
CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the At-Large capacity building webinar on geopolitics and cybersecurity taking place on Monday, the 1st of June 2020 at 21:00 UTC.

We will not be doing a roll call as this is a webinar. However, we do have English, Spanish and French interpretation as well as real-time transcribing on the call today. We will put the link in the chat so you can all follow along if you wish.

We will also have a pop quiz section at the end of the webinar, so please, stay on to participate in the survey. And thank you all for joining, we are now turning the call over to Joanna Kulesza, the co-chair of the At-Large Capacity Building Working Group. Thank you very much. Over to you, Joanna.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Claudia. Welcome to yet another At-Large Capacity Building webinar. Thank you for joining us. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everywhere you are.

this capacity building webinar, as you can see in the description, is a continuation of a discussion we've had during the last virtual ICANN meeting, ICANN 67. It is my pleasure to welcome today to this webinar León Sanchez, ICANN's vice chair of the board, Veni Markovski, who's ICANN's vice president for UN engagement, and my ALAC colleague, Javier Rúa-Jovet who has accepted kindly the invitation to speak on behalf of the At-Large community or ALAC during this meeting.

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.

We are using a new tool, as you guys can see, here during this webinar, so please bear with us. We are exploring new formats for webinars. There will be interactive questions during this meeting. We've asked our presenters to include those. So please, allow for certain accommodations. Thank you for taking the time to register for this webinar. We are very much looking forward to our presenters providing updates on the discussion we've had during ICANN 67, but also to building the capacity of the At-Large community when it comes to vital and current issues of geopolitics and cybersecurity.

As Claudia indicated, we are providing translation. There is also a transcript, should you be willing to use it. There is a Q&A section. We will be taking questions at the end of the three presentations we have scheduled. There is a more detailed agenda if you look at the At-Large capacity building website.

As already said, we will welcome three presentations. I will ask Veni to start us off. He was wonderful during the session we had at ICANN 67w introducing or explaining the geopolitical context of ICANN's work.

There is an ongoing discussion within ICANN on the multi-stakeholder process, how it impact international relations, policies, politics and law, and that is an area that Veni has taken on within ICANN Org in terms of presenting ICANN's position and supporting the community in engaging with relevant UN bodies, institutions. This presentation today will be a continuation of that debate, that discussion that is going on within UN.

Then I will be happy to welcome León Sanchez with an update on board's plans in terms of geopolitics, cybersecurity, ongoing discussions.

I would like this capacity building comprehensive meeting, webinar to include also current challenges such as the pandemic that has impacted also this community when it comes to the form of our meetings, the scope of our meetings.

So when giving the floor to our presenters, I will welcome also a reflection on whether these processes have impacted how ICANN deals with geopolitical challenges.

And then last but not least, Javier has kindly accepted to provide his ideas, his thoughts, his presentation on an end user perspective to this process. As you can see in the agenda—and we will have the overall questions we're trying to address during today's meetings on the slide, the overall narrative is for us to build capacity when it comes to understanding global processes, political, legal processes that might impact ICANN's mission. If that is the case, we will try to better understand what is that impact. Then León will provide us with updates on what the Board is doing to address these.

And finally, in my eyes, the takeaway from ICANN 67 session is the end user perspective or, if you will, an individual perspective. So we will try to give this discussion a geopolitical spin. We will try to better understand where we find the individual in all of those political but also technical discussions.

You can see the detailed questions in the agenda, as already said, and you will see them on the slides as well, as we progress.

With that, I would be happy to give the floor to our speakers. Trying to pick up on the discussions we've had before, I would kindly ask Veni to

start us off with updates. Veni has been kind enough to share with the community direct updates from UN processes. My understanding is that he will provide us with a little bit of background, but I know that there are new drafts coming our way, there is progress being made despite the pandemic, or maybe the pandemic has stopped those processes and there is little for us to be concerned about.

Veni, I'm more than thrilled to give you the floor. Thank you for accepting the invitation. The floor is yours. Thank you.

VENI MARKOVSKI:

Thank you very much. I'm very happy to see so many people joining this webinar. If we can go to the next slide, because I think my e-mail address is easy to share.

For those of you who have been in previous settings, maybe some of the information that I will share will be familiar, but there are some new developments. So you guys feel free to also ask questions, and I'll be happy to answer once we are done with the presentations.

So within ICANN government engagement and intergovernmental organization engagement function that we do, I am responsible for the relationship with the UN.

At the United Nations, we do a lot of work within the general assembly, UNGA. In the general assembly, there are three committees that are of interest for ICANN and the broader ICANN community.

The first committee deals with all issues related to security. The second deals with Internet governance, including the IGF and any other subject

relating to it, but every once in a while it also touches on discussing ICT, information and communication technology for development, ICT for development. The third committee is the one that's going to be more of interest for us because it's the one that will be discussing the drafting of a new UN cybercrime convention.

Within the first committee, there are two groups which have started, and I was wondering whether I should just leave the abbreviations and make quiz to see who can tell what these abbreviations mean, but then I decided that it's better to put them in small font so that you can see them for yourself.

We have the open-ended working group, OEWG, and it's a very long title. OEWG on developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security. For the purposes of this webinar, we can call it the OEWG on cybersecurity.

The second working group is the group of governmental experts who are also discussing cybersecurity issues. The third one, which I mentioned is starting work this summer, in August, is the open-ended ad hoc intergovernmental committee of experts, so OECE. The open-ended working group is the one that we have been focusing a lot from the perspective of the broader community, not only just ICANN but it's the one that's opened—as much as it could within the rules of procedure of the general assembly—its discussion to outside participants. I will post the link to the group's website so that you can go and take a look and figure out what is happening. There are a lot of documents that you can read, including a lot of comments that were sent in the last couple of months by different member states, but also

by different nongovernmental organizations, including some of the organizations that are actively engaged with ICANN.

They were all focusing on the three draft OEWG reports. GGE and the OEWG will be issuing reports. The OEWG is chaired by a Swiss diplomat and the GGE by a Brazilian diplomat, well-respected diplomats with lots of knowledge in the area.

And these reports will come to the general assembly. Now, in the context of discussing these reports, every once in a while, there are certain proposals coming from different member states. In these proposals, every once in a while somebody is talking about not naming ICANN per name but talking about ICANN's mission and remit. So that's one of the reasons why we are watching actually what's happening, and that's one of the reasons why we are engaging with the diplomatic community at the UN so that we could bring our expertise and knowledge as a technical and neutral body to the diplomats so that they understand how the Internet works and they understand what is the role of ICANN and other organizations.

So between the previous ICANN meeting and today, we have a webinar for diplomats from Geneva and New York. We had about 116 participants if I'm not mistaken, and I'll send you later in the chat I'll put the link to the blog entry that Mandy Carver wrote. She's the senior VP for government engagement that brought about this webinar, because it was 116 diplomats from New York and Geneva, plus a lot of people from different capitals. And they all were hearing from ICANN CTO, David Conrad, and Naela Sarras from IANA.

So the OEWG has just published a few days ago a new pre-draft report which was done on May 27th, and now it will have a day and a half in the UN world, actually nine hours of virtual meetings and discussion with member states on June 15th, 17th and 19th with member states to see what their reaction is to this pre-draft OEWG report.

Because of the COVID-19, the UN is closed, so there are no face-to-face meetings and there is a lot of deliberations on how to proceed with these discussions, because the UN is not used to not having face-to-face meetings. A lot of the conversations that are taking place are taking place in the hallways and in the coffee breaks.

So given the circumstances, I think it would be fair to say that the chair of the OEWG is doing everything possible to have a substantive discussion on his report and on the comments that are coming from different stakeholders.

The Group of Governmental Experts, which is also discussing cybersecurity—oh, I should have mentioned, sorry, the OEWG was supposed to issue its report by this fall, rather in the summer. We will see whether they will be able to keep that timeframe. Of course, there may be a need to extend it a little bit so that they can still finish the job.

The Group of Governmental Experts actually consists of only 25 experts from 25 member states. It does not have open consultations with other stakeholders, and its job is supposed to finish by fall next year. So they still have a lot of time to finish what they have started and issue a report as they usually do.

Both groups work on a consensus, so the report should be built on consensus. There is a lot of diplomacy going on. For the ICANN community, this is very strange unless they come from the diplomatic circles and they understand how this is working.

The Open-Ended ad hoc Intergovernmental Committee of Experts which is supposed to discuss the drafting of a new UN convention on cybercrime is scheduled to meet in August. We will see whether the UN will be opened and whether it will be working in August. It very much depends on the overall situation in the city of New York, where I'm also based, and you may have seen it also in the news. There are a lot of issues related to COVID-19 and to other internal American, US issues. So We'll see how it goes and how it will happen.

I've put also a couple of other entities at the UN. I'm not going to talk a lot about them, the ECOSOC, Economic and Social Council, and the CSTD, Commission on Science and Technology for Development. The CSTD is discussing one of the items left from the WSIS, which is the enhanced cooperation. And ECOSOC usually had in the past meetings sometime in May on ICT for development where a couple of years ago, Göran Marby came to address the audience and to have some meetings at the UN, including with the Secretary General. But this year, everything is virtual, most of the things are postponed, so there is nothing to report there.

I will stop here. If you have any questions, and if there are any follow-ups after León speaks, I'll be happy to continue.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Veni. I believe we have still a few more minutes for this section. I'm wondering if you might want to emphasize how those processes are related to ICANN's mission.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Oh, yeah, absolutely.

JOANNA KULESZA: [inaudible] on your slide, and if we could elaborate on that, I think that would be very useful for our participants. Thank you.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Yeah. I didn't know how much time, I was trying to be short.

JOANNA KULESZA: It is ten more minutes according to our agenda, so you're more than welcome to slow down. Go right ahead.

VENI MARKOVSKI: This is fantastic. So, ICANN has been engaged with the UN in the last five, six years since I moved to New York to cover that organization, because we realized at some point that there are a lot of conversations happening in New York, and in 2015, there was a WSIS—WSIS is the World Summit on Information Society, for those of you who may not know. This is an intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder event that took place in 2003 and 2005 in Geneva and in Tunisia, and it created the

Internet Governance Forum which everybody in the call, I assume, is familiar with.

So in 2015, the UN started discussing the continuation of the IGF, which resulted in continuing the IGF for another ten years. So we are now five years past that date, and those of you who participate in the IGF know that especially in the last three, four years, this has increased its participation in terms of numbers, in terms of workshops. It covers a lot of topics.

So the UN General Assembly was the one to discuss how the IGF is changing. Also, the UN is the one that can change [also in five years,] but it can change the way the IGF is functioning.

So we engaged with the UN because a lot of those deliberations that are happening behind closed doors are the ones where issues related to the future of the Internet and the governance of the Internet are actually being discussed, and in some cases, when they discuss issues related—and that's particularly visible in the open-ended working group report and in some of the comments that came to this report, member states talk about issues like the core Internet infrastructure.

In the conversations that we have then, they continue to explain that this actually includes the domain name system, for example. And as I mentioned, I will put a link in the chat and I'll try to put it now. You'll see for example in the comments that are coming from a couple of the countries and nongovernmental organizations that they do talk about how the DNS is the core critical Internet infrastructure we have to

protect or it should not be attacked, etc. It's talking about member states' behavior.

And we wanted to make sure that when the diplomats are talking about those issues, they have enough information which we try to provide in regular briefings to the diplomats and to the UN staff, but also that they understand how the Internet functions so that they don't come with some proposal that is practically impossible to do.

And it turned out that this is a process in which the ICANN and the broader ICANN community learns about the processes of the UN and the UN learns about ICANN and the processes that are taking place at ICANN.

So in other words, this is a mutual educational outreach effort which continues because the diplomats keep on changing every three years, give or take, and every new diplomat that comes to cover the issues, some of them might have information from the colleagues who were previously covering these issues, but not always. And also, these are people who most of them have studied international relations, political science, something like that. I have seen so far only a handful of people who have come with some computer background so they understood very well what are RFCs, what is ICANN doing, how the DNS is working, etc.

So there is a lot of effort that we're putting there in terms of bringing knowledge to the UN. And in return, sometimes diplomats come to talk to us and they sometimes go to meetings like the IETF and they learn a lot also and they teach a lot. They tell a lot to the participants in those

meetings so that we better understand at ICANN what's happening in the UN and how it might impact our work, but also, the diplomats better understand that what they do might impact the Internet as we know it.

So I hope that is giving you a better idea why we are engaging with those groups and how we are working. The UN has very strict rules of procedure and it's not a multi-stakeholder body, it's an intergovernmental organization. So it sometimes requires some innovation on behalf of chairs of the different working groups to open the meetings for participants from other stakeholder groups. And some of you may have seen that in the past where they would say, "Okay, we are ending now the formal session and we are opening the session again," and they're in the same room, they're immediately following one session after another but it's now considered open session for everybody to participate.

So it's a work in progress. It's very challenging at some points because with these different working groups that are sometimes working in parallel and it's difficult to cover all of them, it will become even more challenging with the open-ended group on drafting the UN convention. But we have a good team at the government engagement and we're trying to do as much as we can with the resources we have.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Veni. Thank you for the questions. I see them in the chat. I also encourage you to use the Q&A section of this wonderful webinar panel we have been provided with. We are taking note of these

questions. They will be addressed and answered by our speakers during the Q&A session.

I see the questions we have right now from Javier and Vanda focus also on the best way to communicate the community position to the diplomats, the UN circles that Veni supports the community in on behalf of ICANN Org.

In that sense, I would be inclined to give the floor to León Sanchez to give us an update or maybe any sort of a summary recommendation, what is the community's position, the community leadership position, on addressing these concerns? What should the community do to support getting through ICANN's message to those diplomatic processes?

Again, we've accommodated 20 minutes for each of your interventions. If there's time left, that is more than welcome, that will allow more time for discussions. With that, León, I give you the floor. Thank you very much.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Joanna. Thank you for inviting me and thanks, Veni, for the clear recap of all the things that Org is following and doing in regard to the different topics that you have mentioned.

So I would like to remind you, if you're not familiar with ICANN's strategic plan for fiscal years 2021 to 2025, that we have included a strategic objective to address the geopolitical issues impacting ICANN's mission to ensure a single globally interoperable Internet.

So you can see that strategic plan on the following link that I'm going to paste into the chat, and we have again this strategic objective, and we think we can achieve these objectives, hence we have established two strategic goals.

The first strategic goal within this strategic plan is identifying and addressing global challenges and opportunities within our remit. That is, of course, within ICANN's mission and remit, by further developing early warning systems like ICANN Org's legislative and regulatory development reports. You can find an example of those reports in the following link that I'm going to paste into the chat.

We also think that we can achieve this objective by continuing to build alliances in the Internet ecosystem and beyond to raise awareness of and engage with global stakeholders about ICANN's mission and policymaking. So these are the two strategic goals within this strategic objective. And we have been following, of course, the different developments and issues that are likely to impact ICANN's mission and remit in regard to geopolitics and Internet governance. We work closely with Org on following these topics. I see that there was a question from Vanda in the chat on whether Org informed the board on the work that they develop and follow in this arena. And the answer is yes, we do receive regular updates from Mandy Carver and her team, and of course, Veni is part of that team, and we receive all the information in the developments and the whereabouts of the discussions that are being held in these topics.

We have been, of course, following initiatives like the one mentioned by Veni on the UN cybercrime convention, and also, the new IP. You might

be familiar with the topic of new IP, which is more technical and tries to solve an issue that is not really an issue as far as I've been explained. I have been asking to my more technical friends about the new IP initiative and whether they see it could have a future or an impact on what ICANN does.

And most of the comments that I've received about new IP is that the biggest weakness they see in it is that it tries to solve an issue that is really not an issue. So of course, we will continue to follow these kinds of initiatives and we will continue to try to provide as much input and interaction with the relevant actors within these discussions.

So I also wanted to share with you the approaches that the board takes on the different issues that we considered to be relevant in the geopolitics and the Internet governance arena. We have divided the scope or the approach from the board and also from Org into three buckets, if I may say, one of them being the one in which ICANN needs to take a leadership role. This means that, of course, ICANN needs to drive the discussion, push the discussion and act as a leader in that sense.

The second one is where ICANN takes a collaborative participation role and this of course may entail different actors both in the technical, governmental, private, and academia sector. And this is of course a different kind of approach. And also, a third approach which is the selective engagement.

All these different approaches are, in a way, led by the spirit of ICANN being this actor that likes to engage with the communities to build

capacities, to create awareness, to explain how things work, to try to guide the decision makers into making the best decisions possible that will allow the Internet unique identifier system to work as it does right now.

So we have also established with Org a charter for engagement with governments and standard bodies. You can find this charter in the following link that I am pasting now into the chat.

And here you will see three principles that are followed by ICANN Org when engaging with either governments or standard bodies. The first is that ICANN Org engagement on a proposal will be limited to providing technical information on the impact on ICANN's mission or articles of incorporation. There may be jurisdictions where ICANN Org's ability to provide such information is limited or prohibited by local limitations on lobbying activities. So of course, we need to do an assessment to see where we're standing and provide this input as feasible.

The second principle is that ICANN Org will maintain a publicly available list of proposals for which ICANN Org intends to or is considering engagement. And the third one is if ICANN Org provides any written proposal during a public comment period or equivalent, ICANN Org will post that written comment on the ICANN Org website.

So these are the principles that guide the way ICANN Org engages with these bodies, of course, under overview of the board. And as I said, we have been working together with ICANN Org in identifying the different challenges, risks and some would say even threats to ICANN's mission, ICANN's work in the terms of geopolitics.

So with this, Joanna, I would like to thank you again for allowing me to be here for today, and of course, I am open to any questions that you may have.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, León. This was most informative. I believe this is a wonderful summary of where the community stands, how it interacts with the Org. I must admit that one of the most interesting questions that were posed during our initial session on geopolitics and cybersecurity was on the interests or the position of noncommercial or noncontracted parties, noncommercial users, end users. So, individuals who are online and get the chance to be represented within the ICANN community.

With that, I would like to give the floor to our third speaker tonight who is Javier Rúa-Jovet speaking on behalf of the At-Large community and taking on a difficult challenge trying to identify the end user interest, so the individual interest, within those debates.

My understanding is that this intervention should help us better understand how the At-Large community, how the ICANN community, can facilitate those global processes. Javier, thank you for accepting the invitation. The floor is yours.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET:

Thank you, Joanna, for this invitation. Good afternoon, buenas tardes. I'm Javier Rúa from the ALAC. I'm from an island in the Caribbean called Puerto Rico, part of the North American region in ICANN:

Today, I will speak, as Joanna mentioned, on Internet end users' perspectives and this conundrum of international rulemaking, particularly in cyber matters.

Caveat, I do not speak for the ALAC as an institution, I speak as an end user of the Internet, as an Internet prosumer because I produce information also in the Internet. So I speak for myself. And I try, as best as I can, to represent other end users of the Internet in what I speak in that capacity.

So in my presentation, I will make some philosophical points in the beginning kind of like the first third of my slides. And my apologies on the slides, they're very wordy. I know this is not the best way to do slides. You want slides like León's and Veni's which are really summaries of ideas and then you speak. But I have to learn that skill.

So I will generally make some philosophical statements in the beginning on these matters, on international rulemaking and geopolitics, and also the COVID situation. Bear with me with a thought experiment that I will put forward. And then I will go more into the weeds of more in detail on the matter at hand.

The Internet is the largest and most efficient and freest market of information, ideas, services and goods in the history of humanity. It was born amidst geopolitical tensions and still faces them. The Internet was conceived in the heat of the Cold War. That's contradictory, but in the Cold War, the Soviet Union launches Sputnik, starts technological race, and the United States has a reaction and creates DARPA, and DARPA, as

you know, is the defense agency in the United States for science and technology research.

And that started the Internet, but thankfully, or luckily, or by design or by luck, the Internet was mostly kind of the rules and the protocols were written by civilians, civilian engineers, by, in some ways, Internet people. And I will talk about this concept of Internet people more in the weeds at the end of the presentation. But the Internet was generally a nongovernmental policymaking process, and that's why we will discuss on multi-stakeholderism in the future.

So it was created by the government, but it was molded and given to the people, and the people made it what it is today. And this process has continually grown more inclusive and more open to individual perspectives, and that's what we call multi-stakeholderism, as we will see. Next slide.

As any market, the Internet cannot be fair and free without rules. And so including rules regarding cyber things, cyber terrorism, and also cyber freedoms, human rights. And in these processes that are global, humanity faces two critical options to successfully address any global challenge. It can be viral pandemics, it can be governance of the Internet, or it can be balancing cybersecurity with human rights. These are the two options.

The first option is between totalitarian vigilance and human empowerment. And the second option is between nationalist isolation and global human solidarity.

And bear with me with a thought experiment I will pose to you, or a fact pattern, as we say in law. Let's think about the coronavirus situation. Constant state tracking, surveillance and punishment of the citizenry seem to be effective methods for the control of the pandemic. Policing is progressively self-executing via sensors, applications and algorithms. This is apparently so efficient that our societies are embracing some of these methods despite erosion of fundamental human rights such as movement, privacy and expression, even if states bypass normal constitutional, participatory and lawmaking processes.

Continuing, but persecuting and repression are not the only ways to achieve compliance with norms. Compliance could also be based on citizens' trust in scientific knowledge, in good political leadership, in respecting agreed upon procedural and substantive constitutionality, and in allowing citizens to make individual and collective decision based on scientific information.

This option of course is much more complicated, it seems impossible given the profile of our elected leaders—some of our leaders. Some are quite good, actually—and also the electorate.

But if this type of approach is achieved, the post-COVID-19 world would be better, I think.

Continuing with this experiment, the pandemic is by definition a transnational problem, borderless. It can only be effectively resolved through cross-border cooperation. To beat the virus, we need to share information and scientific strategies as freely and directly as possible. If Canadian experts are unsure about this or that course of action, they

can consult their South Korean colleagues who live in a more advanced point of the curve or maybe a second curve.

And maybe these Canadian and South Korean doctors from time to time coincide in international meetings and conventions further deepening the degree of mutual trust and understanding. Next slide, please. Sound familiar?

Simply put, free trust-based global cooperation is essential to effectively and reasonably address cross-border issues, be they pandemics, nuclear proliferation, climate change, or cybersecurity, the topic at hand. Next slide, please.

Multilateralism versus multi-stakeholderism. As Veni discussed in his presentation, there's many processes going on at the UN and these are generally multilateral processes or intergovernmental processes. Traditional international law, policy- or rulemaking or lawmaking is either bilateral or multilateral. In both cases, it's intergovernmental.

Sovereign states talk to sovereign states, and sovereign states make legal decisions. And these decisions become binding upon states by their own will via treaties, conventions, documents that they draft and sign and ratify, their legislators might ratify, and/or these norms become binding if they are consistently or universally applied by states in their practice and the states consider these practices to be legally binding. So they're just not morally binding practices.

So this is international law today. Generally, treaties, conventions and international, consistent legal custom. And you can find these sources of international law and some subsidiary sources that are at a lower level

in the statute of the international court of justice—which is another international treaty, Article 38, the link is there.

Any many of you know this, but maybe some of you don't: there's a substantial difference between multilateralism and multi-stakeholderism, what we do here at ICANN and other bodies. Multi-stakeholderism promotes the participation of all interested private and public actors. By involving everyone in an open, transparent and collaborative discussion—as in the case of the thought experiment with the Canadian and South Korean doctors and Taiwanese, or everybody—by involving everyone in that discussion, the decision achieved great trust and acceptance from the various parties.

In the case of multi-stakeholderism, private and public parties, governments and individuals, governments and corporations, states and corporations, states and people, these are the stakeholders. So multi-stakeholderism treats private persons and groupings of persons, both natural and legal, individuals and corporations, as equal stakeholders to governments.

And the question for this situation today, this webinar, is whether we think—and I surely think so—multi-stakeholder approaches be better than multilateral approaches to reach better cybersecurity outcomes and whether there even are paths out there for individuals and in groupings of individuals to impact cybersecurity rulemaking processes. Next slide, please.

As Veni explained in detail, and also León mentioned briefly, most of the processes that are going on are multilateral, intergovernmental

discussions to draft for example a cybersecurity treaty. That means that the United States is talking to Canada and maybe hopefully also talking to China and there's many countries talking to each other to draft rules that they can hopefully agree on on matters of Internet security, cyberterrorism, and cyber issues of security that concern states.

And these processes do not seem to have clear openings for individual end users. Veni did mention that ECOSOC, the scientific committee of the ECOSOC, has some opening for civil society. I think—and I'd paste here—and Veni mentioned also the IGF and the WSIS process.

So in terms of at least dialog, openness for individual end user and collective end user positions in these multilateral and international discussions on cybersecurity still is the IGF, the Internet Governance Forum that will have its next meeting—probably a web meeting—in November. It's set to be in Poland, but it's probably going to be a web meeting.

That's the way IGF was designed, by the WSIS process. The IGF is really kind of like a mixed multilateral/multi-stakeholder process. But that's the way it's described. It's really a forum for dialog that's open to different perspectives. It's not like ICANN. ICANN is truly a multi-stakeholder forum that takes into account all voices in its policymaking.

But one good thing about the IGF and its basically recent expressions made in the last IGF, the Berlin IGF by the UN secretary general, António Guterres from Portugal. Portugal, an advanced democracy in Europe. Next slide.

In that slide, you have the slide where the statements are from the secretary general. You can look them up. And I pasted some of these comments here, some of his expressions here. They create some hope, they show openness on individual end user positions on cybersecurity matters. As you can see, he mentions the dangers of some of these technologies, which I acknowledge and we acknowledge. We know these technologies, like most technologies, are like the biblical tree of good and evil in the Hebrew bible. It's just knowledge, it can be used for good or bad.

So technology is knowledge. Nuclear power can be good and bad, it depends on how you use it. So most of the technologies we care about can be used for good and for bad. I'll mention in further slides end-to-end encryption. It's great for privacy, for my privacy as an end user. It's also great for the privacy of Al Qaeda cells. So countries have legitimate reasons to try and regulate these technologies, in this case via treaty, but I as an end user have great interest in balancing into that deal that countries want to make my interest which are only mine as an end user, which have to do with the privacy of my Internet communications, my Internet production and what I receive via the Internet.

So that's that discussion on the difference between state and individual concerns here that León mentioned a bit. So here are some of the statements of the secretary general. Very good. Next slide, please.

Here in the next slide, they continue, but basically, take a look at them, read them. He makes a very open invitation for end user perspectives as the IGF is designed for that on these matters, and hopefully,

theoretically, these dialogs can be communicated, as he says here ,to the appropriate norm setting fora.

So the IGF is not a norm setting fora. It's not a lawmaking forum. They're not negotiating a treaty in the IGF. But the secretary general is saying that end user arguments and end user thinking and individual end user and collective civil society decisions will be heard and communicated.

He also mentions he's going to name a technology individual in the UN here. That hasn't happened yet. This is interesting. Let's wait for that. Next slide, please.

So there isn't a lot more to add, but on the Internet people issue, it's clear that we the people of the Internet have to find ways to circumvent multilateralism's barriers to entry. All individuals or joint nongovernmental Internet stakeholders must somehow claim our independent and equal voice at all possible tables, all cyber tables, alongside states, not under states. This has happened already in the ICANN space.

ALAC, of which hi am a member, is the primary organizational home within ICANN for Internet users, and it could be a great place to discuss these issues as this is what we're doing right now, which is great. But we appreciate many complexities.

There are complexities that have to do in these Internet people creating a coherent point of view for Internet vis-à-vis sates in fora. For example in ALAC, per se, we are different nationalities, different nationalities, different regions, different backgrounds, different viewpoints. In my

case, I come from a small island in the Caribbean, which is Latin American culture and Caribbean culture, but within North American Anglo constitutional jurisdiction. And North America, NARALO, is very simple compared to [Australia,] Asia Pacific or the African region which have many countries and interests. So that's a big step to deal with, our diversity.

Also, we have to stay, in ALAC, within the ICANN remit, which is the technical remit which is very specific on coordinating domain names and addressing technologies and numbers. So that's a challenge there. And a great challenge of creating an Internet people—and I define it a generally autonomous transnational civil community capable of credibly and coherently challenging and standing against Westphalian worldviews. And look at the footnote there, Westphalian is just a fancy way of marking where the new international system was born after the European religious wars where states were the bosses and nobody else.

Westphalian worldviews, structures and institutions. Challenging those requires critical, very difficult political alliances between private sector entities as a precondition to achieve the firepower needed. Next slide, please.

In the last ICANN meeting we had, Professor Milton Mueller was one of the speakers and he made some challenges there on this topic, on how to build a we the people of the Internet that can stand vis-à-vis states. And this quote here basically talks about this big challenge of having the firepower. Only a business civil society alliance can prevent a dangerous alliance between state intelligence and law enforcement agencies and

the major private sector intermediaries who control much of the data. Please read his book, it's very important. Will The Internet Fragment?

The question is whether we're up to this task of making these alliances. We have our ALAC discussions and then we have just bigger things to do to be very relevant in an international, geopolitical scenario. Next slide, please.

So, thinking about rights and positions which are individual end user centered is pretty easy. The hard part is what I mentioned before, these alliances we have to do and this coherence we have to achieve, coherence that ALAC is actually moving towards thanks to this type of effort by Joanna and Jonathan Zuck and others which are very good, actually, to get our act together and our viewpoints.

But in terms of thinking about our positions, I mentioned encryption technologies and I explained that. That's pretty clear. There's some others here. It has to do with a rights discussion. A right discussion that's I believe close to our ICANN remit as DNS abuse, as we see in some of our other webinars and discussions, maybe a right to be free from malicious software like viruses, free from state viruses. Could that be all right?

Just think out loud here, but it's up to you to make up these rights and for us to discuss them and make them true in the pertinent fora. Next slide, please.

And just to end—and thanks for bearing with me—coronavirus again. There are definitely more questions than answers on geopolitics and the coronavirus, the post-coronavirus world.

Failing to acknowledge the elephant in the room would be really foolhardy. The global geopolitical fallout of the coronavirus pandemic raises more questions than answers. And here are some questions.

Will the post-COVID world strengthen nation states and nationalism?
Will authoritarian state-centered governance models be preferred onward? Will cybersecurity trump cyber freedom and human rights?
Will multi-stakeholder models disappear?

Or will the opposite happen? Will this be the shot in the arm that constitutional, free liberal democracies need to reassert a pro individual stance in international lawmaking that could create new fora for rational discussions within all the parties?

The jury is still out, of course. I want to have hope, but things look bad from what we're seeing. But I'll leave it at that. Sorry for taking some extra minutes. Let's take some questions. Thanks.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Javier. That was inspiring. Thank you so much. It looks like the At-Large indeed could be the place where the Internet for the people is being developed. We have a few questions in the Q&A box here, in the part of the webinar that is devoted to questions. I see those have been answered by our speakers. I know we also have a few questions in the chat. I'm wondering if Claudia might be able to read out the questions that were posted in the chat and pose them to our panelists to answer. Claudia, would this work?

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Yes, Joanna. Let's see. One question I have is from Oksana. The question is, "Nevertheless, my question regarding the geopolitical balance in decision making structures, Ukraine and Russia just now are in the same region. So, it is possible that the same representative, meaning the ALAC member or anyone else, will represent both Ukraine and Russia's interests in Internet governance at ICANN, ignoring the fact that we have different priorities." That is from Oksana Prykhodko.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Claudia. I'm wondering if any of our speakers want to pick that up.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET:

I can give it a shot quickly. Oksana, thanks for that, but in general, in terms of national positions within ICANN, it would be GAC, the best place for a national position to be taken. I hope there is a Ukrainian representative in the GAC that is different from the Russian representative. If that's not the case, that shouldn't be the case.

In the case of ALAC, that's part of the difficulties of ALAC. I'm part of the North America region, which is one of the simple regions in terms of number of countries. Puerto Rico is a territory that is part of NARALO, of North America. It's a Latin American country. And all of our international diplomacy is carried out by the United States, which is not a Latin American country.

So these things are complicated, and when I'm in ALAC, I don't purport to represent either Puerto Rico or North America At-Large. I try to

represent, as best as I can, North American Internet users through my particular optic as a Latin America-Caribbean person in Puerto Rico. So that's my best answer for that.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Javier. If any of the panelists would like to add anything to that specific question, I'm happy to give them the floor.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Just to make it completely clear, because Javier was mentioning the two countries that Oksana asked, they do have obviously different representatives in the GAC.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Veni. We have more questions in the chat. I would kindly ask Claudia to read out the next question. If any of our panelists want to pick it up, that would be wonderful. Go ahead, Claudia.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay. Thank you. The next question we have is actually from Javier, and the question was, Veni, is there a way in which ICANN Org communicates ICANN communities' positions in diplomatic contexts?

VENI MARKOVSKI: Well, first of all, most of the discussions at the UN are not related directly to ICANN. and the best way in fact—and that comes back to

what I think Javier maybe was mentioning in the previous presentation, and I would urge everybody to reach out to their national governments, because the positions at the UN of different countries are actually positions that are being formulated in the capital. So it's extremely helpful if At-Large members reach out to their foreign ministries and talk with them in the capitals, because once this position is established in the capital, it comes to the UN and there is not that much opportunity of interaction, intervention, whatever with these positions they have built in the capital. So please, everyone, reach out, because we obviously work with the GAC members, but the GAC members are coming usually from the telecom administration, so the foreign ministries are the ones that are indeed the important ones with regards to the United Nations.

And there are many countries in which the telecom administration work in close cooperation with the foreign ministry, so if there is a policy that touches on ICANN, there is a way to also reach out through the GAC members and make sure the facts are there so that they can formulate a position based on the fact that we can provide.

Again, when we talk to diplomats at the UN, we are not lobbying for ICANN. We're actually lobbying for ICANN. We're actually explaining how the Internet works, why it's interoperable, single, united, and what different aspects of the Internet mean and how their policies might impact one or another issue, also obviously related to ICANN.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Veni. I understand that there was a follow-up question from Vanda that was following up on Javier's question. Does ICANN Org send information to the board? I'm reading it out. I believe it was answered during your presentations. I'm wondering if Veni or León want to take that.

VENI MARKOVSKI: León said that it's correct.

JOANNA KULESZA: Yeah, I think that was answered, so we're just taking note of that. Thank you for posting the question, Vanda. We have one more question in the Q&A box. I will try to read this out. How do states see the question of cybersecurity nowadays in the United Nations and the United Nations ecosystem? I'm wondering if any of our panelists would like to pick this question up.

VENI MARKOVSKI: I guess I'll pick it up. So it's a very interesting question, because first of all, as I was reading the names of the working groups that are established, you may have noticed there is no cybersecurity, actually, in the title of this group. So cybersecurity as a term is not being mentioned. They're talking about security in the use of information and communication technologies and stuff like that. So it's a very interesting concept. It's also very interesting because it shows you that if a term has not been described and explained, the UN tries not to use it.

You will see, by the way, in some of the comments of the OEWG that some member states mentioned that the core Internet infrastructure is a new concept, so it's better not to discuss it. This is just giving you some idea as to what we need to work in order to explain differences of terms, what they mean, etc., and to also take this into account.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Veni. I see Javier raising his hand in the chat to try and reply to that question as well.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET:

Thanks. Obviously, Veni covered it perfectly. All I can say—and I think we all know this—we're seeing a world that is becoming a world of superpowers again. We're talking about a rising superpower in the east as China, and I would say really a waning superpower in the west, the United States. I see lack of leadership on one side, and I see strong leadership in the other.

The danger here, in my perspective, humbly, is that—and [so many people are discussing this,] that the post-coronavirus perception that authoritarian models were more effective than democratic models to deal with the crisis would permeate other discussions, like cybersecurity discussions. And I think that's bad for individuals because it would be a worse forum for the thing we care about, which are non-state interests.

The security interest of states, phrased that way, are very similar. Their sovereignty-based border protection and protection of the state

interests. Whereas individual and community end user interests have to do with dignity and privacy and individual and civil and political rights.

So, I see a world that's becoming more big power struggle geopolitically. And I don't know what the result of that will be, but it seems to me that the things we care about as individuals can be lost in that noise.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Javier. We have a few more questions coming up. I will try to read them out. We have two more in the chat. I see the one in the question box was just answered. Thank you. So we have a more general question on ICANN allegedly being out of touch with current reality of the cold war between big powers. And the question is, what can ICANN do to ease tensions? And then there is a second question that just popped up from Nigel: do we think the upcoming roadmap on internet cooperation from United Nations Secretary General may help take forward the multi-stakeholder model we have been discussing? So whether the roadmap will help to incorporate the agenda we're trying to cover during this session.

Would any of the panelists like to pick this question up?

VENI MARKOVSKI:

I can take the one from Nigel. Let's see what the upcoming roadmap will be, and then we will figure out whether it'll help. I didn't mention that at all in my presentation because this is yet another level of engagement that is taking place at the UN secretary general level. So once this roadmap is published, we'll take a look at it and we'll know.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Veni. León and Javier, anything to add?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Not to add on to Veni's answer, but I think I can take a shot at the previous question about ICANN not being in touch about the cold war. Well, I think one of the advantages that ICANN has had through time is that it's not a political organization. And so far, not being a political organization has actually helped ICANN navigate the different storms that it has been through.

So I don't think it is a matter of being in touch or aware of any cold war happening. We are aware of many tensions happening in the international arena, but we need to think of ICANN as a technical organization rather than as a political organization. And this will, of course, lead into ICANN having different roles as I tried to highlight the three approaches that we take on governance issues, the ones that we think ICANN should have a leadership role, the ones that we think we should be collaborating with someone else, and those that require selective engagement.

So I beg to disagree: we are well aware of the tensions and the different political issues that are happening right now. It's just that we don't think it is the direction or the task that ICANN should be involved in. Again, ICANN is not a political organization, it's a technical body. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, León. I think this is exactly the line we're trying to discuss here. Where does the technical capacity link with all the geopolitical debates? Thank you. That is a wonderful summary.

I don't see any more questions in the chat. I don't see them in our question pod. I believe that most of the issues have already been covered?

In terms of process, my understanding is—and Claudia, do feel free to correct me—that we would like to ask our participants a few questions on their takeaways from this specific webinar. If that is the case, I would beg our panelists for a few minutes of patience and then I would move on to concluding remarks. Would this work, Claudia?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes. I will launch that survey now. One moment, please.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: You can all feel free to answer at your leisure. The first question is, how did you learn about this webinar? I believe you can all answer either on your phone or your laptop that you're using now. Second question is, what region are you living in now? Third question is, how do you feel about the timing of the webinar which is 21:00 UTC? The fourth question is, did the webinar duration allow sufficient time for questions? The fifth question is if the presentation was interesting. The

sixth question is, have you learned something from this webinar? And the final question is, would you like to participate in other At-Large webinars? We'll give you a few moments to answer, and that will conclude the survey. Thank you all.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, everyone. I'm going to give you a moment to answer the questions. I see Herb's question in the chat on how many participants. I understand that that is the question on the participants that took part, that took the time to join us during this webinar. To answer your question, Herb, we've had, you could probably see displayed, overall, 104 participants. I see some of them have already departed.

With that, I would like to take a few moments first to thank our panelists. Thank you for accepting the invitation. I know this is a challenging topic. As León rightfully emphasized, this is a fine line we're trying to walk here between politics and the technical work that's being done by the ICANN community.

But as Veni's presentation emphasized, there is a strong political tension that's building up around the discussions that we're having here. And it is wonderful that ICANN Org is supporting the community and being in all the right places where those decisions or discussions are happening.

It is wonderful that the board has a plan on how to identify them and how to take on this challenge. I specifically welcome Javier's contribution because it's not an easy task to try and identify the global

position of individual end users that we as At-Large are tasked to represent within ICANN.

With that, I do not see any more questions. I see comments in the chat. Thank you very much, everyone, for taking the time to join us. I know that this time might prove challenging for some of you, so thank you for staying up late or getting up early to join us.

I'd like to once again thank our panelists. I believe there is an ongoing discussion to be had, so we will likely reach out to you again and ask you for updates.

Thank you to our interpreters. This is me trying to speak slowly. I hope this works. Thank you very much for your patience when I'm not doing my best to speak slowly.

Thank you to our wonderful team. I know this webinar has been somewhat technically challenging. We're exploring new avenues, new paths. Thank you very much for all the technical support, IT team. And once again, thank you very much for joining us for your questions, for your curiosity to try and identify this fine line that ICANN has been walking since its conception.

With a few minutes still ahead of time, I'm going to adjourn this session to close this meeting. This has been a capacity building webinar. There's a Capacity Building Working Group. If any of you have any ideas on further webinars, if you have any ideas on how to better build the capacity within the ICANN community, especially within At-Large, do feel free to join us, do feel free to reach out to me or our staff, all of

those comments, questions, queries, hunger for knowledge will be addressed.

Thank you again. The meeting is adjourned.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Bye, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]