
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. This is the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance call on Wednesday, the 6th of December 2017 already. Today we have quite a short agenda, because first there was a bit of an update to catch up the first call after the meeting that we had over in Abu Dhabi. We are going to have a quick follow-up to ICANN60. We were supposed to speak about the cross-community working group on Internet Governance vehicle. Unfortunately, Rafik is not able to make it on this call. He just sent me a note that he is unlikely to be on the call today. If that's the case, then we might have to skip that. There is a call that will happen next week.

After that, we will be focusing on a quick update on the workshop preparation, the IGF. Finally, finishing with the latest Internet governance news from the news service that Nigel Hickson runs.

That's the agenda today. Are there any amendments or additions to the agenda? Not seeing any hands, the agenda is adopted.

Follow-up to ICANN60. I realize that there are ... What am I doing? I should be doing the roll call. Let's start the roll call, please.

DESIREE CABRERA: Okay. In the room we have Alan Greenberg, Ben Wallis, Barry Cobb, David Maher, Erich Schweighofer, [Collin Kurre], Jim Prendergast, Judith Hellerstein, Klaus Stoll, Lori Schulman, Tatiana Tropina, and Thongchai

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.

Sangsiri as well as Olivier Crepin-LeBlond for the Chair. In staff, we have Nigel Hickson; and myself, Desiree Cabrera.

We have two members. One of them is Ben Wallis. Then we have one more who hasn't identified themselves. The phone number is ending in 4849. So, if you could let us know who you are, I'll note it for the phone call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I cannot hear anyone. Number starting 131 and ending in 4849. I have a feeling this might be Lori. Anyway, let's just get going. 312 might be David Maher, his phone.

In any case, let's get to the next part of our agenda. Have we missed anyone in the roll call? Anybody on the call that we haven't called? I'm not seeing any hands up, so let's go directly to the follow-up to ICANN60.

Nigel Hickson has forwarded two different documents since ICANN60. We had two meetings, one which was a public forum and the other one which was a face-to-face meeting.

In the public forum – and you should have those two reports that Nigel has put together. In the public forum, we had just an update on the Internet governance activities, an update on the WTDC, the G7 ICT Ministerial, the ITU open consultations, the CSDBN [inaudible] cooperation working group, the ISOC global Internet report on the future of the Internet, and then we had a discussion. We had so much time on our hands. It was only a one-hour slot. Which was about why is

Internet governance important to ICANN. That went, I think, pretty well. We had a good attendance for this meeting and good audience participation. it was a pretty enjoyable activity.

Are there any comments on this public meeting that we had? I don't see anyone putting their hand up.

So, the other thing that we had was the face-to-face meeting. That also was pretty well attended. We had about 60 people physically present and about 5-10 people on the line. That's the meeting of the working group where we had to deal with our administrative matters and discussion with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. We welcomed Markus Kummer who was the then Chair of the Board Working Group on Internet governance. Effectively, we had a full report on the activities of the Board Working Group, a question and answer session. Then there was a discussion on the vehicle, which Rafik took us through, and making reference to the draft that was circulated on the cross-community working group on Internet Governance list.

The aim is to have that draft finished as soon as possible and then pass it over to the supporting organizations and advisory committees, the chartering organizations.

Again, this was just a one-hour face-to-face meeting, very short. So, time really went very fast. I just open the floor now if there are any questions or comments regarding that face-to-face meeting.

What I have realized is usually we have a page for the working group's meetings at an ICANN meeting. For some reason, I'm not sure why this wasn't created for ICANN60, so I'll ask staff to please as an action item

to create that page and put all of the relevant material in those pages, including the great summary, which Nigel Hickson has put together for each one of the face-to-face and public meeting.

I don't see any hands up. Is that noted, Desiree?

DESIREE CABRERA: Yes, I noted that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much. I see Nigel Hickson. You have the floor, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, good afternoon or good morning. Thank you, Olivier. Just to note as a follow-up to those two meetings, I've internally expressed my dissatisfaction with the current way of seeking slots, if you like, for these meeting and that it's a bit like you go into a raffle and the only raffle tickets left are the ones that are half torn up. That's probably not a very good analogy, but in other words, I was, if you like, embarrassed. The only slots that we could confirm for the CCWGIG were both lunchtime slots, which were not necessarily the best, although I think we made the best of them we could.

Hopefully, for the next ICANN meeting, which no doubt we'll discuss another time, we will at least have a better choice of when the working group might like the slots to take place. But, we'll have to see. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Nigel. Next is Jim Prendergast.

JIM PRENDERGAST:

Thanks, Olivier. With the timing, I don't have any insight into the process and I feel for you, Nigel. But, compared to 6:30 at night or 8:30 in the morning, I actually thought the lunch slot, at least for the open meeting, worked pretty well. Theoretically, people wouldn't have any other conflicts with that time. At least with the Abu Dhabi venue, it's either grab a light lunch and bring it into the room and make it into a working lunch which I think wasn't terrible. I wouldn't necessarily discount the lunch concept. If it turned into a brown bag lunch, it might actually lead to a more interactive discussion, less formal type of session where it's people just running through an agenda, as opposed to getting into a brown bag lunch discussion. I'd take lunch over 6:30 any day of the week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this, Jim. I think I can echo this. We had terrible timings late at night when few people managed to turn up because they were already busy with other things, but lunch seems to have done us quite well as far as attendance is concerned. I think more of a problem with a lunch is that it's just a one-hour slot rather than a 90-minute slot. With both sessions having taken place during lunchtime, you would've probably been a lot happier with a 90-minute session both for the face-to-face and the public session.

Nigel, your hand is up. Is that an old hand or a new hand?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Oh, sorry. It's an old hand. I'll take it down.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I was waiting for you to speak. With regards to the actual scheduling process, the way that it works is the SO, AC, SG and C Chairs and RALO Chairs as well – and I'm lucky to be one of the Chairs – do come together and have a basic schedule that gets given by ICANN meetings and then each one of the SOs and ACs and so on make their own internal schedules. So there only a couple of slots that are blanked out that nobody are able to use. For example, you'd have the public sessions, cross-community sessions, which in the past there were many of which are [inaudible]. But these are very formal sessions, and I think that we found also that some of the more terrible timings, and so on.

Just to cut a long story short, I'm still in that group this year. I know that Nigel has voiced his unhappiness and I will echo that. There is a working group meeting starting – I think the process is starting later on this week, so I shall certainly voice the concerns that we've had to try and see if we can get better slots or lunchtime slots that are 90 minutes rather than 60 minutes.

I do agree with Jim that a lunchtime slot makes it less likely for people to be conflicted with other things, apart from lunch. It really depends on how things are, but because we've got people from all across ICANN, it's sometimes pretty difficult to find suitable times for everyone and that's why we end up in the terrible slots that nobody else wants.

Are there any other comments regarding ICANN60?

So, to close off this topic I just wanted to mention that, as you heard, Markus Kummer left the Board, so he has handed the baton over for the Board Working Group on Internet Governance to Matthew Shears who was a member of this working group and is now no longer, as he now Chairs the Board Working Group on Internet Governance, but it's very likely that we'll continue the great collaboration between the Board Working Group and the group that we're all part of. That's all regarding this topic.

I don't see anybody having put their hand up, so we can move to the Internet governance vehicle, the vehicle that is there to replace the current vehicle.

Well, not very much has happened since Abu Dhabi. I know that Rafik has been working on integrating the comments that were given, that were made during both the ICANN meeting but also before that. He is aiming at actually having a first draft out before the holiday season. It's cutting it a bit short. We are the 6th of December, but next week there will be a call of the drafting team. In fact, anybody who is interested in the vehicle should be on that call.

Desiree, have you managed to send a Doodle out for next week?

DESIREE CABRERA: No. I'm actually working on it right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. So, Desiree will have to send a Doodle. We were originally hoping to be able to get both the current call and the call about the

vehicle this week. Unfortunately, you might have seen in the Doodle, it was pretty hard to get everyone on the call at the same time. Everyone is pretty busy. Hopefully we get a better slot sometime next week. This week it was just terrible. I think we just have sometimes ... The best one was about 60% of the respondents to the Doodle that could make it somewhere, which makes it pretty terrible. So, watch out for that Doodle, please, and fill it in and hopefully we can get something out before the holiday season itself.

Any comments or questions on the CCWGIG vehicle? I'm not seeing anybody put their hand up, so let's move to the next agenda item. That's number four, and that's the IGF workshop [inaudible].

Behind the scenes, there's been quite some work to follow-up with all of the different participants in the workshop itself. There is a Wiki page, which I'll put as a link in the chat, which is also now in the agenda page. That's our Wiki page to keep track of what's going on and where we are on this.

The [inaudible] speaker list. What's happened is the Chairs have contacted all of the different speakers to find their confirmation. Only one person has submitted apologies and that's Ben Butler from GoDaddy who was not able to make it and was conflicted at the time itself.

All of the other people that we had discussed face-to-face in Abu Dhabi have responded positively, apart from [inaudible] who is from Colombia and unfortunately is not coming to the IGF. She has confirmed as a remote participant. Well, [inaudible] be 3:00 in the morning for her at

the time, but she is very committed. She said she's happy with participating remotely.

Apart from that we'll have [Farsan Abadi] has confirmed she'll either be there or she will get a young generation person. I guess that's what they're called these days. [inaudible] young person.

Jordan Carter is confirmed. Mark [inaudible] has confirmed, Keith Drazek has confirmed, [inaudible] is confirmed too, Grace [inaudible], Lori Schulman, Matthew Shears, and Larry Strickling. That's our star-studded panel that we have here, number of speakers. For a star-studded panel, we've gotten the green light or the full confirmation from Markus Kummer that he will be able to chair that meeting. It looks like it's going to be really good.

I already looked at the IGF website with the number of people registering for the session and I think we had hit 43 or 47 people, which is quite rare at this early stage. People are only just now starting to be interested in the scheduling and using the online schedule to prepare their days. Some sessions have had more people. Of course the main sessions have already got more interest. But I think it will be well-attended, well-run, and with a fantastic set of speakers. I'm really looking forward to watch this.

The agenda is currently pretty brief. It will be speaking about, first, [inaudible] domain [inaudible] from the stakeholder [inaudible]. Then a perspective from the stakeholders around the table. This is supposed to be a roundtable. Then big question, could the model be used for other

Internet governance issues and topics out there? Hopefully we'll have some very punch and interesting discussions about this.

Are there any comments or questions about this? I don't see anyone putting their hand up.

Just one point on that. [inaudible] taken the baton so he is now in touch with all of the panelists. I know that he sent out a note to ask some feedback already, so if anybody has feedback and is on the call here, this is just a kind reminder that you can drop a note back to Markus.

The session will be at 9:00 AM. That's interesting. Do I have it? Yes, it's at 9:00 AM. From 9:00 to 10:30 on Tuesday, the 19th of December. Thanks for updating the page on the website, Nigel. That's really helpful. That's the IGF website I'm speaking about. I don't see anybody putting their hand up, so that's the workshop preparation.

Now we can go to our news part. Oh, I see Judith has put her hand up. Perhaps we could turn it over to Judith. Judith Hellerstein?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Tuesday, 9:00 AM Geneva time?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, yes.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alright, thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 9:00 AM to 10:30 Geneva time, which is UTC plus one for those people who will follow remotely. In other words, 8:00 UTC.

Latest Internet governance news. For this I will turn the floor over to Nigel Hickson, and indeed anyone else who is interested in letting us know or able to let us know what's been happening in the Internet governance space. I am aware that quite a few things have taken place.

Nigel, you have the floor.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Oliver, thank you very much. Just to comment on the IGF as well, in general terms. It does seem to be generating quite a bit of interest here in Geneva. That's only right and proper. It's been a bit of a slow burner I suppose because there's always such a lot going on in Geneva, preparing for all sorts of different conferences, but there does seem to be a lot of interest and the secretariat are being – I can't even say the English word. They're being inundated I think is a good expression with lots of inquiries about the IGF from lots of people that don't know what an IGF is. That's good news in that we're going to get a lot of fresh faces I think in Geneva for that week. It's going to be nice weather, I'm sure, so that should be good.

ICANN is doing a reception on the Tuesday night. I'm only just saying that because we all have a lot of beer and wine and sausages on sticks and things like that, so we don't want them to go to waste. So we'll be sending out invitations for all the community people that are going to be here. If you don't get one, then just ask me.

On Internet governance news, and as Olivier says, I'm sure other people have got news as well. Just a couple of things to report on since the ICANN60 meeting. We had the Global Cyberspace Conference in New Delhi the week before last on I think the 23rd and 24th of November. This attracted a lot of people. There were over 3,000 registered participants. I think around 100 countries were represented. It was a good conference. It's part of the so-called London process, this idea that by bringing governments together along with business and civil society, although perhaps there wasn't so many civil society as there might have been, but you couldn't work out agreements on responsibilities for cyberspace.

In effect, I'm not sure it did that, but it did allow a platform for India put on a fairly impressive show on what they're doing in the ICT area and the progress that they've made. Their Prime Minister spoke and different ministers. And they committed themselves to the multi-stakeholder process in terms of the governance of the Internet.

I think I've said lately a couple of bits from that conference and there will be a full report that I can copy at some point. The ICANN organization was represented by Tarek Kamel and myself, and Veni and Matthew Shears, [inaudible] and Martin Butterman from the Board.

Another conference has just finished actually, the Global Internet Conference I think it's called in Wuzhen, in China. This is the fourth iteration of this. This is what the Chinese call their global Internet governance conference. I haven't seen any report back from it. We saw a copy of the Chinese Premier's speech to the conference, which talked about championing sovereign Internet and being able to control one's

own Internet. Said a lot about that. Hopefully we'll have a report, which I can circulate. I must do a note to myself about that to circulate a report in due course on that.

I'm sure other people will have come across this. There's been a couple of statements in Russia in the last couple of weeks. Various Russian ministers have been talking about the Internet and how they're going to propose the UN that the governance of the Internet should come under the UN, including the activities of ICANN, etc. Nothing new in that, but interestingly Russia is I wouldn't say quoted, but inferred, that this is a BRICS position, i.e. it's a position of Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa, which seems slightly at odds with the statements that those other countries have made from time to time. Anyway, I'm sure others have come across these things. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. I now open the floor for any comments or questions. Whilst people think about their questions, I have a couple. The first one with regards to the Indian conference, the GCCS – Global Conference on Cyberspace.

I've heard some feedback from it with, on the one hand, some congratulations or head's up or thumb's up to the fact that India had this conference and it went quite well. Good attendance, etc. And it promoted the multi-stakeholder model. But, on the other side, I heard some critiques about it not really being multi-stakeholder itself and being very heavily influenced by Indian government. Is that a fair critique?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Others on the call might have taken part remotely or whatever. [inaudible] says desperately trying to find ... That's a very fair critique. The panels were dominated by India to an extent which one felt surprising. I recall having been the co-organizer of the London conference that we were very careful not to include too many Brits, although perhaps we didn't include quite a few. But, yes, it was somewhat dominated by Indians and it wasn't particularly diverse. Some of the panels were not particularly diverse in terms of gender or anything else.

Tatiana will no doubt know more than I. I think there were some problems in some civil society groups getting recognition in attending. There were some civil society there, but perhaps not as many as there could have been. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Nigel. We have a queue with first Jim Prendergast. You have the floor, Jim.

JIM PRENDERGAST:

Nigel, I know you weren't in Wuzhen for the World Internet Conference, but as you ask around for reports from those who were, I'd be curious to know ICANN Board member Akinori Maemura, according to the blog post from Sally Costerton said that he participated in a closed door session specifically on international rules and cyberspace consensus and outlook. Any insight as to why – not that anybody could do it remotely –

but why particularly at a conference that was a closed door session and what was discussed in that closed door session? It's typically not a venue that ICANN participates in or willingly participates in. I'm just concerned about the nature in which that particular session was held. Thanks.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes. Thank you. I wasn't aware, Jim, that it was a closed session. I was aware that he had gone and spoken. As I say, we'll get some sort of report back and I can share it or part of it or whatever. That does sound a bit odd. I don't understand why some sessions were closed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Jim for pointing this out. And thanks, Nigel, for the response. Was Maemura Akinori the only Board member at ICANN staff who attended the Wuzhen conference?

NIGEL HICKSON:

It was Akinori from the ICANN Board, it was Sally Costerton at global head of Global Stakeholder Engagement, and our man in Beijing [inaudible] who attended. I think it was just the three of them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks, Nigel. On this, there's nothing really to report. No show-stopping news about the declaration, etc. I'm just looking at it and I do realize it was very recent, since it was taking place on the third of November – third, fourth, etc.

NIGEL HICKSON:

As I understand it, there was no declaration as such. Well, there was no declaration. I mean, there was no conference declaration. I should have referenced that in relation to GCCS in India as well because up until a few days before the GCCS India were pressing for a conference declaration, which they had circulated to different governments and we had seen. It wasn't particularly brilliant in terms of a balanced approach. In the end, what they produced was a Chairman's statement which I circulated to the list.

In Wuzen, as far as I understand, there was no intent to have a conference declaration. You recall that they had problems in previous years in having conference declarations. So there wasn't a conference declaration. Perhaps the Chair summed up by saying something. I don't know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Nigel. On the website there is actually – it's not a declaration at all. It's just a press release from Xinhua, the Chinese news agency that just gave a few paragraphs saying that it took place and speaking about a few of the topics that were discussed and the Chinese companies that took part, actually. Not only Chinese. Apple is also included in there. Is Apple a Chinese company? It could be. Sorry, just a side note.

Tatiana Tropina, you have the floor.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much, Olivier. I would like to comment beyond what Nigel said about the London [inaudible] and the conference in New Delhi. If we look back, this comment about it not being multi-stakeholder, [inaudible] any expectations. I don't think that they should exist here because if we look back from the London process, it wasn't meant to be multi-stakeholder. And even if Nigel said that they were trying not to make [inaudible], yeah but it would just [inaudible] balance of power, so [inaudible] participants you have.

In the Hague two years ago, they actually tried to open up and [inaudible] government wrote a [inaudible] to attract civil society, but still it is invite only, and who decides who is going to join? So it's not an open venue.

Then, as far as I'm aware – maybe I'm wrong here – there was a problem of who is going to host the next conference because I know that the next place after the Hague was Mexico. It never happened. I believe that in this sense India was kind enough to take this burden because its cost, its organization and so on. It's like with IGF now. They search for hosts for the next year. I believe from this perspective, probably the position of Indian government was that they're doing something nice for this community and whatever. Maybe this is why it was so [inaudible] from their perspective because they were kind enough to host it even. Maybe I'm wrong here, but that's how I perceive the situation.

And the last comment. I think that we should give it time. When something was not meant to be multi-stakeholder, it will take time for it to even open, let alone to really be multi-stakeholder because even in

the Hague where the government is everything, it was still very much and government and industry dominated. It's very closed, very much separation. From civil society, only some folks were actually accepted fully and all others felt, even though they [inaudible] a part of this [inaudible] being still left behind the closed doors in terms of discussions, negotiations and so on. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tatiana. Helpful comments on these conferences. Any other comments or questions? I have another question with regards to the – well, both of these conferences. Are they likely to yield some actual results that might affect ICANN at the end of the line? A bit like the ITU processes, for example, or the Unesco processes or G7 processes. Are these really to be as a sort of [inaudible], more of a discussion rather than fora where decisions get taken? It's an open question. Nigel, maybe? The respondent of last resort.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you. Yes. We attend ... The London process I think has a particular focus. I think in general ... Tatiana is obviously absolutely right, of course. It hasn't developed perhaps in the way that we hoped it might. She's right, the original London meeting wasn't multi-stakeholder. It was organized in a real rush and it certainly wasn't multi-stakeholder.

In terms of the general discussions on roles and responsibilities of cyberspace and the governments of cyberspace, we feel in ICANN that we have a role to contribute. I don't think it's going to produce ... It hasn't got any mandate from the UN. It's clearly a process of just a

number of countries getting together. It doesn't, if you like, produce concrete results like the ITU or the UN. But I think it's a useful vehicle for continuing the dialogue.

Wuzen, I'm not an expert, but it's very much a vehicle for China to demonstrate what they're doing on the Internet and their particular views on how it should be governed. We certainly don't think anything concrete is going to come out of it, but we think we should at least be there to listen and to understand the views of a group of stakeholders. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Nigel. I don't see any other hands on these two conferences. Now, with regards to the other Internet governance activities, I wonder whether there has been any – I mean, we've touched on the Internet Governance Forum. Has there been any follow-up on the WTSA or the WTDC? As you know, the WTDC took place in Argentina in October. Is there any follow-up now to this?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. I think actually I saw another document – I'll have to write another note to myself – yesterday or the day before. I circulated the final conclusions I think from the WTDC but there's another document that's come out. No, there's no follow-up. These conferences either come to an agreement or not on the work program, the ITUD which is the development sector, a new resolutions. And then things take place within the committees and within the structures of the

ITU. There's no absolute follow-up. Well, they're all follow-ups, but not at the high level.

So, really, the focus now – in fact, I should've mentioned. The focus, well I think our focus and the focus of many people in relation to the ITU, is in relation to the plenipotentiary which happens in end of October 2018 – next year. And what might emerge from the different regions in relation to that conference. It's something we're following very carefully, and perhaps in due course we would want on this group to dedicate a further discussion to it once we know perhaps a bit better the sort of proposals that might be coming forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Nigel. Whilst you were speaking, I've put in the chat the website for the ITU Plenipot 18. I will take this in Dubai indeed at the end of October. But there's an interesting set of key deadlines that have already started so far that might be able to help us with planning our work around preparation for Plenipot 18. The next deadline is the 31st of December for the member states to announce their provisional type of contribution and so on that they want to put through. That's the next thing, and then afterwards there's one deadline at the 28th of February with the submission of proposals. Deadline from submission of proposals. Then there's an opening of online registration on the 20th of May, etc. There's a whole timeline leading to the 29th of October. I think we might need to make a note of this and perhaps add this to our own schedules so as to be able to plan correctly and on time for these knowing what's coming up.

Are there now any other processes such as, for example, the CSTD? Is there any movement in this?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes. Thank you, Olivier. That really isn't ... I should've mentioned it, although nothing has happened since ICANN60. The next step in that – and I circulated the Chairman's report, so this is the Chairman [inaudible] who is the Chairman of the working group on enhanced coordination under the CSTD. His draft report, which will be discussed at the next meeting in January is open for comment. I've had one or two comments on this and will be providing an input to that in the next ten days or so. Then the inputs to his report and his report we discussed in that working group, and then any agreement on the report will go forward to the CSTD plenary in May.

So, yes, there is a process for that. It's unlikely from a reasonable report – anyone who's followed this will see that the report notes, if you like, the various proposals that were put forward for new UN mechanisms, etc. But also notes that these proposals for new UN mechanisms or other proposals did not find sufficient traction to go forward.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Nigel. I've looked at our own Wiki pages on the UN CSTD that's a commission on science and technology for development and these are a bit out of date, so I think we'll have to have an action item here to update those pages with the actual report from [Amancada Franceca] and everything that's been going on recently. Even though there's not been very much, it's good to keep track of this. Any

questions or comments? I'm not seeing anyone putting their hands up. Now, the other track was the G7 and G20. Have you been monitoring this closely, Nigel, or indeed anyone else? Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Sorry, Olivier. I was [inaudible] a bit. Again, there was the G7 process and there was the G20 process earlier in the year, both which produced – had meetings, multi-stakeholder meetings which I think we discussed at ICANN60. The meetings were multi-stakeholder, but how those meetings affected the declaration from the G7 and the G20 was less clear.

The real focus now is, from I understand it, from the UK government is on what sort of focus they'll be in the next round. Let's get this right. So, G7 is being – the chairmanship of G7 has been taken over by Canada, and so discussions are taking place whether Canada will have some sort of ICT ministerial, and if they do, what it will focus on, whether it will focus on just innovation issues or whether it will focus on Internet issues as well.

For the G20 Argentina have taken on the mantle on that and discussions are fairly evolved from having some sort of ICT Internet ministerial type meeting in Buenos Aires in 2018. Time unknown I'm afraid.

What happens for these sort of ministerial ICT sessions is that [inaudible] are selected from each country – in other words, civil servants – and we all get together, or they do, and discuss what the declaration should be, what the program should be, for the various sessions, etc. We'll learn more about it in due course, hopefully.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. Tatiana writes in the chat that she was at the G20 in April. Mentions a comment about their understanding of multi-stakeholder. Would you care to elaborate please, Tatiana Tropina?

TATIANA TROPINA: I'm sorry. There was just a short comment. I just wanted to echo what Nigel said. We were invited indeed, different stakeholders including civil society. But, for example, the composition of the panels, the way they negotiate and so on, it finally shows [inaudible] some stakeholders are more equal than others, and apparently it is again back to my previous comment. You have to give it some time. You have to give it some time. You have to let them learn because apparently business is perceived as much more powerful [inaudible] stakeholder, for example, than civil society and so on.

It is [logistical based premises], these meetings, they're very much institutionalized and it is hard to [inaudible] them up. Even from the way the panels, for example, were composed. Even from the way the discussions were carried out. They invited to give a contribution, but at the end, you're standing there or sitting there with one question in your head. What for? Because most of the time it's about people having their opinions and panels [inaudible] moderator just regulating the change between them and not that much of an input. Apparently once it goes to any decision-making process, it will go behind the closed doors without involvement of the main stakeholders.

I know, maybe Nigel can correct me, but that was my impression. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Tatiana. Are there any other thoughts on this? I wonder whether this is not a pattern that we are seeing across many different institutions. For the multi-stakeholder goes out there is a case of, yes, we are a multi-stakeholder but it's actually a completely different definition than what it actually is. Tatiana?

TATIANA TOPICANA: Yes, Olivier. I totally agree with you. I think this perception of multi-stakeholder sometimes goes just as far as just [inaudible] some [inaudible] like civil society or whoever just to enter the premises and that's not for them to call themselves multi-stakeholder.

I think that there are also different definitions of multi-stakeholder in terms of policy making, decision making, decision execution and enforcement. There are different layers of this. I think sometimes that we should just have to admit that some of the premises, some of the fora, will just never be multi-stakeholder. We just have to live with this. [inaudible] them up doesn't make sense because it will just not provide any valuable input and will just increase tensions or expecting them to be multi-stakeholder from day zero when they open also doesn't make sense. It takes time to learn after all. So, yeah, you are totally right. There is different understanding of this and different [declaration] of being multi-stakeholder. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tatiana. Any other comments or questions on these topics? Sorry, Nigel, have we gone through the whole roundup? Back to you, Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Not trying to stretch it out until the end of the session, but I'll [inaudible] like it to go to the full time. Just one thing that has been quite high on the agenda, and it really linked to something Tatiana said and this is, if you recall, back in the summer the government group of experts on cybersecurity and something else failed to reach an agreement in June. I think we touched on this in Abu Dhabi. In parallel with that or around the same time Microsoft proposed something called the Geneva Convention or the Geneva Digital Convention which would have various parts to it including some sort of agreement between governments and between business on cyber space and on ways in which [inaudible] were protected, etc. And also this idea of attribution in that you would have some sort of [inaudible] to set up that would adjudicate where a cyber attacker come from.

There were a number of ideas. A few weeks ago in Geneva Brad Smith from Microsoft gave a presentation on this – I think I put a report around the group – which was very interesting indeed. And said in Microsoft are keen to pursue this. There's obviously been concerns raised by a whole host of different people on this.

But, just the reason I mention it, and the [WEF] also have announced that they're creating a Cyberspace Center of Excellence and I don't think

it's called that, but it's something like that. Just too many acronyms. Basically, they're creating a resource here in Geneva whereby there will be expertise on cyber issues and people can go and talk about cyber threats and cyber incidents and things like that.

There's a lot of work going on in this area. The interesting thing is that a lot of this work is being initiated not by governments, but by business, by other groups. Whether that's preferable to governments doing it I suppose down to individual views, but it's certainly something which I think is worth following. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Nigel. Any other comments or questions? I think one final thing is the news that I read earlier this week of a company called Blockstack having raised \$52 million to build a parallel Internet where you own all your data. I'm not sure whether any of you have seen this. I'm putting the link over in the chat at the moment. It's an interesting article. How would it affect ICANN? Obviously if one builds a parallel Internet, one builds a parallel addressing system. It's interesting how it's some kind of a block chain system to link apps together through the system. It doesn't go into depth into how it all works out.

It's something we should be also monitoring to not only just the Internet governance – this obviously has big implications on the Internet governance and the whole idea of build a parallel Internet where you own on your data, I gather they meant where you own all your personal data. That somehow then alludes to I gather the data that one has under the WHOIS records, etc. I'm not quite sure what it points to, but

would it be interesting to pursue and continue monitoring? Just an open question here. I see a green tick from Israel Rosas. We'll just follow through on this. "If someone has capacity" says Tatiana. Yeah. So just in case. I keep on reading these things, so if there's anything that comes up, I'll forward it to the mailing list.

Are there any other updates? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. It looks as though we are reaching AOB, any other business.

Just to remind you, then, in AOB we will have a Doodle poll coming out to everyone shortly. That will be for the drafting of the vehicle. It's not a case that everyone needs to be on that call, but we thought we'd keep it an open process, so the core team that has been in both so far with working on the vehicle will be convened and will be very much encouraged to take part. But, anyone else who wishes to take part at this stage of the discussion is very welcome to be on that call. That's a call likely to take place next week depending on the results of the Doodle.

With this, I'm not seeing any other hands up, so I'd like to thank you all for being on the call. We've managed to fill a full hour. It's been very helpful and very interesting with all these updates. So, thanks everyone. And to those people who will be there next week, see you next week. If not, we're likely to have another cross-community working group call in January after the holiday period. Have a happy holidays, everyone. I'm sure many of us will be able to meet face-to-face at the IGF in Geneva in just over a week's time.

Thanks, everybody. Thank you, Nigel. This call is now adjourned. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]