

-
- MODERATOR: Okay. The recording is now going.
- OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [Inaudible] the introductions there. Okay, we're not hearing you [inaudible].
- VERA MAJOR: I'm assuming you mean the role call.
- OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, please. Yeah, start with the role call.
- VERA MAJOR: Yeah, I'm sorry. Hi. Good morning, good afternoon. On the call, Olivier Crepin-Leblond is our host and our co-host is Desiree Cabrera. Nigel Hickson, Taylor Bentley, Ben Wallace, Everton Rodrigues, Jim [Heben Blest], Kara Douglas, Klaus Stoll, [Rickson] Acosta, and [inaudible] Kim are on the call, and then myself, Vera Major.
- OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Vera. Thank you and welcome, everyone, to this, I would say, quarterly call in some way, of the cross-community working group on Internet governance. In fact, it should really now be called the engagement group on Internet governance, the EGIG. And we have an

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

agenda today that will have, first, a full debrief of the IGF. And I, of course, invite everyone here to contribute to this.

Then we'll have mention of some upcoming ITU meetings, reports on the global commission on cyber stability, and then looking at what our next steps are going to be for the engagement group and looking at growth forward to the [inaudible] 2020 at some point next year.

Are there any amendments or any additions that anybody wishes to add to the agenda? I'm not seeing any hands up. I note that Carol Douglas has also joined us. Welcome Carol. And we, therefore, are able to move on and go straight into the IGF debrief.

Now this is the first call in quite some time since a lot of things have happened. We had a meeting that took place. Well, two meetings, a face-to-face and a public meeting that took place at ICANN in Montreal and then immediately afterwards, a couple of weeks later, of course, the Internet Governance Forum took place with a lot of sessions and various reports which were sent to the mailing list which you should all have had in your mailbox.

I think we can start, perhaps, with the ICANN-hosted sessions or hosted session and ask if perhaps Nigel Hickson could take us through this, please? Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, yes. Thank you, Olivier. Good afternoon. Yes, so the Internet Governance Forum in Berlin, we tried to keep the group up to date with developments. There's an excellent report from the DiploFoundation or

the Geneva Internet Platform that goes through some of the sort of details of the IGF so I don't think we need to talk about number of participants and number of governments, etc. Suffice to say, it was probably the best attended IGF there's been and it was very well run, and we can reflect on how successful or otherwise is during this call.

As you know, ICANN are a keen supporter of the IGF both in terms of financial contributions to the IGF trust fund, but also in terms of our support in terms of proposing sessions and supporting it through contribution of ICANN Board members, our CEO, Göran Marby, and Theresa Swinehart, and a couple of members. The executives were on the ground in Berlin a couple of weeks ago and we had a number of sessions.

I just was going to touch on the ICANN sessions. We ran sort of three sessions ourselves. We ran a Day 0 session on ICANN and the DNS as sort of a session that looked at the technical role of ICANN and what we do in terms of the domain name system and the security of it in particular. We then had a Day 1 open forum which was sort of fronted by our Chairman of the Board, Martin Botterman, and Göran Marby, our CEO. And this really looked at the future of the domain name system, warts and all, and a lot of focus was on DNS abuse, ICANN's role within DNS abuse, but over and above that, the fact that DNS abuse was casting a shadow over some use of the Internet.

And then finally on Day 3, which I think was the Thursday, we had a workshop on universal acceptance. Universal acceptance was a theme that came up in a number of sessions and certainly, I think was quite well regarded. So those were the ICANN sessions. We also co-hosted, as

people know, we co-hosted a reception, a so-called tech reception on the Tuesday night. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Nigel. So let's open up the floor if there are any comments or questions and if you have attended any of the sessions that [Ike] and that Nigel has just taken us through.

I should say that I think Desiree is sharing her screen. The screen is moving around and things. Maybe you should just share the window that has, I think there's a sharing of a specific window that would be the agenda window rather than sharing the whole screen like this. But yeah, fantastic. That's good. Super.

Now I'm not seeing any hands up or any questions or comments regarding this. I think we can then move on with the Jimmy Schulz declaration. Some of you might not be aware but Jimmy Schulz was a member of our committee for a number of years. He was on the ALAC for a number of years, for, it was a three-year length as selected by the Nominating Committee. He was a politician in Germany for the Liberal Party and he had quite a few ideas about an open Internet and was really fighting throughout his life for Internet governance and bottom-up multistakeholder systems to be something that MPs should be looking at in the German Parliament, and not only, but perhaps even applying to other fields of the world. So I can hear some noise in the background. I'm not quite sure who needs to mute on this. If you could please just check your phone.

But yeah, unfortunately, Jimmy passed away on the 25th of November, just before the IGF started and so there was a whole moment of memory for Jimmy but there was also a declaration that was drafted and shared from many different Euro NTs. And I'm not sure whether we have a copy of this declaration or whether you have a copy of this, Nigel, in front of you because I, unfortunately, do not have an e-copy.

NIGEL HICKSON:

I'll put it on the chat. I'll find it. We have got it. It was in some of the postings that went around, but I'll find it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, that's great. Thank you. So that's the second thing.

Now next, there was also the UN High-Level Panel on Digital Cooperation and that panel, if you've paid attention in our past calls and our past meetings, came up with a number of potential avenues for expanding Internet governance and actually developing a multistakeholder model where decisions could be made, etc.

One of the proposals was based around an enhanced Internet Governance Forum, what they called an IGF+, and it appears that this model was favored by quite a few people including people within the IGF circle and the IGF MAG. And so there was some discussion at the IGF regarding this and how would the IGF be able to move or to progress towards an IGF+. The whole session was devoted to this and a number of other workshops were devoted to it.

Nigel, would you like to add anything to this? Or would anybody else like to speak a bit about this?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Olivier, if I may just say a couple of things on the Jimmy Schulz declaration which I'll find in a minute. The site is not always intuitive.

I think it's worth mentioning that, as we might have flagged prior to the IGF, the German hosts were very generous in terms of their contributions to this particular IGF and part of that generosity extended to inviting around 150 parliamentarians to the event mainly from developing countries in the global South, but of course, some closer to home as well. Many of them stayed the whole week and had discussions in a range of different sessions, culminating in a large, clean recession on Friday where they went through a number of issues. ICANN was fortunate in that we were able to have a bilateral with them between our Board members and some of the parliamentarians, and just a one-off you really, but it did really seem a successful venture to engage with these parliamentarians.

And the one point which I suppose is fairly obvious, but then I'm not very bright, is that these people often don't reach, if they're opposition parliamentarians, so to speak, if they're members of national parliaments and they're not part of the government. And we don't reach them in our traditional outreach so much because we reach the government through the GAC, but we don't always reach the opposition parliamentarians. So I think it was a very valuable exchange on that.

Just on the high-level panel, I think these were very good sessions indeed on the high-level panel as Olivier said. Clearly, there was a groundswell of opinion, I think, in the discussions that in any future recommendations that emanate from the high-level panel and we can touch on that because we know some of the process that's going to take place in the next nine months.

But they have to be conducive to sort of strengthen the role of the IGF rather than diminish it, and therefore, some of the models that had been proposed as alternatives by the high-level panel but perhaps not appropriate in that regard but the IGF+ model was a vehicle that could be conducive. So I think that was very interesting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Nigel. And I would like to thank Adam Peake for having put the link in the chat to the declaration, the Jimmy Schulz declaration, or Jimmy Schulz Call as it's called. And it was a declaration and call made by parliamentarians from 56 countries so we're not speaking about a small number of countries. It's a lot of people. That's quite significant.

On the IGF future, there is a question in the chat first and then I'll go to Ben Wallace afterwards. Question from Jim Prendergast who is in a noisy area, "What role, if any, will ICANN Org play going forward with the next steps for this effort and which portions of the report would they focus on?" And Nigel, you might be muted.

NIGEL HICKSON:

No, I wasn't muted. I was just hopeful. No, so ICANN took a decision through the CEO that we wouldn't comment so much on the report itself in terms of picking out a particular recommendation. Although we've also made it clear that we fully support the IGF, and therefore, there's a link there to an extent. But I think it's unlikely that we'll engage in terms of putting in written comments or anything on the various groups that have been now taking forward some of the recommendations.

As I mentioned, I don't have perfect knowledge of this in any way. But I know of at least two different groupings, one which had a call yesterday, whereby a number of different stakeholders—the one yesterday was led by the German government; the German government and United Arab Emirates together are looking at the recommendations in Section 5 of the high-level panel report, these are all the models for cooperation, the IGF+ model, etc.—and are looking to come up with some sort of consensus language on that which then could be included within the so-called Internet declaration which we understand will be made by the UN next year at the 75th anniversary.

But also contributing to that is another group that's looking at other parts of the panels recommendation on trust and security. So there's probably a number of different groups that are discussing these things. But I think it's unlikely we'll put in direct recommendations to those groups. Unlikely [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Nigel. Just a follow-up question on this. Will ICANN be involved in any way further than just being part of the working groups? As in maybe as a coordinating buddy or is that not on the cards?

NIGEL HICKSON: I wouldn't have thought so because this really is outside of our remit. I'm not trying to suggest that these things are not important in terms of the Internet ecosystem but they don't specifically pertain to the DNS. So I think it's unlikely we would organize anything in that regard.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Next is Ben Wallace.

BEN WALLACE: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, I was going to ... I think Nigel's covered some of it, but I was on that call yesterday so I was just going to share some information about the next steps with the high-level panel report following the discussion in Berlin.

So as Nigel said, I think this week, there are groups covering all of the various recommendations. In fact, on the high-level panel website, they've now published the names of each of the groups but also of the champions for each of the groups and the key constituents for each of the groups. I'm going to be following the one on digital cooperation and that was a call that was held yesterday that Nigel mentioned.

As Nigel said, the German government and the UA government are two of the champions and it looks like officially, the Office of the Secretary General is also a champion. And then there are 24 key constituents. I think that's the term.

So I was on the call because ICC Basis is one of the key constituents and the U.S. Chamber of [inaudible] members of. ICANN is one of the key constituents and each of the key constituent organizations were asked to speak for a couple of minutes. And when it came to ICANN, they asked for Avri Doria but she wasn't there. ICANN wasn't the only key constituent not to provide comments, but they were formally recognized as one of the key constituents and Avri was the name that they had.

So in terms of what this group on digital cooperation would do, it seems very clear, in the words of Fabrizio Hochschild, that IGF+ is the only model they're going to pursue and that their working methods will be to hold a number of roundtables over the next six months where they hope to come up with some very specific ideas about how to turn IGF+ into reality.

I think they're aiming to have those roundtable sessions, which will be open to anyone, co-located with existing relevant events, so whether that be the [inaudible] Forum or the STI Forum in May, those kind of things. Yeah, I think that's all I have to say at this point [inaudible] useful. And as I say, there are other working groups. They're all [inaudible] this week on the different recommendations, trust and security. As I understand, there's one on human rights. There's one on AI. They're all kicking off this week, their work, and each working group

will have its own dedicated webpage. There will be public information about all of the roundtables, where they'll take place, any input received, that kind of thing. Okay, so I'll leave it there. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Ben. That's really helpful. I have one question on this. You mentioned the roundtables being face-to-face meetings with real roundtables. Is there likely to be any successional work that will take place on conference calls, on open conference calls and things, which sometimes makes it a lot easier for people to get involved in rather than having to travel to specific meetings? Do you know at this point?

BEN WALLACE: I don't remember that being mentioned, but I would suspect that will happen as well as having these formal meetings where they bring people together. I expect they will continue to try and keep the momentum going with some conference calls. But it wasn't specifically mentioned. It was kind of an opportunity for the Germans and the UAE and Fabrizio to kick off the work and say what they hope to do. But it seemed like some of the details are still falling into place of the exact working methods and the work sites haven't been set up yet but will be. So I think details are still to be announced.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks for this, Ben. I was just looking at the website, and yes, it doesn't appear to have been updated yet. But I guess that will be the

next steps for them and we look forward to more updates on this as the process starts moving and things start happening in that area. Any other questions or comments on this topic? Okay. I'm not seeing any other hands up.

Just speaking about the IGF, there were, of course, a number of other, well, many other sessions that were undertaken by members of our committee where they either were organized by members of our committee but were also involved as the panelists or as the main speaker. I don't have a full list in front of me, but one of the ones that I had heard about was the one about universal acceptance. Nigel, have you spoken about this one? I'm not sure whether it was an ICANN-hosted session or not.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes. So yeah, thank you, Olivier. So universal acceptance was raised in at least two sessions and ICANN organized one workshop on universal acceptance but there was another very well-attended workshop organized by the Dynamic Coalition. As many of you will know, there's a whole range of dynamic coalitions that meet intercessionally. And these, I think, are growing in importance and Olivier is much to be credited for a number of these initiatives.

And the Dynamic Coalition on the Domain Name System which was formed last year has been looking at universal acceptance and they had a session indeed. And what's incredible about universal acceptance was for some of the people, they just hadn't really understood that there was this problem, that there was this fundamental problem. Even some

of the new gTLDs with only four or five letters in their top-level domains, you can't use e-mail for on some sites. So I think these sessions were very valuable.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Nigel. Any other comments on the current IGF? Would anybody else wish to speak about any session that they've attended that pertains to ICANN-related issues and that they feel is important to share?

I'm not seeing any other hands. So thanks for this. And of course, the next IGF is going to be again in Europe and that will be in Katowice. We had a reception held by the next hosts at the end of the current IGF on the last day and looking forward to this. We'll have an enormous quantity of amazing food again, certainly recognizing that the Germans went full way to feed everyone at lunch time and also sometimes in the evenings and just so much. I can't imagine. I don't think we've had as much coffee as in this meeting ever because they had coffee machines located everywhere around the venue and things. It was just amazing hosting. I can see that the German hosts have put the bar very high, but the Polish hosts are also ready to take on the challenge and put the bar equally as high as the one before.

So I really look forward to Katowice, and of course, by then, we might see some movement in the IGF itself. I understand that new MAG members were announced. I don't have the list here but I recognized a number of names that were part of our community.

I see a question from [Yasol] Kim. Will EGCC host any sessions at Katowice, and if so, are there any specific plans? And the answer there from, I'm not seeing any answer yet on that. So I don't know. The EGCC, who would the Engagement Group on Internet Governance, is that the one? EGIG? No. Go ahead, Nigel. Sorry.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Sorry. When it's up to SLI, I though he meant us. EG, no, that's someone else.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

EGIG. Okay, thanks for this, [Yasol]. Okay, so in the past, yes, we have held some sessions at IGF. This year, we submitted a session proposal and it was not retained by the MAG. So if this community wishes to prepare for another proposal for next year, of course, there is nothing blocking us from doing so. A body of like-minded and interested people that might wish to put together a proposal and a workshop of some sort, but of course, it all rests in the hands of the MAG when they will review the workshops.

I believe that if we were to organize a workshop, we would have to submit or start work on deciding what topic, etc. so as to be able to submit on time. And I also need to mention there is no funding or anything associated with the group. So if we are ... One of the difficulties that we've had, of course, with running our own workshops is to find people that are already funded in other ways to be attending the IGF. So these are things to keep in mind.

But indeed, the first MAG meeting will take place on the 14th to 16th of January so that's short deadlines and, of course, the themes and the sort of general framework will be looked at by the MAG at the time. I don't know when the workshops usually are chosen, but that's further down when the call for workshops are done.

So in short, my answer is yes, this group could submit a workshop proposal and if it does get then agreed by the MAG, we can certainly move forward and have a workshop on a topic that would be important for this community.

One of the difficulties we've had in the past is the fact that if we are to do a workshop on a specific topic that is DNS-related, sometimes we're told, "Well, it's just not balanced enough and the panels are not balanced enough, etc." So that's something that we've managed to go around in the past as well by having a good number of participants from our community.

Any comments or questions on this or anything else regarding [inaudible] the IGF?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Olivier, just a couple of further things from me and I'll try and be very brief.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes. Go ahead, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Strange noises in the background on this call. But one, during the meeting, during the IGF, there was a meeting of the trust fund. These are open meetings. The trust fund is the fund that during the year, funds the operation of the IGF Secretariat and sort of funds the general, funds the IGF Secretariat and a number of other events like some of the Dynamic Coalitions, sort of support and things like that.

The trust fund runs at a deficit and has run at a deficit for the last couple of years. And so the situation is relatively serious. I'm not trying to pretend the IGF Secretariat will shut down or anything, but clearly, the amount of funds is quite limited, which in itself limits the effectiveness of the IGF Secretariat. And so indeed, I think under the new MAG Chair, the MAG Chair has got Anriette Esterhuysen [to be the] Chair of the MAG and I think support for the trust fund will be one of the key issues that the MAG will have to address. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Nigel, and thank you for mentioning Anriette actually. I was going to mention a new MAG Chair [inaudible] bit vote of thanks and lots of applause for Lynn St. Amour's stewardship during those years. And now we're opening up with another Chair that is likely to also move things along and imprint her own style on the way things are run.

And Anriette, as we all know, is not just someone who will sit on the side. She is very proactive in doing things and her background with APC makes her an ideal person for running the show for the next few years. So really looking forward to that and I do apologize for the background music if you can hear it. My little goddaughter is playing next to me.

Right. Looking ahead to Katowice, we're done. I don't think there are any other hands up so I think that we can then move to the next agenda item, and that's the upcoming ITU meetings. I haven't spoken about the ITU for quite some time but of course, they still have also a number of tracks and meetings. I don't think there was a [plenty pot]. Was there a [plenty pot] this year? I can't remember. No, there wasn't a [plenty pot] this year, but certainly there were a number of other meetings taking place.

Okay if, perhaps, Nigel, you can take us through these please?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, sorry, Olivier. I was on mute. Yes, thank you. No, you didn't miss a [inaudible] so don't worry. The last one was in 2018 and the next one will be in 2022. So yeah, nothing too soon.

I just thought it was worth flagging that although, well, obviously we just said there's no [pleni-potentiary] and no Wicket or other sort of treaty making meeting in the next couple of years. The ITU is preparing a number of dossiers. The main dossier in preparation is the World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly. So this is the sort of four yearly meeting of the T sector where a number of resolutions are agreed and the structure and the questions for all the different working groups or working parties of ITUT. That meeting is in Hyderabad in November next year, so just yeah, this time next year, or just before this time next year. And the regional preparations are taking place on that and ICANN are involved in sort of tracking developments that might be of potential to affect our mission, etc.

In addition, there are council working groups. As you know, the ITU Council has a number of different working groups. There's one on WSIS which is ongoing and will meet in February and that will discuss the WSIS Forum in a bit more detail and other issues.

There's also a council working group on the International Telecommunication Regulation. This is ... The ITR is the regulation that was discussed at the Wicket back in 2012 in Dubai. And there's an ongoing expert group looking at the current international telecommunication regulation, looking at how effective it is, whether it's used by business and whether it should be amended, so to speak.

And finally, there's a World Telecommunications Policy Forum. This is a four yearly event although it hasn't taken place, I think since 2013. But this is going to take place in 2021. The World Telecommunications Policy Forum is not a treaty forum. It does come up with a number of ideas and recommendations and proposals which then find themselves inside the [pleni-pot] recommendations or whatever. So I just was going to track those developments. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Nigel. Very helpful and very complete list of ITU activities. Is there anyone else on the call who wishes to share more about any ITU insights? Judith Hellerstein.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Nigel, did you also talk about the Council Working Group on International Internet Public Policy and the open consultation that's

going to happen end of January, beginning of February, with that meeting?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Judith, thank you. Good afternoon. I didn't, but I should have done. Many of you will know on the list, there's a Council Working Group on International Internet Public Policy. This is one of the Council Working Groups which are only member states but they do organize open consultation session although there hasn't been one for a couple of years. There is one coming up which is actually taking place on the third of February and there's a [inaudible] call for it at the moment. I think I put it out on the list. Anyone can contribute to this open call. It's looking at how innovation and how new technologies can help connection, can help reach their sustainability goals, etc. I hadn't put that very well but it's ... I'll put the link again in the chat. It's something that we're probably going to contribute to. I think that contributions have to be in by January [where] ICANN Org contribute as an organization in due course, I suspect.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Nigel, and thank you for the question, Judith. I do have one question, which is effectively, a few years ago or months ago—I've lost track of time—there were several proposals by our usual friendly countries that pertain directly to the DNS and to the running of the critical operators, etc. Are we seeing this again permeating to the different groups? Or is this now, this issue put to bed?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Well, others will comment, Olivier, probably. So within the ITUT, as you know, ICANN becomes sector members of ITUD. Within ITUT, there are a number of groups looking at a number of issues. There's a study group that looks at smart cities and Internet of Things and various other issues. And that's had a number of proposals put before it on alternatives to the domain name system. We've talked on this list before about alternatives to the DNS, digital object architecture and other technologies. And those discussions continue and one of the reasons I mentioned the World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly is that we are likely, we think probably, to see proposals put forward to the WTSA next year that will touch on the domain name system whether they be in the form of proposals for the ITU to have an enhanced role with regards to generic top-level domains or country code top-level domains or IP addresses or the domain name system in general.

So this is something that we'll obviously be looking at alongside with our technical partners. Obviously, the regional Internet registries take a very close look at this as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this, Nigel. Any other questions or comments on the topic of upcoming ITU meetings or anything ITU-related? Not seeing any hands up, we can then move on to the next agenda item and that's the report from the Global Commission on Cyber Stability, another long-term process. I see Sivasubramanian Muthasamy has put his hand up. Maybe Siva, was that regarding ITU meetings?

SIVA MUTHASAMY: Yes, Olivier. My observation is that the participants from telecom find it easier to participate in ICANN process, easier to comment on what is happening on the Internet because our process is multistakeholder whereas participants from the multistakeholder process find it difficult and experience barriers in participation and ITU meetings instead of something that is being done about that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Siva, your hand is up again or is that an old hand? Nigel, did you wish to comment on this or Judith, [inaudible].

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, Siva, the ... It's not the ITU. There's an effort always within the ITU to make sure that they open it up to different other interest [inaudible] groups. It's very difficult on some ITU consult or on ITU Council Working Groups to do that because of the non-compliance or non-wishes of the other members. But there's always a push for that and every year, every [pleni-pot], every four years, the U.S. and other developed countries push to get things open more and it's a struggle every year but everyone pushes forward. So that is also why it is so important to contribute to the open consultations on the Internet Public Policy Group because we struggled and we struggled and we horse traded and we finally got this open consultation. And so we want to make sure that we keep it very popular with different civil societies and other groups contributing because then they'll say, "Oh no, people are not really interested." So that is what I have to say. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Judith. And it's worth noting that some countries actually open up their delegations to other stakeholders, the UK being one of them having a thing called MAG-IG, the Multistakeholder Advisory Group on Internet Governance, and that has both participants from the private sector but also [inaudible] users the technical community that are part of the UK delegation [inaudible] and sometimes [inaudible] plan [inaudible], of course, in coordination with the British government.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, and the U.S. and Canada and Australia also have similar open discussions with them as well. So ...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. And I understand there was a discussion recently in some circles of the IGF asking if there are any other countries that are doing this and providing perhaps some details for some countries perhaps to follow this way forward. I've seen some mailing list discussions elsewhere but I don't know if [inaudible]. They only have a handful of countries that [inaudible].

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Olivier, there was a documentation from the UK, Richard [Rigfield] from the UK delegation who explained this as an example and it was a submission by the UK government as an example of how this could be

done. I forgot where it was posted but Richard did write something up for the UK delegation.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you. Right, so now we can move on to the report from the Global Commission on Cyber Stability. Do I have to call on to Nigel again? Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah, sorry, Olivier. Well, I think, yeah sorry, the Global Commission Report, I think we might have touched on this before. So this was set up in 2017, a number of eminent people were sort of called together to discuss the whole issue of cyber stability and to an extent, the formation of this group was a counterpoint to the UN, the ongoing UN discussions which Veni Markovski has briefed us on in previous times. He can't do it this time because he's involved in discussions in New York, but as you recall, there's two ongoing discussions taking place in New York under the UN, the government group of experts and an open-ended working group which met earlier this week.

The Global Commission looked at advancing a number of norms in terms of behavior in cyber space. So these, if you like, were norms that governments and businesses and other stakeholders should sign up to in terms of behavior during elections, behavior in terms of the way that business is conducted or the way that international transactions are conducted in cyber space. One of the norms directly affects ICANN in that it talks about the infrastructure protection of the domain name system infrastructure and how governments should prohibit attacks on

this infrastructure because it's so vital as the backbone to the Internet. So the Commission's report, which some of you will have seen anyway, the Commission's report was launched on the 12th of November during the Paris Peace Forum and it was also discussed at the IGF in Berlin and it was discussed in New York this week. And yeah, it's certainly an interesting document. The Commission certainly want to take this forward as they can and promote these norms and principles to see how they can be adopted by different stakeholders. But other people will know just as much as I do and we can put the link in the chat. I'll put the link in the chat to the report.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

[Inaudible] Ben Wallace [inaudible] on the ITU meetings and multistakeholder delegations at ITU meetings. And regarding the [inaudible], I'm not seeing any other comments here. [Inaudible], but since you mentioned [inaudible], one of the important things is just a quick note that when you sent us that, at the moment, [inaudible] working group [inaudible] ongoing organizations of the UN and it was followed by two days of an informal meeting of the 25 members of the UN group of government experts in cyber and the rest of the [inaudible]. So [inaudible] in those meetings, so he couldn't be with us today. But I have no doubt he will follow up by e-mail to brief us on this. And thanks, Nigel, for being [inaudible] on cyber stability.

If I understand correctly, wasn't part of the meeting hosted by, I might be getting the wrong ... No, it's the GFC, okay, sorry. I'm getting lost with acronyms and I thought that Martin Botterman was also involved in this. But I think he was not. First time I thought but I didn't.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. That's the GFC, Olivier. Yeah.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm just getting to all of them. It's getting alphabet soup in my head. Okay. Any questions or comments on GCSC? Or GCGS? No. Okay, then we can move on to look at the next steps for the Engagement Group. So as you know, we've now moved from a cross-community working group to an engagement group and [inaudible]. I guess that the next thing, really, is to finalize—and this, we can do on the mailing list—finalize the terms of what we will be doing as a platform for exchange of information on policy topics that are related to ICANN, that are taking place outside of the ICANN walls. I'm paraphrasing and I'm sure there's better language than this.

But really, the next thing, I guess, is to devise what we can do from here until our next face-to-face meeting which will take place in Cancun over in March of this year. So that gives us a number of months ahead of us. Obviously, a [inaudible], part of the work is going to be with [inaudible] the work space and all the things that we'll be doing to the wiki space as to make things a little bit more understandable. As you know, all of our calls are recorded and there's a [inaudible] so that's kind of done. But I'd like to try and put a little bit of order in following the tracks. When we follow tracks in the UN and the IGF and the other non-[inaudible] tracks, we have some wiki pages pertaining to each and these will have to be updated with time.

There is also a discussion regarding tools and whether we use the mailing list at the moment as being a good way to do things or should we [inaudible] to share information and perhaps curate such information? I've had a call yesterday in At-Large and the Technology Task Force that looked at the ITI—the Information Transfer Initiative is it, ITI?—that ICANN is currently working on and this is just a way for the ICANN web services and websites to somehow organize as a first step. But maybe in the future, there might be an angle where we would be able to use any of the tools that are developed for the ITI. Any of those, certainly [inaudible] to be able to integrate with. But that's not something to be done right away.

In the meantime, perhaps should we think of a way of how we want to share this information [inaudible]? And obviously, we need to discuss with Nigel and Vera and Desiree on how we can curate this. So when Nigel provides an update or someone, for example, the IGF report that was just sent to the mailing list, very difficult to search mailman mailing lists afterwards. So having a way to curate this and put this somewhere on a wiki and then [inaudible] searched and found is something that would be helpful. ITI, yes thank you, Judith, Information Transparency Initiative. So that's the first thing, organizing [inaudible].

The second thing [discussed] was what we wish to do next year. One of the things, of course, is in agenda item six, the WSIS Forum 2020. The other point that's been raised earlier was the one about [inaudible] IGF. We have some panels or organize some panels not necessarily with just members of our working group but certainly on ICANN-related topics whether it would be anything to do with DNS, threats to the [inaudible], cyber threats, stability, DoH, DoC and anything technical or even

relating and pertaining to multistakeholder model that we use at ICANN. We have had plenty of such sessions in the past and I invite you to look at our wiki pages for these that are the full-length reports from each one of the past proposals. Obviously, I wouldn't want to repeat what we've already done in the past.

I'll open up the floor now for suggestions and comments and so just in the queue, well there is no queue. Judith Hellerstein. Judith, you have the floor.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes, thank you so much. So yeah, I wanted to comment again on the knowledge management. What Olivier was looking at was ... Oh, could someone mute, the person who is speaking? Thank you.

So the idea is how are we going ... Is there a tool for searching through and easily finding tips on Internet governance whether it's either through a blog, whether it's through a slap channel or whether it's through some other mechanism and so Olivier was talking about a meeting that the Technology Task Force had yesterday looking at this issue, looking at a range of different issues, and we invite everyone to go on it. But one of the other possibilities is also an additional budget request to try to get some format of what are we looking for, what kind of tool are we looking at, and is there something cross-SOA and ACs that would be very helpful to our engagement group? And Olivier, maybe you want to say more about this. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Judith. So I think you've said it pretty clearly here. Is there anything, like are there any specific type of information that we'd be interested in storing in whatever tool we might wish to use? One of the reasons being depending on what type of information we want to share and make sociable, different tools could be used. And [inaudible] the simplest one being just some kind of a sitewide search that is currently being worked on.

I'm not asking for answers right away on this call. I'm mindful of the fact that we're reaching the end of this hour and it's gone very, very fast. But this was just to get you thinking on this and I think we'll have to follow-up on the mailing list. And I do hope that we'll get plenty of response on that because unless we [inaudible] what we want to share and in what format we'd like to share it, it's going to be very difficult for us to then make any kind of request or suggestion to ICANN as to what rules might be interesting for our group.

Let's then move on. Not seeing any hands up, we can have [inaudible] 2020. Nigel Hickson, you probably have lots of information about this.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier. Well, I can tell you that it's taking place on the 6th to the 9th of April in Geneva. The WSIS Forum is hosted by the ITU but it's organized in conjunction with UNESCO and UNCTAD and UNDP and it has contributions from a host of other UN agencies that are responsible for the different WSIS action lines from the [inaudible] agenda.

As Olivier said, we've contributed in the past and been able to have some fairly successful and interesting discussions on a variety of topics, such as what ICANN was doing in relation to data protection, what ICANN was doing in relation to the IANA Transition. We have to what? So we don't have to do anything. So ICANN, if it wants to have any sessions as the organization or in relation to this engagement group, has to put proposals in by, I think it's the 4th of February. No, 3rd of February, I've got it. Deadline to submissions is the 3rd of February so we've got a while but not too long and we can, in our efforts on what this forum should cover, we can include proposals to have discussion on certain topics. So that's something that, perhaps, we can give some thought to.

We have found it useful to have sessions at the WSIS Forum. We reach a slightly different audience to what we reach at ICANN meetings, typically more government representatives from developing countries tend to attend the WSIS Forum. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. And indeed, we have had some sessions. So yeah, the WSIS Forum in 2015, '16, '17, and '18, this year I think that we did not have any unless I am completely wrong and it was there. No, we did have that. Did we? Yeah. Of course, we had one this year. It was such a wonderful experience. So this year was expedited policy development process from a temporary specification for detailed e-registration data that is a very charged topic. And we had Keith Drasek and Kurt Pritz who interviewed remotely to be able to speak to the audience about this. I think it was quite interesting for everyone.

In fact, the person sitting in the front row was a gentleman hitherto unknown, a gentleman by the name of Janis Karklins who [inaudible] to try and find out a little bit more about this topic because as you know, Janis became the chair just a few days afterwards of this process.

So now every year, we've had a different topic. In 2015, we had [inaudible] multistakeholder model, multistakeholder model process showcase. In 2016, we had, I was just looking through the wiki pages and I think that we can probably share this later on. But the topics do change a lot from year to year and we have usually quite a good reception from participants locally on these topics because as you know, this is not a typical ICANN audience and so you do get the usual suspects from ICANN but you also get people from outside and it's a good outreach in some way to bring some [inaudible] for people that are not part of the ICANN committee to ask questions about ICANN and about specific purposes.

So again, we have until February to think on the topic and please make those suggestions on the mailing list. I'm not seeing any hands up, further hands up on this, so we can go to any other business. No hands and no comments for any other business, so it looks as though everything that had to be said has been said. Or at least, on this call. I was just going to repeat or review the action items. I gather that the first one, the first action item that I picked up, [inaudible] or discussion for a potential IGF workshop proposal, and the second one being a follow-up discussion to be held on a potential proposal of a workshop for WSIS 2020 bearing in mind, by the way, but actually having to kill two birds with one stone and propose something that was very similar in one and the other, in both of the venues. And because of the

targeting groups are [inaudible] and they were not looking at the same audiences, it's unlikely that people will see that there's a repeat. And we've also, because of the difficulty that we've had for getting people to travel to WSIS Forum. We've had very different panels at the WSIS Forum than at the IGF.

So these are the two Ais. I'm not hearing any other AI from this call and I ask one last time, any other business? And if not, we can then foreclose the call. And I wanted to thank you for all participating in that and that said, we'll [inaudible] on the mailing list and I hope to have a good Wednesday participation on the mailing list. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night, wherever you are. Thank you. Bye.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you. Thank you, Olivier.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Bye all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]