friendly regulatory environment which enable cost effective inner connection for those ISPs who were emerging. At one point, there were 7,580 independent ISPs in the United States. I'm just filled with trivial facts.

And I know that because the company I worked for, AT&T Worldnet, helped to support the small trade associations that supported them. And so I don't think we would. I think lots of people say the Internet's never been regulated or we want governments out. I think what we want is the right balance of laws and regulations and codes of conduct and recourse when needed.

And you can only have that when you sit at the table and develop a shared agenda that tries to understand different roles and accountabilities and responsibilities. We're already seeing, and I think if you were to ask anyone, "Do you really want the Wild West on the Internet where people are concerned about using their credit cards, they're concerned about losing their identities, they're concerned about the new and growing security threats which are contributing to concerns about fragmentation?" The average layuser on the street's going to say, "That's not the world I want." The average business user is going to say, "That's not the world I want."

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right, thank you. And may I remind everyone for those people that are not sitting on the table, we actually have some mics which are on either

side of the room. So you will be looking at these, if you wish to share your points of view, then please go over to the mic.

Now we have in the queue, Wolfgang Kleinwaechter.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Thank you, Olivier. I think it was Bill Clinton in an ICANN meeting around ten years ago in San Francisco when he described Internet governance as a process of stumbling forward. He said, "Stumbling is not bad as long as it goes forward." And if you look backwards, then you would say and I fully agree with what Livia has said. From time to time, you have to recollect what you have and then you have to take the next stumbling step forward. And more or less, at the eve of the 2020s, we have reached this point.

We had the [Tundis] agenda which produced the IGF. We had the [Net Mundial] which triggered the IANA Transition. We had the Paris Call on Trust and Security which pushed the establishment of two new negotiation bodies, now in the United Nations with the Augmented Working Group and the GTE.

And now, it's such a complexity that time is ripe to get the fully picture in the form of the next stumbling step forward.

Twenty years ago, the Internet Governance was more or less a tactical issue with some political implications and the environment has changed and today, Internet is a political issue with a technical component.

And insofar, I am very happy for two things which are in the report. One thing is that the report marks, in my eyes, the end of the always senseless debate between multistakeholderism and multilateraliam. For more than 10-15 years, there were heated battles between people who said everything has to be multilateral and governments have to take the lead. And the other said, "No, it has to be multistakeholder with private sector in the lead."

So after 15 years, we have realized we need all stakeholders. And the report makes very clear that multistakeholderism and multilateralism goes hand in hand, and the new "enemy", the new counterconcept is unilateralism. What we see now is a wave, and the wave is coming on digital nationalism.

And insofar the message of this report is extremely important that we say we need this new innovative multilateralism with multistakeholder components as, let's say, a counter strategy to avoid, to [inaudible] in hundreds of national segments or [walled] gardens or alternative routes or whatever. I think this is really an important point where we have reached and insofar the message of this high-level panel is very clear.

Although the other keyword which is used, the title is the age of digital interdependence. And this is my second point because interdependence means not only the interdependence among the stakeholders. It means also the interdependence among the issues. It means if you have a cyber security issue today, let's say 5G, this has an

economic dimension. This touches human rights and has technical implications.

That means the four big baskets in Internet governance, security, economy, technology, and human rights, are also interlinked. Here, in ICANN, we have the nice example of the GDPR. The intention of the European Union was to have, protect privacy as a human right. But immediately, we realized this effort had economic implications. It raises security issues with law enforcement and we are looking for new technologies, probably new protocols, how to handle this.

And I think this is also a lesson which is, and it's my final point, important for ICANN because ICANN is fortunately not anymore in the lead. It was in the leading position during the business process. It was in the leading procession when there was Net Mundial and the IANA Transition. But it was very wise by the new leadership of ICANN to step aside and to say, "We are not the world government of the Internet. We make a contribution."

But it would be risky and dangerous for ICANN just to ignore what's going on in this field because ICANN can immediately affected. I would not say overtaken, but there could be government regulation that could be other forms of activities by people who have no clue what ICANN is, who have ignored all the IANA Transition, all this. They are setting a new powerhouse of dealing with military issues, with security issues, and ICANN is a platform, is a body which touches security issues. All the issues we have here discussed about DNS abuse, there are security issues.

And there are hundreds of people outside with no knowledge about ICANN who say, "We are responsible for security and we will regulate this." I think these are the new challenges insofar it would be wise if ICANN would participate in the process, not as the leader but as a very critical observer. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Wolfgang. And of course, this morning during the opening ceremony, we also heard about the potential threat of fragmentation, all of the things that are coming or might be coming our way.

We've got Chris Buckridge next.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE: Hello. Chris Buckridge from the RIPE NCC. So RIPE NCC also submitted a response to the report from the high-level panel. We, I think, put it into the EuroDIG process for collecting those responses and also to the IGF one.

I think Marilyn's point about shifting from that idea of improvement to enhancing and strengthening the IGF is a very important one, and I think it's one that we tried to reflect in what we said in our submission.

We essentially supported the IGF Plus model. I think of the models that are presented there, it makes the most sense. But I think we do need to be a bit careful in terms of how we sort of see the IGF as it is and not to sort of put too negative a spin on that.

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

I mean, I think even to hear talk about more tangible outcomes, I know how much time RIPE NCC staff contributed to say the best practice forum on IPv6. Two significant reports came out of that forum and there are multiple other best practice forums which, I'm sure, produced outputs of varying usefulness to different stakeholders. And that's the process as it should go.

But I think we need to acknowledge that very strongly and say this IGF has actually produced tangible outcomes, tangible outputs that are relevant and useful. It's not making policy. That's not what the IGF is there for and I don't think there are many who feel that that's what the IGF should be, even under this new IGF Plus structure.

But it's important to really acknowledge the positive role that the IGF has already had.

The other point that we stressed quite strongly – well, two other points – one which I won't belabor is the financial aspect. I think one challenge for the IGF in terms of how it's presented even has been that sort of constant struggle to find a sustainable, reliable financial model, financial backing. The other was the importance of seeing the IGF in the context of an ecosystem which includes the regional and national events. I think working as RIPE NCC or Regional Internet Registry, we've actually seen some of the most important and useful Internet governance discussions happening at some of the national IGF events that happen around our service region or in some of the regional events, whether it's EuroDIG or Central Asian IGF or APrIGF. So seeing that somehow reflected in what the Secretary General is going to

propose to us or suggest to us I think would be very useful. So thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Chris. I wonder are there any MAG members that are around the room? I can see one. I saw just Jimson Olufuye just before wanting to say a couple of words. Jimson, and then we'll go over to you. Thank you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much. I have the privilege of being one of the five business representatives to the IGF Working Group on Improvement to IGF, the CSTD Working Group on Improvement to IGF and onto the Working Group on Enhanced Corporations, Phase 1 and Phase 2. I've been in MAG before as well, and I've been quite active in the National IGF in Nigeria, West Africa, and the African IGF.

Well, I've listened carefully and I just want to make this brief contribution that number one, Internet has done a lot of good and the Internet's community, they've done pretty well with regard to at least sharing discussion idea, with regard how to govern the Internet. But one thing is clear is that there has to be control and accountability and its collective control, collective accountability. And that's why we need all stakeholders, government, the business, the private sector, the technical community, academic community, all communities will need to be involved. And we need to continue to evolve and continue the dialogue.

I take away, again, from this high-level panel, they made good recommendations. But it still flows into the fact that, number one, at the national level, there must be inclusivity, they must [inaudible] economy, it must not put anybody behind at the national level, maybe at regional level where we have some regional framework, and also at the global level where, well, do we have a framework yet? That is the question.

And I remember I made a proposal that we can use the instrument of the CSTD, the CSTD Working Group. The United Nations Commission for Science and Technology for Development, there is a framework in their mandate that they could discuss public policy issues with all stakeholders as inclusive. And then they can then pass it to the [inaudible]. There is [inaudible]. And then they will present it at the General Assembly where [inaudible] and I gather now that several business associates [inaudible] they have observers at the General Assembly.

And we've got to get more traction. We've got to control. We're moving into IoT right now. We're moving into highly intelligent robotics. There has to be accountability. So we need to move fast so the recommendation of high-level panel, the [inaudible] corporation can have some measure of where at the global level there could be some form of understanding and general [inaudible] of responsibility. This is very important now. We need to take that conversation for what [inaudible] about control. Let's have some structure. Let's have some mechanism that ensures that we have a good grasp of this technology. It must not go out of hands. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this contribution, Jimson. So next is Ben Wallace.

BEN WALLACE: Thank you, Olivier. I'm Ben Wallace with Microsoft. I am on the MAG. It's coming to the end of my second year and I can talk a little bit about Microsoft's contribution to the consultation on the high-level report.

So I first need to kind of think about the nature and the purpose of the IGF. There was one part of the report which talked about a lack of trust among government, civil society, and the private sector, and sometimes a lack of humanity and understanding of different perspectives.

And Microsoft sees a real value in the IGF as a place where you can go and hear different perspectives and learn from each other. And it's fairly unique in that sense. You can go to the World Economic Forum and come away with a really good sense of what the private sector feels. You can go to RightsCon and come away with a really good sense of what civil society feels. And there are multilateral bodies where the governments are dominant and that's what they're there for.

The IGF is kind of unique in its efforts to bring together stakeholders on an equal footing. And so when we talk about the discussion about whether there should be recommendations which I'll turn to in a second, I still think you need to leave space in the IGF for it to be a forum for discussion and hearing from each other. And, of course, in that

respect, you do need to keep up the efforts to make sure there's a balanced involvement of stakeholders and that means continuing to try and find ways to get the private sector and governments to engage more.

So turning to the question of recommendations, well, let's remember that firstly, there exists a number of written outputs. There are the messages, the meeting summaries. Increasingly, I think there are efforts to make sure these summarize areas of consensus within a discussion. But I think the Secretariat has lacked the resources to effectively organize and market what could be a really impressive repository of information.

There are also actual recommendations and research that come out of the best practice forums and the dynamic coalitions and I'm the cofacilitator for the best practice forum on cyber security. I think these could provide a good starting point for the policy incubator function, which is talked about in the report. But again, these are done on a voluntary basis and kind of going back to what Marilyn said about the Secretariat. And I think what the Secretariat, this small team, manages to do is very impressive. But it's to kind of even start to fulfill some of the roles envisaged by the report, it needs to be significantly strengthened.

So it probably brings me to the last point which is the funding, even for the existing purposes of the IGF has been inadequate. It's limited and it's unstable and it's limited what the IGF has been able to do. I think

year on year, the money that comes in doesn't reach the projected budget and as I said, it's not predictable.

So with the UN's initiative with the high-level panel and its report, and with suggestions we hear about moving the IGF under the remit of the Office of the Secretary General, if the IGF is indeed going to rise to that level of importance, I'd hope that its funding would be given equal importance and attention. And one of the ways that could be envisaged is for the UN to take more of a direct role in funding. But it's obviously a question. It's great to talk about the different roles and if the funding's not going to be available to enable a Secretariat that's going to be able to support those kind of roles, then it's a non-starter. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this perspective, Ben. And I guess that if one of the things that this high-level report has done is to trigger input from a wide range of organizations from civil society to private sector to governments, which is a great thing forward. And it's certainly brought the topic to the forefront rather than just being something that's discussed among a small group of people.

We still have Louseweis van der Laan who is currently in Waterloo. I just asked whether it's possible to actually have her intervene remotely by voice. It is? Oh, excellent. Okay. Let's try and see if we can hear from Louseweis van der Laan.

LOUSEWEIS VAN DER LAAN: Sound?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can see her microphone working, but …

LOUSEWEIS VAN DER LAAN: Hello. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can.

LOUSEWEIS VAN DER LAAN: Oh, wow. That's impressive. Hello, everyone. Can I start by saying I really miss you guys? But leaving that aside, and hello from Waterloo. I wanted to make the following comment which is that I feel that this discussion about the role of the IGF has been going on forever and I agree with Wolfgang that maybe stumbling forward is the best thing we're going to have. But there's something incredibly unique about bringing together all these stakeholders, also for the UN to learn that there are different processes in the world rather than just putting governments in the driving seat.

And I think that even if the IGF would not actually lead to any kind of results – and Chris pointed out that there are actually results – that even if there were none, but just people talking to each other, showing what multistakeholderism is and starting to change the mindset of how we can change things in the world, that is already a big win for the way we do politics.

But the real [inaudible] for me for the IGF is to take policymakers, including politicians who have very little knowledge of especially the technical aspects of the Internet – and I can say this very freely because four years ago, I was one of them and if it weren't for you guys, I would still be stumbling around in the dark – but just to have the techies get together with the politicians and the policymakers and to prevent them from doing really stupid things, that's worth something as well. And so I hope that it can be going forward, maybe a little bit more than stumbling and that the solid funding is found so that between IGFs, there is actually more progress being made. But I really think that anything that can be done to strengthen it, to make it more sustainable and to keep it going, there should be strong support from all people in the ICANN community for that.

And thanks a lot and sending you all lots of love from Waterloo.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Louseweis. And it's quite amazing you actually sound as though you are in the room. So it's pretty impressive. So kudos to tech on this one.

I'm going to have to close the queue because time is always playing against us but we still have Nurani Nimpuno.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Hello. Nurani Nimpuno, former MAG member and I was also on the [CCT] Working Group on the IGF improvements together with Jimson, I think in 2011, a long time ago.

EN

And I think, I recognize some of the discussions that we have today are discussions that we had back then. But I just wanted to say that this tension between having the IGF being a discussion place which is just a very open place of sharing and ideas and then views where we should have more concrete outcomes, these are discussions that we've had since the very start of the IGF. But the fact that we're still discussing it doesn't necessarily, to me it's not necessarily a bad thing. That tension is not a bad thing. It's something that we should continue to have at the IGF because it is this dance that we have with each other and if we didn't have that dance or that tension, maybe the IGF was actually not generating those discussions it needs to generate. So I think it's a positive thing.

The other thing is also that the IGF needs to continue to respond to the Internet evolving as well. 2011 was different times to what it is now so I think these discussions should also be about how do we continue to evolve the IGF. We will never get to a place where we will have this perfect model.

And then I also think when we talk about we need to have more concrete outcomes, actually like Chris was pointing out, we sometimes forget to look at some of the concrete outcomes that the IGF has actually generated. And in some cases, it's also outcomes that have had impacts locally that we don't necessarily always share back to the IGF. Some of it might not necessarily be policy changes. It might not be decisions made by governments. But it might have been sharing of knowledge that have changed local processes or the way governments

engage with our local communities. And some of those are just anecdotal outcomes, but I think they're just as valuable as the others.

And then I'd also like to say, again, in 2011, we were also saying that one of the main things that we need to fix is the funding because we can have all sorts of ideas about what beautiful things we want the IGF to do but unless we have this funding, we can't do the outreach we need, we can't engage those who don't have employers or others who can fund their trips or their engagement. We can't have great remote participation and find other ways of sort of reaching a wider community, so that's still one thing that we really need to fix. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nurani, and I'm going to break my own rule in letting Jimson speak. But please, 30 seconds because we do need to move on.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, distinguished Chair. I just felt I needed to make this point that one of these critical outcomes of the improvement to IGF was the organization we have right now. We have the Chair here, IGFSA. IGFSA has added tremendous value. Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Support Association.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:	IGF Support Association. The Chair is here with little contribution and ICANN [great] support, we have really covered a lot of ground. Like as we are speaking, we are more than 100 [inaudible], National Region IGF. If after this morning, there is somebody that is engaging me about their regional IGF, so they say [inaudible]. We still have a long way to go, so that is why we need to keep the discussion, keep the engagement, and the funding Nurani mentioned is key.
	So I want to encourage everyone, corporations, please support IGFSA and let us have a [inaudible] funding mechanism because towards IGF 2019, there are so many people that were denied funding. And some [inaudible] wanted to organize, the speaker cannot come and things like that. So we need to have alternate funding mechanism, so we want to appeal to everyone to at least be part of IGFSA and add value to what we are trying to do. Thank you.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you for mentioning this, Jimson, and yeah, I think you can become an individual member of the organization, IGF Support Association, and we'll put a link around. Okay, fantastic. Thank you.
	Okay, well, I would have loved to continue the discussion, but unfortunately, we have to move on and we now have to look at an update on the CCWGIG. So just very, very briefly, the history of the CCWG started as a Cross-Community Working Group but as you know, the rules for cross-community working groups is it has a start and an end. And of course, the end of Internet governance is not nearly in sight so we transformed it to a cross-community engagement group.

Now originally, the working group was co-chartered by the ALAC, the ccNSO, and the GNSO. But with the end of the cross-community working group, none of the organizations. Well, we ended up not having three chartering organizations which doesn't make it a cross-community working group or engagement group anymore.

To cut a long story short, we now are having an unchartered engagement group on Internet governance that has effectively the ability to stage meetings like this one, but absolutely no way to write statements, etc. because it was felt in the community that this was not something needed by this working group. And so it's transformed itself into a platform for engagement, especially this sort of discussion that we've had here so far.

Nigel, did you wish to say a few words on this? Because I think with Nigel or Mandy. I haven't seen Mandy Carver.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: She's here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, she's here. Okay, so I don't know if you wish to come to the table or come to the mic. It's really up to you.

And this, of course, while Mandy sits at the table, this, of course, is after discussions with the Board working group on Internet governance and with government engagement staff. So Mandy Carver.

MANDY CARVER:	So the process has been started. The idea is being socialized with the SO and AC leadership. Those dialogues have begun to utilize this Cross-Community Engagement Group as an ongoing discussion platform, the vehicle for which the community can have face-to-face with the Board Working Group on those issues that touch on legislative regulatory IGO resolution. So it's those items that would touch on ICANN's mission and mandate, things that directly impact the operation of the DNS, things that might directly impact the single stable interoperable Internet in the sense of the management of unique identifiers and anything that we see coming up and you all see they could definitely or directly impact the ICANN community's ability to make policy, touching on the DNS.
	So it's more broad than the IGF per se. And the hope is to have an ongoing vehicle for those kinds of discussions so that there would be a place like a birds of a feather or a dynamic coalition, a mechanism for people who are interested in those topics to come together, share information and also be updated. But it is not anticipated, the reason we're moving away from the chartering concept. This is not to develop policy on ICANN's behalf nor would it be speaking on behalf of the specific SOs and ACs. Did I get that [inaudible]?
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much for this, Mandy. And I don't know if you wanted to add anything, Nigel, to this.
	So we'll have more discussion with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance to actually sort of gel the new non-charter, as

such, the terms of operation or whatever on our next meeting which will be the face-to-face meeting on Thursday. I think it's Thursday.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thursday lunchtime.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thursday lunchtime. It's an open meeting as well, so if you're interested in more process stuff, then please come and join us. What I would suggest is we move now to the Internet governance updates. And for this, we have several people who are going to be able to speak to us about several processes. First is the UN cyber security discussions. Those are taking place, I believe, in New York. And Veni Markovski from ICANN Org has been following this quite closely. Veni, you have the floor.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Thank you, Olivier, and you're right. They do take place at the UN in New York.

So there are two groups which are established by resolution of the United Nations General Assembly. You will learn two new abbreviations, OEWG and GGE.

The Group of Governmental Experts is the GGE. It consists of 25 representatives of 25 countries, the five permanent members of the security counsel plus 20 more countries. And the Open-Ended Working Group, or the OEWG, which consists of all 193 member states of the UN.

These groups are working in parallel. That's a unique situation as in previous instances. There have been groups discussing cyber security but only one, the Group of Governmental Experts. So most of the first couple of meetings that have taken place at the UN have been dedicated to figuring out how the two groups will be cooperating, coordinating or not between each other.

The first formal session of the Open-Ended Working Group took place in September. There were 73 countries that expressed their opinions and views on issues related to cyber security as well as statements by four non-governmental organizations who, however, spoke outside of the formal session time so this was a procedural issue that we need to know because whoever thinks that the Open-Ended Working Group means it's open for everyone, it's actually open for all member states, not open like the IGF or other meetings that are open for all stakeholders.

I will distribute. I mean, [inaudible] will distribute in the chatroom a couple of links that you guys can take a look at, and I will send them to the mailing list so that you can take a look at the [inaudible] that was issued by the United Nations after another meeting which took place last week at the UN, which was part of the first committee deliberations and also was dedicated to the work of the two groups.

It's interesting to know, I think, for this group here that ICANN was not mentioned specifically during the deliberations and during the 73 country statements. However, China and this is public. You guys can go and check it on the record online said, and I quote, "There is

imbalanced distribution and unjust management system of critical Internet resources which pose grave security threats to the smooth functioning of critical infrastructure." So they did not elaborate any further but that, reading it, it probably has in mind some of the unique identifiers that we are taking care of.

So that was …

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is this a new position from China?

VENI MARKOVSKI: It's not. There is a position, a similar position expressed by countries throughout all their deliberations around cyber security at the UN and also at the [inaudible]. This is a little bit nuanced position.

Also, the government of Netherlands was specifically talking about the critical [inaudible] code Internet infrastructure that should be outside of possible attacks by any state [inaudible] and this has also been a position that they have expressed for years.

I would also add to this that in most of the deliberations actually was focused on A) how the two groups are going to work with each other, but also is the existing international law applicable in cyber space. So there are huge disagreements between many countries. Some say it is applicable. Some say it's not. It needs a new legislation framework. We need to watch all these developments because, at the end of the day, the UN may become the body that will be discussing some new

EN

conventions of some kind or maybe not necessarily conventions, but even the resolutions of the UN General Assembly which are non-binding in nature could be used for drafting national legislation which might have some impact.

There have been also proposals that the UN should create a new body within the UN to deal with all cyber security issues. That's something that we also need to watch and we will inform you as a community because it may end up being something that we will discuss issues that we discuss here.

Now I also, I will quote a diplomat, a serious diplomat from a very respected balanced country who said that he hoped that we don't end up with two or three different Internets but recognized that there is a risk based on where we are now, which is the situation is very delicate. There is not yet consensus whatsoever but we have to understand that the OEWG is going to work until end of next year and Group of Governmental Experts will be working until the end of 2021. And there will be a lot of outreach efforts, like for example, there was a cyber security regional conference in the U.S. of the Organization of American States where the GGE Ambassador and the OEWG Ambassador were speaking.

There was one in [inaudible], which I also attended a couple of weeks ago. There is one somewhere in the Asia-Pacific that they are doing, so they are trying to reach out to as much as they can. The two ambassadors who are chairing the groups, the Swiss ambassador,

I C A N N
ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

[Louvre], and the Brazilian ambassador, [Patriota], they were very skilled diplomats. They know what they are talking about.

And the next opportunity for some informals as they are called in the UN language discussions will be in the beginning of December so the second to the fourth of December, there will be intersessional multistakeholder meeting, as it's called as part of the OEWG, and then the next two days, the 5th and 6th, there will be informals for the GGE. I will keep you posted on what's happening but it's very likely that they may be webcast as was the first formal session of the OEWG.

So if it's webcast, you guys, if you want to take a listen and see what's happening, please. And if, as happened with the OEWG in September, if there are statements outside of the webcast, I will also let you know what they were because that's what happened in September. And you'll see the links in a minute.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much for this, Veni. Is the risk that this diplomat had alluded to, the risk of fragmentation?

VENI MARKOVSKI: Yes, and I take his word seriously because he is somebody with the longest experience in negotiations and if some people with experience say that way in the beginning, we need to be extra careful.

Now, one of the things that ICANN does and that's something I should have said first probably, is that we do regular events at the UN. We reach

out and we do educational outreach, if you will, where we bring speakers who explain how the Internet functions, who is doing what. We usually take people who are engineers or who are from the technical community. We have had in the past somebody who later joined the Board as a director, but she was actually one of the Root Server Operators, Tripti. And the good thing is that she is here so she can understand as far as I can see without my glasses.

So she now knows and we had representatives from IANA, from OCTO. David [Connor] was one. But we also had other people coming like Andrew Sullivan when he was chairing the Internet Architecture Board, etc. So this is extremely useful.

The other useful thing that is happening is the IETF and ISOC have a program for bringing diplomats to the IETF meetings and there is a special program for introducing them to the IETF so that when they start their negotiations behind closed doors, there are diplomats who actually understand how the Internet works and they're also reaching out if there are questions that they don't know or they need to address, they reach out. I've met with many of them when they have a question and if I don't know the answer, I'm always happy to try to find somebody who does. So we are proactively engaged with them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right. Thanks very much for this really extensive update from New York. Now next we have Vera Major who has been following the World Trade Organization public forum. Vera?

VERA MAJOR:

Thank you, Olivier. Good afternoon, good morning, good evening everyone. I will be speaking on the public forum, the WTO. So I will start by giving a short background.

The e-commerce is not part of Internet governance. It was decided during the World Summit Information Society in 2005 that e-commerce would not be included. But we have been following the issue closely because it might still affect ICANN's remit. So the public forum is held very year at the WTO and garners the pressure or the themes that are most relevant to member states at this point. It was held last month in October and the theme was trading forward, adapting to a changing world.

Digital issues were not part of key themes. It doesn't mean that they were not important. They were included in most of the agenda. But the WTO is currently going through major reforms and those themes became more important.

So I will highlight only three things that were said this year during the public forum. The first one is the launch of the e-commerce negotiations next year at the [inaudible] meeting in Kazakhstan. There have been pre-negotiations going on for at least one year. 78 countries at this point have signed up to be part of those negotiations that are led by Australia. Not all the countries, not all member states want these negotiations to happen. There are several arguments against the negotiations taking place now. The main one being that it might cement current status quo of e-commerce.

You might have seen in the UNCTAD e-trade report – digital trade report, sorry – that the U.S. and China now have 90% of e-commerce trade between them and a lot of the countries fear that given these positions, these might continue in the future, which leads me to the second point I'd like to highlight: the moratorium on electronic transmissions. It was signed. Well, it was adopted in 1998 and member states agreed that they would not impose custom duties on electronic transmissions.

Today, some member states want to go back on this moratorium thinking that they are losing a lot of money on not being able to tax electronic transmissions. However, other countries seem to think that having a moratorium actually has helped [inaudible] e-commerce and has garnered a lot of GDP for their countries.

On the other hand, there is also questions of taxations, of big [inaudible] platforms. This discussion has also been going on with the OECD which published a paper the same week the public forum was taking place There has been attempt to discuss the paper, but unfortunately, not enough people had read it by that time. So I'm assuming the discussions will go forward at the OECD in the upcoming month.

And the last issue is that of governance. The [Osaka] [truck] was being promoted. It promotes cross-border data flows with enhanced protections for IP, cyber security, and protection of personal information.

So what is next for the WTU? Like I said, in 2020, there will be the 12 ministerial conference which will be held in Kazakhstan and the expected issues that will be discussed will be the moratorium, taxation, e-commerce negotiations which are likely to be launched there. And also what impact e-commerce is having on micro and small to medium size enterprises. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Vera. So next we have Nigel Hickson who is going to speak to us about ICANN's activities at the IGF. I guess we all know about the IGF already but we are not quite sure what ICANN is doing, and of course, ICANN's communities.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier, and I'll be very brief. I'll just touch on one or two things.

So ICANN is committed to the Internet Governance Forum. We've been active in the IGF over a number of years both in terms of persons and the MAG and in terms of the annual events themselves and also as a financial contributor to the IGF trust fund.

We continue to be absolutely committed to the IGF as a multistakeholder discussion platform for Internet governance issues. This year in Berlin, we will be represented by our ICANN CEO and President and also the new ICANN Board Chairman, Martin Botterman, and a number of Board members which we're very grateful for indeed.

We have a number of sessions at the Berlin IGF, including an open forum on the domain name system and on the future of the domain name system, a workshop on universal acceptance, and a workshop on Day 0 on DNS abuse.

We'll also have a presence there at various other events and we're co-hosting along with ISOC and other contributors, the regional Internet registries, etc. reception on the Tuesday night and we can certainly give you more details about that. There will also be the opportunity to conduct flash sessions and other various activities.

So I think that gives a bit of contribution on the IGF. We continue to support the IGFSA and grateful for Jimson mentioning that. Obviously, Tarek Kamel who has sadly passed, was a great advocate of the IGF and the IGFSA as well. And hopefully we will continue his legacy there.

Just two other very brief reflections on Internet governance issues. This week, the World Intellectual Property Organization is the trademark committee. This is a committee that meets every six months. ICANN is an observer on this committee and discussions are taking place as they did six months ago on a proposal on geographical domain names. If you read this proposal and I think I had circulated it on the list previously. You would think it is very similar to some of the work that the Work Track 5 is doing here in ICANN, the part of the subsequent procedures process.

The WIPO discussion concentrates on where there should be protections given to geographical names. It's a discussion that's ongoing. It's not going to be solved this week, but I flag it as something

which, as Mandy was saying, with the use of this forum to be able to highlight discussions that are taking place and alert people to that nature.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, just touching on the International Telecommunications Union, the ITU because no session would be complete without mention of the ITU, I suppose. Various activities obviously taking place as normal on the ITU. The World Telecommunications Policy Forum is something taking place in 2021 and preparations are ongoing for that. That has a wide agenda on Internet-related capacity building initiatives and work also is taking place for the World Telecommunications Standardization Assembly which takes place next year in Hyderabad in India and the regional coordination is taking place on that.

ICANN participate in those regional coordinations, proposals, touch on gTLDs, ccTLDs, the domain name system, IPv4, IPv6, etc. So quite a few of the issues are relevant to us. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. And finally, in our Internet governance updates, we have a very patient friend and colleague, Leonid Todorov, General Manager of APTLD who will be speaking to us about the WZHEN conference and before he starts, we do have a spelling mistake, a typo, so apologies to our Chinese friends. It's WZHEN, and it's actually the World Internet Conference. WZHEN Summit is actually the name that we give it. Leonid Todorov.

LEONID TODOROV: Right. Thank you. Thank you, Olivier. Of course, that cannot be forgiven.

So WZHEN Summit was held for the sixth time in a row this year. The purpose of this summit or to be more precise, the World Internet Conference is dual. For one, it's to project China's image as an Internet superpower and it's [inaudible] in the Internet governance area outside of the country, and also to champion the nation's status as a living Internet and high tech nation domestically.

It's a kind of interesting event and some ICANNers were there, particularly ICANN Org was there this time last year. So the hallmarks of this event typically are the ray of light that's an exhibition and also an award for breakthrough innovations in high tech and Internet areas, business areas.

Also, WZHEN itself is a fascinating city, one of the miracles, I guess, on this planet, really exciting place to be, and Old City Water Town near Shanghai. And also yet another hallmark which is not the typical of China is its high-level advisory counsel, of which I am a member which is a truly multi-stakeholder body co-chaired by Jack Ma, and for now, Professor Werner Zorn, which is hand-picked, obviously, in a top-down manner by invitation only panel. Its mandate is very narrow. We are supposed to provide suggestions as to the agenda which never happened by the way. And we also contribute to the WZHEN outlook document, which is like a final document which is published in Chinese. Then it's that thick and then in English and this time, I believe it's eight pages, I believe.

Anyway, participation is huge. I mean the turnout for the meeting is huge. Of course, it's by invitation only. This is my gut feeling between $2,000 to $3,000 people. It's hard to discern really who those people are unless they represent the government. Then you can immediately recognize them. The agenda basically focuses on four baskets: cyber security, economy and innovation, policy and regulation, and cross-trade [Macau] and Hong Kong relations.

Interestingly, the format went quite understandably. The format of sessions, in addition to opening plenaries meant some other plenary sessions. There are sub-forums. Each of them lost for three hours of which the first one and a half hours is all about public presentations by some government officials and then there are panels. For these panels, one can be given at least five minutes to express him or herself.

So this mostly goes without any Q&As and any discussions. Some sessions are closed, so by invitation only. So this year in particular, the overarching theme was, of course, all about the 50th anniversary of the Internet and there were some Internet pioneers there to celebrate that.

Also, my observation, my personal observation, after five years in a row, there are some signs of, I am afraid, the same disease which IGF, the Global IGF suffers from and that's repetitive agenda items, Usual Suspects as [inaudible], less, far less young internet entrepreneurs and think tanks present in the rooms. Less treks and less sessions in general. The audience is thinning which is not typical of China. No big names on the agenda. Like two years ago, there were heads of Google and Apple

there, for example. Now no one. Of course, cuts obviously. They're visible.

And overall, the general fatigue and uncertainty as to where to go further. Interestingly, and I would say that it's not accidental then that the Secretariat of the World Internet Conference is reaching out to IGF for the second year in a row to be present there and to contribute to the agenda with a session. This year is going to be a session on the data governance if I'm not mistaken.

There are some novelties this year. Well, first of all, China explicitly championed the idea of economic cooperation into cyber space and raised voice against unilateral actions that derail free trade and free market fundamentals and international competition in the Internet-related area. There was also a huge China/Africa forum. I guess I wouldn't elaborate on hat. We understand that China has certain interests in Africa these days. And also, the focus was pretty much on artificial intelligence and industrial Internet but this is ongoing topic. They revisit that time and again. So that is basically it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Leonid. Was there any track that pertains specifically to ICANN-related topics?

LEONID TODOROV: Well, no. I don't think so. Well, it might have been.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Or any perceived threat.

LEONID TODOROV: It might have happened that ICANN was brought about in the context of cyber security or whatever issues. But overall, we always should understand that this is a typical, I would say, Chinese event in a sense because it was very much focused on China and its developments and its fantastic record in many areas.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right. Thank you very much and I do see that we are over time now, so I was going to open the floor for any discussions but there's so much that's being updated here. Perhaps we can following our next meeting or online. And that actually takes me to just any other business. Is there anything else that we have not covered today? Briefly, Marilyn Cade please.

MARILYN CADE: It's not that we haven't covered it. But I just want to call attention with Marcus who is the Chair of the IGF Support Association. You'll see on the formal schedule that there is the usual IGFSA supported informal NRI session on Wednesday at noon. You don't need to sign up for it, but there are a lot of people who attend ICANN who are engagement at their national level, so just calling it to everyone's attention that it's an open meeting and you're very welcome.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. Chris Buckeride?

CHRIS BUCKERIDGE: I just thought I would say I made a somewhat snarky comment at the meeting of this group in Marrakech that we spent more time talking about the mechanics of the group than Internet governance issues. So I take it back now in terms of the session here today has been very interesting so thank you to everyone for the information.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, and thank you for your contribution to the discussion. Young-eum Lee.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: I'd just like to inform people that the CC community that has created the Internet Governance liaison group. We are focusing more on the substantive issues that the Internet governance community is talking about and we are having what we hope to be a very active session on Internet governance activities within the CCs and the global world on Wednesday from 3:15.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Young-eum. And is that open to everyone?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Yes, of course.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. I might try and see if I can escape from somewhere else to go there. And finally, Wolfgang Kleinwaechter.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: I just want to inform you that the Global Commission on Stability and Cyber Space presents its final report on November 12th in Paris as part of the Paris piece forum and this final report includes the norm of the protection of the public core of the Internet and the commission is very thankful for the interactions they had with the ICANN community, in particular with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

And this [Norm], the public core and 20 mentioned it from the discussions where you had in New York on the open-ended working group will continue to play a role and it would be good if the ICANN community in their specific constituencies would continue to follow-up of this report. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this reminder, Wolfgang. And so with this, one last.

ELLEN STRICKLAND: Hello. Ellen 0Strickland from Internet New Zealand, or dot-NZ, ccTLD and I just wanted to mention the Christ church call initiative that the New Zealand government along with France ahs been involved in over this year layer, which has an advisory sort of network that's attached to

the content of the Christ Church Call is around eliminating violent terrorist extremist materials online and there are elements of it that are relevant to the domain name industry and the technical community, although the bulk of the work has been social media companies.

So I just wanted to sort of note that, that there is an advisory network. The New Zealand government has set up under ChristChurchCall.com and that we note and has been noted by civil society, a lack of technical expertise other than the social media companies and broader Internet ecosystem engagement and just sort of put it out there for people interested and if you want to know more about it, myself and my chief executive, Jordan Carter, are both involved and happy to have a chat in here this week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. ChristChurchCall.com. Is that correct? Okay, great. And of course, we'll follow-up all of this on the mailing list We've got the details of people who have been in the room. If you're interested in joining the mailing list and you haven't had the sheet in your hands, then please just come to the table after this session is finished. And with this, I'd like to thank everyone, each and every one of you, and also our remote participants for a great session. Thank you and have a very good afternoon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]