

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. So, you have participating today yourself, Adam Peake, [inaudible], Wale Barake, Erich Schweighofer, Yesim, Badu. I can't pronounce the last name. Sorry about that. Judith Hellerstein, Leon Sanchez, Mandy Carver, [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, [inaudible]. Welcome everyone to this cross-community working group on Internet governance call on Thursday, the 19<sup>th</sup> of November 2018.

Today we have an agenda that will consist of taking stock of ICANN 63, reviewing the main outcomes from the ITU Plenipotentiary conference which took place a couple of weeks ago and also the IGF of this year. Then we'll be looking ahead to main developments that are currently coming on the horizon.

You've got an abridged agenda on your screen. On the lower left-hand side of your screen, there is a link to today's agenda which does include in there an additional number of [sub-links] for each one of the agenda items.

I was going to ask also did we miss anybody in the roll call so far?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I don't see any new participants here, [Lohan Feralli].

---

*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.*

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, [Dierdre]. Let's look into the public forum and the face-to-face meeting that we had in Barcelona as the first thing. I was just going to ask if anybody has to ... Before we start into this, does anybody have any other business to add or any amendments to make to the agenda? Seeing no hands up, I think that Veni Markovski was going to speak to us about developments at the UN General Assembly. We'll have that in the any other business part of this call. Let's get moving.

First, the two meetings that we had in Barcelona. The one which was a public forum that we did and then immediately after the public forum, on that same day, we then went on to have a face-to-face meeting to discuss more all of the inside work and to discuss things with the ICANN Board Working Group on Internet Governance.

The public forum in itself started with several topics, each one being allocated between 20 to 15 minutes. The first one was about the IGF Paris 2018 in Paris Peace Forum. The one after that was a discussion about the proposals from member states that affect ICANN directly in the ITU Plenipotentiary team.

After this, we had 15 minutes on the UN Panel on Digital Cooperation. Then, a quick – and I think by that time, we nearly ran out of time. A quick run down on the World Trade Organization Trade Agreement and how that affects the DNS. At the end, we had little time to do the any other business and closing remarks.

The meeting itself was rather well-attended. It was a large room, thankfully, that we had and it was at a time where we managed to get some following. So, all together I was just going to ask if there's

anybody who has any questions or comments on this. The streamed audio recording is online. We haven't got the action items yet listed, but I'm going to turn to Nigel who did take notes, whether we did have action items specifically to this call, to this face-to-face meeting. I believe that the action items were probably in the second meeting rather than in this one since this one was more of a discussion and a forum to inform participants who have an interest in Internet governance ICANN-wide rather than [taking these] issues.

Shall I ask Nigel Hickson do you have anything else to add?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier. Good morning and good afternoon to everyone. So, yes, there is a note and I apologize that we haven't sent it around yet. I will do that in the next day or so.

In terms of action items, we didn't record any specific actions. There were some observations concerning the ITU Plenipotentiary and other issues, but no specific action items, but to keep the working group updated on the deliberations of the IGF, the Plenipotentiary, and also on the UN high-level panel. And perhaps, as if you like, a point on the agenda so to speak or on the minutes of the last meeting, the high-level panel has put out a call for input as I think many of you will see. There's [inaudible] contributions and it's something that we are looking at at the moment whether ICANN should make a contribution or not. Thank you very much.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Nigel. I think I've listed that in the agenda under item four, so you'll be able to expand a little bit more on this UN high-level panel on digital cooperation on this consultation.

Are there any comments or questions with regards to the topics that were treated at the time of this face-to-face public session? I'm not seeing anybody put their hand up.

Whilst we are on this topic, I would ask staff to please check now if the transcript of the session is now ready on the ICANN website. At the time that we last updated the page, the transcripts weren't ready yet. Then maybe we should also put the link to the transcript. That would help people in being able to navigate this. There is a link to the session details and I think that this actually contains links over to the transcript. So, as far as I can see at the moment, transcript CCWG IG Public Forum is ready.

Not seeing any hands, then we can move to the second part which was the face-to-face meeting. We had an update on the introduction of the charter of the cross-community engagement group, the CCEG. During that introduction, Young Em Lee, the co-chair from the ccNSO informed us that the ccNSO was going to withdraw from the CCWG and had decided not to take part in the cross-community engagement group, the CCEG, as such.

So, we're in a position right now where we have to find out what happens next with regards to the vehicle itself. I forwarded the response from the ccNSO to the ALAC since that's the last remaining chartering organization for the CCWG and I'm awaiting their response

---

on this on whether the CCWG would continue existing or whether that would transform into something else. That something else, of course, being as open as the current group so as to be able to accept people from across ICANN.

The presentation of the CCEG so far hasn't yielded a formal response from the GNSO Council. Whilst in Barcelona, I did answer some questions and presented in front of the GNSO and the response was that they would be deliberating it within the council and also checking with other chartering organizations. So, at present, we are I guess ending the CCWG but have [inaudible] CCEG which puts us a little bit between two vehicles.

That being said, the resources being used by this process are so small that we probably can bridge those in between. As I said, I've asked the ALAC chair to follow-up with other chairs of SOs and ACs and discuss what happens next. Any comments or questions? Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'm clearly not in a position to commit on behalf of the ALAC or event predict but I will note that when we approved the last change to the CCWG charter, the wording of the resolution at that point was that we support the organization as we were approving then or whatever it evolves into. So, there was certainly an intent at that point to support the new organization when and if it was created. Now, whether the current ALAC will do that or not, I suspect they will, but

---

you'll have to work with the current ALAC chair to get that to come to be. But my prediction is we will be willing to support it.

Now, what happens if we are the only AC/SO that supports it, we're in an interesting position.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alan. Indeed, as the representative or the chair as appointed by the ALAC for this working group, you do need more than one SO or AC to make a cross-community.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I will note there is something called a Cross Community Working Group on Human Rights which only has people from one group in it, as far as I understand anyway.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. What I suggest is that we leave this to the side until I receive a response or we receive a response from the ALAC chair and let the chartering organizations or potential chartering organizations work on it. But it's clearly not something that we can action at this very moment.

The other thing in that face-to-face meeting was the discussion that took place with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. On this we had a very good interaction. What we were told was that the chair of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance is changing. Matthew Shears is moving on to other board working groups and Leon

---

Sanchez is taking over from Matthew as the new chair of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. So, that's the current status.

I actually see Leon on the call. So, welcome Leon for this. I understand that staff have also changed the subscriptions. Matthew used to be subscribed to our mailing list and now Leon is being subscribed instead. I also understand that – and I should say that of course everyone is invited to speak on this call. So, Leon, if you wish to say a few words later on in any of the points regarding outlook, outcomes of Plenipot 18 or the IGF, as I know that you have attended the IGF including a number of other board members, then please do not hesitate to take the floor.

That's pretty much all I can report on the face-to-face meeting. The discussion on the Internet governance priorities for ICANN also took place. Again, I think I should just turn over to Nigel Hickson for those people that weren't in the room at the time. I believe that, Nigel, you've also taken notes on this meeting. Perhaps, could you share with us the IG priorities that were supposed to be the bulk of the discussions in the face-to-face meeting? Have we lost Nigel Hickson? Have I been dropped?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No. Olivier, you're still there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm still here. It looks as though we might have lost Nigel. Okay, that doesn't help very much. But if we have then ... I guess we can just move on rather than waiting for him. We can always come back to this.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I will call him back in the call. Sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Have we lost Nigel? Is he not on the call anymore?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I don't see him listed, so I'll pull him on.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: He has dropped off. Okay. No worries. Let's then move on. Let's make some progress in our agenda. The next thing in our agenda is the other thing that took place and that's the GAC high-level meeting. That, of course, was particularly important. There are not high-level meetings all the time. That took, if I remember correctly, a day or two days. There's a whole section in the GAC Communique about the GAC high-level meeting.

I understand that it was attended by [inaudible] delegations and it addressed a range of issues such as ICANN post-IANA transition, cybercrime, data protection, privacy, the roles and impact of Internet technological evolution of ICANN and the global digital agenda and Internet policies. So, a number of things. And the communique includes some text regarding WHOIS and data protection legislation, new gTLD subsequent procedures, geographic names, dot-amazon, auction proceeds, two-character country codes at the second level, and ICANN accountability. I gather that all of these were addressed during the



---

ICANN meeting. But I do not know whether all of these were addressed at the GAC high-level meeting because I didn't attend that. If anybody was on that and could tell us a little bit about the discussions on the GAC HLM, that would be very helpful. Oh, that sounds like Nigel Hickson is back.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, I do apologize. I'm not having a good day at all. Yes. Dropped off. Sorry. The question was about high-level government meeting. Sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: Well, we did circulate something about the high-level government meeting. There were four agenda issues discussed on the high-level government meeting. Was there a specific area that you wanted to touch on?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: None in particular. I understand the four issues were ICANN post-IANA transition, cybercrime, data protection and privacy and the role and impact of Internet technological evolution and ICANN and the global digital agenda in Internet policies. Are there any that ... Because obviously some of them are internal, ICANN post-IANA transition, but cybercrime, for example, is something that is very Internet governance-like and many would say that is outside the ICANN mandate as such.

---

So, what was the angle that was taken in this respect?

NIGEL HICKSON:

It's a good point. Of the four sessions, the post-IANA transition was really looking at ICANN over the last couple of years. I don't think there was anything particularly surprising there in terms of how it is developed with the new accountability mechanisms, etc.

Data protection and cybersecurity, again, no surprises there. I don't think we touched on the GDPR. We touched on the various discussions going on globally on cyber governance and cybersecurity, what's taking place in the commission for global stability, what's taking place in the potential new government group of experts, etc.

The area which I think is of most [inaudible], of course, we did touch on this when we had the public forum, the CCWG IG public forum at ICANN 63 which of course was on the Thursday [inaudible]. We touched on this issue of ICANN and its place in the wider world. There was quite a discussion on what role ICANN should playing in Internet governance in general and the role that ICANN should have. This is something which of course we've discussed again before. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks very much for this, Nigel. Any comments or questions? Not seeing anyone put their hand up. Let's then move on and we can go to—

---

VENI MARKOVSKI:                   Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:       Oh, Veni. Veni Markovski, go ahead.

VENI MARKOVSKI:                   I'm not in the room, so I can't raise my hand. You mentioned that people are asking the relation between cybercrime and stuff like that and ICANN. I'll talk a little bit later with more detail, but just to mention often in inter-governmental organizations, the discussion starts around cybercrime but it's being discussed in a broader sense.

So, sooner or later – and I have witnessed that through the year – sooner or later, somebody [inaudible] mention more specific terms [inaudible] they have come down to making a connection between fighting cybercrime which is [inaudible] websites which are domain names which are [inaudible] ICANN.

So, in a couple of cases, I have said I have the same [inaudible] ICANN [inaudible] deal with that issue. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:       Thanks very much for this. Thank you, Veni. I'm not seeing any other hands up, so lets move on in our agenda. The next now is the review of the main outcomes of ITU Plenipot 18 and the IGF 2018.

Plenipot 18, you would have seen in the e-mail. You might have received a couple of updates from Nigel Hickson on a day-to-day update

during the early parts of the meeting. It was a three-week conference. So, very long. My understanding is that the last week was particularly tough with early morning starts and very late closing time and I guess the high-level summary of it is that many or most of the proposals which were made – the more controversial proposals that were made – actually didn't go through at the end and were either withdrawn or somehow taken out of the overall declaration.

There are two links in your agenda. One is the RIPE NCC high-level view that they have published recently and the second one, they've also published a blog post, details from [Mark Hoconik] who looked at specifically the technical issues. But I guess we are waiting. I'm turning to Nigel, I guess. We are probably likely to get an ICANN report as well on these, a final report on what happened there. Let's have Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes. Thanks very much, Oliver. Of course other people will be able to comment in a less noisy atmosphere. Essentially, the Plenipotentiary, as you say, [inaudible]. It's worth reporting that Goran Marby spoke on the opening day on the 29<sup>th</sup> of October in the afternoon. He was the guest of the ITU Secretary General and made an effective speech. We had a positive presence in Dubai. Four or five members of staff on a rotation basis.

The outcomes. We will, as you say, be circulating a report which will detail the final ten days. I think my initial report detailed it day one to day nine or day ten. We'll circulate a report detailing the activities of the

---

---

remaining days and then give an overview of what happened on the main resolutions.

The Internet resolutions, the batch of the Internet resolutions, essentially were unchanged. They were marginally updated in terms of references and that. But there was no substantive change. So, the proposals for the ITU to take on work on gTLDs and ccTLDs and indeed involve themselves in the GAC in some decision-making process didn't come to any fruition, nor did the proposals on IDNs, etc.

Conversely, the proposals that Europe and other regions put forward to open up the ITU processes to become more multi-stakeholder, they didn't bear fruit either. So, as I say, essentially unchanged on the Internet resolutions.

On the cybersecurity, there were marginal changes but nothing substantial. There was a new resolution on OTT. This was something in the early briefing that we put around. There was a new resolution adopted there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: What is OTT?

NIGEL HICKSON: Sorry, over-the-top services or over the top, as it was called. Essentially, the ITU involvement in looking at studies and policies concerning such issues of social media and DNS players and other players, non-telecom players, Internet players.

---

Artificial intelligence was a new resolution which was not adopted. There were other changes here and there but that's the substance.

It was a difficult plenipotentiary. I think that we were right in predicting that the discussions will be long and difficult. However, it did conclude not in an adverse way. I mean, there are some lessons to be discussed further and perhaps we ought to have a more in-depth discussion after people have read the report. Clearly, the geo-politics of the ITU are something that we might want to discuss further. But in terms of the effects on the ICANN mission, they were minimal so to speak.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Nigel. Next in the queue is Judith Hellerstein who was also at the ITU Plenipot. Judith, you have the floor.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi. So, as Nigel explained, luckily we did not get many changes to the Internet resolutions, nor to the extent new artificial intelligence proposal. But one of the things that we do need to be working on is better explanation to the [inaudible] about the problems of the digital object architecture and also about what ... There was a very confusing talk on people thinking about the transition to IPv6 and a lack of understanding that [inaudible] are going to be operating but there still are transitions. I think capacity building needs to be done on that because people think that [inaudible] drop one and go to the other and that's the only way of doing it, when that was never an intention. So, I think we need to do more work on getting people knowing that it won't

be ... IPv4 will probably not be dropped ever, but we'll have two, but the importance of moving to the IPv6 area.

The digital [inaudible] that came out expressed more frustration on this because it's being lumped into something that – you need this to have the Internet working. And there's a lot of [inaudible] misunderstandings around there, especially in the African regions who are the main components. I think we need to do a lot more work on explaining the problems of this and the pitfalls.

I will say that was one of the large discussions in the Internet ones. It's in every single ... They're trying to put it into every single resolution, even ones where it doesn't belong, even in places where the chair says, "I have no idea why this is here because it has no relation." But then countries were insisting it be there. So, that's one thing, one takeaway that we need to focus on.

OTTs were passed when I thought it wouldn't be, but we got together and made compromises. But artificial intelligence wasn't. I also give kudos to the chair of the working party because without her, we would never have gotten any of these resolutions passed. She went in and got people talking, used her power of chair to say, "Well, you've got to review this. You can't bring anything to me that's not completed." I think, without that, we would have been in much worse shape and things would not have come. Everything would have come to the plenary without questions or square brackets, as they say. Instead, we only got two of those and only a few points [inaudible], mostly the artificial intelligence and other areas.

---

---

But I think that's [inaudible] some of the ones that are very particular to ICANN. Cybersecurity is also one, too. Yes, they had [inaudible] as well in there, too. So, we've got to look out to saying how can we educate better the community that digital architecture is something that they need to better understand and it doesn't pertain to many issues that are in the resolution. So, that's [inaudible] from there. Happy to answer any questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Judith. I do have a quick question for you. You mentioned DOA, Digital Object Architecture. You also mentioned IPv6. In what sense would those be affecting ICANN or be in ICANN's realm in some ways?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Well, I think DOA would be in ICANN's realm because it's trying to put another layer of [surveillance] [inaudible] which is relating to domains. So, I would say that is something that would be in ours because, as Veni explained and other explained, they all relate to domains, whether security or other [surveillance], making the Internet not work well I think is also a problem.

The IPv6 also has an issue with I think IDNs and upgrades. So, I think that's also ... The [IANA] resolution has a lot of ICANN in there as opposed to not.

I think this one also we managed to get ICANN from underneath the footnote, to in the main document. The last thing is there was a lot of



---

pressure on ICANN [inaudible] claiming that ICANN is not a multi-stakeholder community, that it's [inaudible] by one country, US, and that it doesn't – and that it will always remain in the background.

No matter how many times we say about that the GAC is an advisory committee that everyone can join, it just doesn't get into their ... Maybe it's political calls or something else like that. We keep having the same arguments over and over again. [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. Yes, please? Veni Markovski, please follow-up.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Yeah. There are some people on that and I just want to add to what Judith said. [inaudible] in public speeches, their ministers of communications have explained the digital architecture, and I quote, that it's [inaudible] the DNS. So, there is a [inaudible] in certain countries that it is indeed the case [when] we know it's not [inaudible] cannot function without it. There are certain countries [inaudible].

And on the IPv4 to IPv6 transition [inaudible] should be. Again, [inaudible] certain countries believe that the ITU should become a regional Internet registry and [inaudible]. So, there are certain ... I mean, these are directly related to what we do at ICANN.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Veni. I recognize also Jim Prendergast having arrived in the room. I would ask Dierdre to please keep track of the

---

additional people that are coming in, so that we've got a full list of participants afterwards.

I am not seeing other hands up at the moment. The feedback that I have received from a couple of meetings that I have attended, debriefing meetings that I have attended regarding ITU [inaudible] 18 was there a concern that the main drivers, I guess the main blocks. So, there was a western European and US block on one side and the African block led by Saudi Arabia coming up with a number of recommendations on the other side. Then there were recommendations from Russia and from China and a concern that many of the African countries, specifically or more so the Anglo African countries actually repeated some of the ... Well, were supporting some of the Chinese proposals and I think some of the [Fadi] proposals as well, as a block with just [inaudible] effectively. There was a real concern about this, as it looked as though this was more political or maybe some kind of a play of numbers, playing of numbers, if it ever came down to a vote at some point.

Now, Plenipot doesn't come down to a vote, but some of the future work might come down to votes. Are we seeing now a capitalization of votes around?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Olivier, if I may. Obviously, we can perhaps reflect on this another time, but there are geo-political issues here at work. As our report will make clear and as you probably read in the UK report that they submitted to their multi-stakeholder group, we did see this polarization between on the one hand western or Europe, [inaudible] and North America and

---

South America, and on the other hand, the Arab group countries and Africa. Russia and China played somewhat of a different role. China, as in previous Plenipotentiaries, is not particularly aggressive. They do have points to make and they make those points, often quite intelligently, but they're not particularly aggressive.

What was disappointing, and this will be reflected in the report, is the linkage between some of the African countries and Saudi Arabia. To the point that when the Arab group countries decided to veto a proposal that [inaudible] proposal promoting the importance of community networks, something which has grown and become quite important in Africa. African countries said they didn't want references to community networks because they weren't defined within the ITU scope of telecom services, which was really rather disappointing to hear that.

So, we are seeing these geo-political groupings which is not good for the ITU because, obviously, everyone has different views and we have to respect those views, but when we get essentially [inaudible] vetoing other people's proposals just because they want to join other countries for no good real reason, then that's disappointing. So, I think it's something to reflect on. And thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Nigel. I think we might need to move on but this certainly is a concern and there seems to be a lot of work on the plate. I just had one last question. With ICANN being a sector member and therefore – ICANN is a sector member, isn't it, or is it not? It wasn't,

---

okay. So, how was ICANN represented there? Were you part of other delegations, as such?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes. As we made I think clear before the Plenipotentiary, a number of us were based either in APNIC, the Asia-Pacific RIR, or RIPE NCC or [inaudible], Veni served in the Bulgarian delegation and very effectively indeed in terms of visibility to speak on the microphone. So, that was our [position].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Were sector members at any point asked to take part directly or were they effectively sitting in the back row?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Sector members typically didn't speak apart from any [inaudible] small drafting groups where they sometimes took part. Mainly the debate is occupied by member countries.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks. I just wanted to check on that since there's always also the discussion on the ITU's improvements and being able to be more multi-stakeholder in scope, whilst at the same time, remaining multi-lateral. But we'll no doubt have further discussions on this in future calls.

Next, jumping onto IGF 2018. This was opened in Paris for a very short Internet governance forum. Three days which really ended up being two days since the first day was used for half the day for the opening ceremony and the last day was used for half the day for the closing ceremony and speeches.

I guess the big story there was the Paris declaration that was presented to the assembly and also the speech from Emmanuel Macron, the French President, who appears to be criticizing on the one hand the two extremes. We see one extreme being the Californian Internet and the other one being the Chinese Internet and asking for an Internet that is somewhere between the two with certainly more regulation appearing to be the way forward for him. Also, the mention of multi-lateral a number of times with multi-stakeholder being seldom mentioned in his speech including also the speech of his IT minister.

That's my opening remarks on this, since I was there. But I'll open the floor for others to reflect on the IGF on the Paris IGF as well. Oh, and the additional thing I was just going to add is I did try to go to the ICANN public forum. Unfortunately, that was in a small room. The room itself was filled with ICANN people and they didn't let anyone else in. Not the ICANN people, but the ushers didn't let anyone in because they were very tight on capacity requirements. So, as soon as there were no more seats, ushers would not allow anybody else in the room. Unfortunately, it was on the first day which means the Internet wasn't working, so I completely [inaudible] out this part. I guess if the room was full, that was good news as well. It was well-attended.

---

---

Any other comments or further points regarding the global IGF? Yes, Leon, please. You have the floor. Leon Sanchez?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Olivier. I agree that this was, at least from the IGFs that I have attended, was a one-of-a-kind IGF, given the political message delivered by President Macron. I think we shouldn't underestimate the speech because he said this seems to be some sort of a trend that they [inaudible] ... Someone has not muted their microphone and there's an echo. Could you please mute your microphones? So, I see this as a trend that ... I think it's Alan's line that's not muted. I'm not sure. Someone has their mic ... Okay, I think that's better. Thanks so much.

As I was saying, I look at it as a growing trend. President Macron said that it was coming from Geneva, then going to Paris and then keeping up until Berlin. I definitely see this as something that [inaudible] maybe by some governments and maybe other stakeholders. As I said, I think we should be keeping a close eye on how this trend develops and continues to evolve. I think that ICANN community, ICANN Org, and the ICANN board should be participating in the different fora that will be shaping the future of the IGF.

I agree with some of the points that President Macron highlighted. For example, the outcomes of the IGF, the way that the multi-stakeholder model needs to evolve. I don't agree with other points of his speech, [inaudible] to say that we need to do a multi-lateral effort rather than a multi-stakeholder effort. I definitely don't share that view. I think we

---

must keep things under a multi-stakeholder model. But it's up to us to prove that the multi-stakeholder model still works, that it can be effective and that it can actually produce meaningful outputs that could be [inaudible] by Internet community.

I note that having outputs and making decisions in the IGF is not how it was designed to begin with and is not the spirit of the IGF, but maybe that is the way that it should [evolve]. I'm not saying it should. I'm just saying that we should think about how the IGF should [evolve] and then come to conclusions if we think that in order to have a more meaningful outcome in the IGF, there should be some sort of agreement as an outcome from the IGF.

So, I guess, as I said, we'll need to keep a close eye on this trend. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Leon. For Macon's speech, you can have a look at it. It's actually linked from our extended agenda. There used to be a copy of the speech on the [inaudible] website. They've taken it down. The one that was finally said, which has been somehow modified from the written speech, is the one that is on the Internet governance website. As I said, there is a link in your agenda to his full speech.

What I would ask, perhaps, staff and Nigel in particular is whether there are any plans for this speech to be somehow fleshed out and the main lines taken out, so as for us to – rather than having people read the whole thing or sit through the whole speech which you can find on

video in several places on the Internet, whether one would point the main points out and the ones that could affect ICANN in some way.

A lot of things, as Leon said, mention the future of the IGF, etc. But is there anything in there that was directly related to ICANN? That would probably be helpful.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you, Olivier. I circulated my notes of the speech I think to the working group a couple of weeks ago. I took notes and I just circulated. Obviously, I only took notes on the bits that interested me, but I tried to do as much as I could and I circulated that.

I think Leon is right in highlighting both the importance of the speech in terms of the reforms of the IGF which is something which is obviously going to be discussed in great detail as we move forward and also the future of Internet governance in general and the interplay between multi-lateral and multi-stakeholder fora, the need for some regulation on content. That was specifically mentioned. Doing something about Internet intermediaries in terms of updating the European regulation on that.

So, some things in the speech that potentially could affect ICANN, not directly, but certainly in the long run and I think it's something that we'll be looking at very carefully and I think Leon is absolutely right when he says that we need to see how this plays out in other fora where his ideas could affect the European agenda. They could affect the agenda in other areas. So, I think it is something that we need to look at very

---



---

carefully and this working group or this engagement group is important in that context.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Nigel. Now, there are two people in the call. Sivasubramanian Muthusamywas the first person and then for some reason put his hand down, but I'll let him speak first. Then afterwards we'll have Yrjo Lansipuro. Shiva, you have the floor.

SHIVA MUTHUSMYWAS: Olivier, it was very possible that [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Shiva, you sound very far. If you could come closer to the mic, that would be helpful.

SHIVA MUTHUSMYWAS: Okay. Can you hear me clearly now?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Better, yes.

SHIVA MUTHUSMYWAS: Okay. It was [inaudible] France took part in the IGF, but to me it was shocking. Part of his speech, I would have expected that kind of a speech from China or from South Africa but not from France. In my

---

opinion, there is some failure on our part to have taken part in the processes that shape government opinion.

Earlier in ICANN, Fadi Chehade, he used to travel to meet some of the leaders and talk about multi-stakeholder process and certain exercise in an augmented scale should be taken up either by Goran or [inaudible] Cherine Chalaby or [Andrew]. The leaders from multi-stakeholder forum should aim to talk to leaders around the world to whatever extent possible.

Leon was talking about the importance of taking part in policy forums, but I would actually think that it's more important to take part in the processes that take shape, that give shape to government opinion. So, by whatever means possible, we should try to do that.

The future of Internet governance is the future of the Internet, which is the future of the world. So, to that extent, we have to consider [inaudible] important. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Shiva. That's helpful and something to consider indeed. Let's go to Yrjo Lansipuro.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Olivier. Just to mention that this speech by President Macron is likely to be on the agenda of the joint ALAC-GAC meeting in Kobe. We have suggested that together with my counterpart, the GAC liaison to ALAC, [inaudible]. So, I think that there's going to be a lot of food for thought and for discussion in Kobe. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Yrjo. Just to add that the person who was the GAC representative for France, [David Matino], also attended his last Internet Governance Forum meeting as he moved on to a new position of [inaudible] elsewhere and therefore left his position in the French ministry regarding the ICT [inaudible] and I understand the person taking over is [inaudible], I believe. I'm not sure whether he is aware or knowledgeable about ICANN or not. I wonder whether Veni or Nigel have met him already in advance of him taking on his new position.

VENI MARKOVSKI: I never met him. However, I just want to send a little [friendly] suggestion to people who are discussing this speech. Let's see what [inaudible]. Let's see whether the French government will actually do something, whether there will be some initiatives at the UN because the [inaudible] IGF at the end of the day will happen in the UN, whatever this reform might be.

So, I think we have to not forget that a [speech is a speech], that the [inaudible] are the ones that will define which parts of this speech will start shaping some kind of policies and [inaudible] trying to persuade other countries to follow with their ideas and [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Veni. Next is Yrjo Lansipuro. No. That was an old hand. Okay. I'm not seeing anyone else in the queue, so thanks for all these points. Clearly, a follow-up required in this. I'm also noting that Jim Prendergast

---

---

is mentioning in the chat that this, at the end of the day, was just a speech by the President of one country and I guess one of the things we'll just have to wait and see until – unless ... And we don't need to keep bringing it up unless others do as well. So, [inaudible] maybe on this is a way forward.

Let's ourselves move forward. Just mentioning that there is reporting by the digital watch on all of the IGF sessions and that's linked in your agenda.

Now, in our agenda, number four, looking ahead to the main developments on the horizon. One of them is the UN high-level panel on digital cooperation which has a consultation ending at the end of this month. We heard from Nigel Hickson earlier in this call that ICANN is still considering whether to contribute to this or not. Nigel, is there anything else that you could say on this? Would it be helpful for members of this working group to look at the consultation and to also chime in on whether [inaudible] or not?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes. I'll be very brief. First of all, the consultation officially ends on the 30<sup>th</sup> of November, but the high-level secretariat has said that contributions will be welcome up to first week of December, so we have a little while. We have drafted something internally which is being subject to internal review. Obviously, anything we say has to be approved in a process.

---

But if anyone has any particular observations on any of the questions, then please do drop us a line. I would be very happy indeed to take on board on this.

The high-level panel, the commissioners I think they're called [inaudible] not called commissioners – the high-level panelists – are meeting in Geneva on the 15<sup>th</sup> of January for their second face-to-face meeting and there might be some outreach at the Geneva meeting to the community and we can update people on that when we find out. So, that's what we know at the moment.

It's worth saying that the panel, of course, members of the panel were at the IGF and had a number of sessions there. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. I see from the webpage that the deadline for contributions, for written contributions, is the 31<sup>st</sup> of January 2019, but that submissions received by the 30<sup>th</sup> of November will be included in the first [inaudible] report to panel members. I gather it probably would be better to contribute before the 30<sup>th</sup>, although the absolute deadline is the 31<sup>st</sup>. That's of January, so one month further.

NIGEL HICKSON: Just [inaudible]. Yes. We definitely want to ... If we're going to contribute, we'll contribute in the next week, etc., because clearly, one wants to be able to contribute and have one's ideas considered by the panelists. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. I note that [inaudible] mentions that he has met the new French ambassador for [inaudible] during the IGF. And he will see him in Paris before the end of the year, so there definitely is some progress. Please keep us updated. If there's anything that we need to do as a community to help in any way.

That's all I have currently on the agenda with regards to looking ahead to make developments on the horizon. Is there anything else out there? I guess that's also the chance for Veni to report to us from the UN General Assembly in New York.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Thanks, Olivier. By the way, in the meantime, you must have received just now the e-mail that I sent about three hours ago. I don't know why it just came out. I will [inaudible] e-mail that you guys have in your inboxes. You will see three official documents. These are the files that start with "N". These are draft resolutions which are already accepted in the UN General Assembly.

The one which says [Draft UN Cybersecurity] Resolution is something that I decided to send [inaudible] the initial draft of the cybersecurity resolution which is particularly relevant for ICANN because there is a point nine in this document which says that all [states] must play the same role and carry equal responsibility for international governance of the Internet. In a way, [inaudible] establishments of multi-lateral [inaudible] and democratic international Internet governance mechanisms which ensure an equitable disposition of resources.

---

So, needless to say that language is not in the final resolution that we have, but it gives you some ideas what the thinking of the [inaudible] United Nations [inaudible]. Any thoughts [inaudible] food for thought for [inaudible] next year? In the next couple of years, there will be two parallel processes of the UN discussing cybersecurity and one discussing cybercrime. All three of them should be on our radar. I mean, they are on our radar but should be also on yours.

I say that because this is unprecedented where two parallel processes with the same more or less goal are taking place at the UN. You could see by the [inaudible] one or another [inaudible], that one of the cybersecurity resolutions is basically [inaudible] and another one is basically [inaudible]. But that also gives you some idea what is the intention of these particular countries vis-à-vis Internet governance, cybersecurity.

I would finish with the fact that this also comes in parallel with the high-level panel that the UN secretary general established on [inaudible] and while we were all talking about the speech of Macron in France, there was also a speech by secretary general before him and he mentioned the [inaudible] panel and said that he expects from the panel to hear some code of behavior coming out of this panel. So, this is again one of the code language, if you will, in the last few years when discussions about code of behavior had taken place at the UN [inaudible] of ICANN, the critical Internet resources [inaudible] domain names.

So, we have a lot on our plate in the next year.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this summary, Veni, and thank you for pointing us to these documents. It would be helpful probably to put them on the Wiki somewhere. I'll try and see with staff where we can put these because that looks like another thread. We have the [inaudible]. We have the IGF. We have the ICANN, the domain names, all of the different threads so far and the WSIS+10. This looks like another one that is opening up in parallel with everything else.

Certainly, what is being said here seems to work somehow with some of the points that Macron has said in his speech, so there is some alignment there between different players.

I'm not seeing anyone putting their hand up. The floor is open if anybody wishes to add anything to what's being said. If not, I do realize we are nine minutes beyond the official end of this call. This is a 60-minute call. So, if nobody else has anything to add on this topic, I can move to any other business. I'm not seeing anyone putting their hand up.

Nigel, did you wish to say a few more words?

NIGEL HICKSON: Sorry, Olivier. Just very briefly. The WSIS Forum is the 9<sup>th</sup> to the 13<sup>th</sup> of April this year, so it's a bit earlier. Obviously, that's some months off, but I think it's worth noting those days. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Nigel. We'll add it to our process chart. Do we have somehow in store some kind of a timeline for future IG

---



---

activities from staffing from now and going into next year? I recall that something like this was presented in Barcelona. Could we have a copy of this and perhaps build on that, please?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah. Thank you, Olivier. We'll update the schedule that we put around in Barcelona and distribute it. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's really helpful. Thank you for this. Finally, the question on whether we'll have another call soon. For the time being, we're doing these calls on an ad hoc basis, as in whenever there is request and demand for it. Of course, we had to report back from PP18 and IGF and all of the topics today and we'll follow-up on the mailing list for the time being, but if there is something that certainly comes up where a big discussion is required, then we'll have to convene a call at short notice. That's just how Internet governance happens.

So, thanks to everyone who has taken part on the call today. Thank you in particular to [Dierdre] who has been running the show. I look forward to following up on all these topics on more on the mailing list and on the Wiki. Thanks and have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night depending on where you are in the world. Thank you. This call has ended.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]