
ABU DHABI – Capacity Development Workshop for Middle East GAC Members
Saturday, October 28, 2017 – 08:30 to 13:00 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

GORAN MARBY: ...to develop this model and go forward.

What is unique with ICANN is that it's also not only a meeting place for talking. On the other end of what we do, there is a machine. When we hit that machine, the interface for all Internet users in the world changes. That is an important fact, and that's an obligation that we have: to make sure this machine continues to be oiled, to be updated, but also to be maintained.

ICANN is not the Internet, but ICANN is an essential part of what the Internet is for most users for the domain name systems. I bet that, already today, everybody in this room has used a domain name, at least if you've sent an e-mail. It is one of those interfaces to the Internet that is important for users.

But now I think, which I've said many times, that we've only done the easy ones, without about 3.5-4 billion users. I don't know how to calculate them. I get new numbers all the time. But they have been the easy ones – often the elites, the very educated, the ones who have English as a language or a concept.

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.

The Internet, which is a global network of networks with parameters for communications is now seeing that we're going more and more, meeting people who don't maybe have English as a context, who will primarily use mobile phones and not a PC, and are not advanced in their training when it comes to PCs.

We together, and especially GAC has an important role in that is to understand the challenge it [meets] because, when local means global, we have to sort out what's good for everybody.

The ICANN model – the multi-stakeholder model – exists for a reason. The Internet today hits users in every part of life, from when you're born until you die. You do your banking, your education, your social media. You search for things. You buy things. And some people tell me also your love life.

That means that we have to a vast array of people coming into ICANN. So we make sure that when we develop the Internet going forward, all those voices are taken into account, especially for the Newcomers. You will meet a lot of diversity when it comes to ideas, backgrounds, and culture values and ideas going forward. That is really the multi-stakeholder model.

But never forget that, in all of this, we're a technical organization. At the end of the day, at the end of all those [discussions], the whole point of what we're doing is to maintain the domain name system.

We're not here to sell domain names. We're here to provide a service to the world. ICANN – ICANN.org is our website – is a non-profit organization with only one aim, and that is to support this service to the world. The best way we can do that is by facilitated discussion with you and other parts of the community.

As I spoke about many times, one thing that I'm very interested in are the so-called IDNs because, looking at the next-generation users, who maybe doesn't have English as a context, how do we make sure that the Internet is accessible for them so they don't have to relearn what they've done? We and I who come from Europe – I'm Swedish. Nobody speaks Swedish – oh, there's one person who speaks Swedish here, isn't there? I tried to introduce Swenglish as a language for a long time. It hasn't worked out that well.

We need more efforts and new ways of cooperation and understanding between different parts of this ecosystem. Everything is meant to be together. Often when I have the opportunity to speak to governments, especially when they are early on in the development phase, I understand it's not only what we do, but also education, demanding creation, content, and infrastructure. All of those things have to happen before you can say that a country is [utilized].

If we want to reach 1.5 billion more users around the world, we need to find good ways of working together. With 3.5-4 billion users around the world, it's an obligation to maintain the system. I hope, especially for the Newcomers, that you will see this as an opportunity to shape the Internet of tomorrow.

We're not done yet. The Internet five years ago was not the same as our Internet ten years ago, and it will definitely be the same Internet five years from now.

Today here you also see not only Newcomers, but also young people that come from around the world. I think we have 130 countries represented here at this meeting, with about 2,000 registered people coming in total. Many of them are the ones who are going to live with the decisions we make here. It's important that they also have their voices heard.

We cannot take the Internet for granted. Often I had to tell people that the Internet is not a natural resource. It's not something that just actually exists. It is a machine. It is a machine that is strangely set up because nobody controls that machine. The Internet doesn't have a central point of itself. But it is a technical set of parameters. We need to work on that and develop that.

Thank you very much for taking time early in the morning. I look forward to meeting many of you during the next couple of days. We are looking ahead at a very, very interesting meeting.

Thank you very much. With that, unfortunately I have to leave. Have a nice day.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you very much, Goran. Thank you for breaking tradition to start the day at 9:00 in the morning. Enjoy your board meeting.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you. I'd like to ask the host to speak. Thank you.

ABDULRAHMAN AL MARZOUQI: Good morning, everyone. On behalf of the UAE government, I'd like to welcome you all to this meeting in the beautiful city of Abu Dhabi, the capitol of the United Arab Emirates. It is such an honor to host an ICANN meeting in this part of the world. I'm very happy with the number of registered participants so far. I look forward to meeting new people in this ICANN meeting.

I just wanted to give a brief introduction about UAE governmental control in ICANN and the organization that I work

for, and then I'll highlight a couple of the important things from our perspective about ICANN.

First of all, my name is Abdulrahman Al Marzouqi. I work as a manager of Internet advancement within the Telecommunication Regulatory Authority. It's the body that oversees the telecommunications sector in the UAE, as well as ICT and smart government.

I'm also the UAE government representative within the GAC. I've been in this position for the past, perhaps, 11 years, so since 2006. 2006 Marrakech was the first meeting I attended within the GAC.

I must say it was quite an experience. I met a lot of people and also I learned a lot of things. Within the TRA, we're fortunate that we have two hats. We have one hat on one hand. We are a technical body, and we're running the .ae country code, so we're also part of the ccNSO for that. We are also the government body that sets the policies for ICT. So it's fortunate because the Internet and DNS are not simple. They're basically technical functions that require a lot of learning, a lot of technical terms, and a lot of abbreviations. Still, after ten years, I must say I still come across new abbreviations. And I love them.

Why does the UAE government participate in ICANN? Why am I here and why have I been doing this for the past 11 years? The

UAE government believes that technology is key in human development and that the Internet is at the core of that development. Perhaps when you search the Internet about the UAE government and the latest initiatives, you'll hear that we have appointed a new minister, just two weeks ago: the Minister of Artificial Intelligence. So my message is that the UAE government really believes in technology. It's important that the government participates in the various forums and organizations to contribute, learn, and develop further.

I think what's unique about ICANN is the multi-stakeholder model. At the beginning, I was actually confused. What does that mean and how does it work? It sounded, at the beginning, strange that the government cannot just make decisions and expect everybody to follow that. It was interesting to learn that we have to all sit together at one table and have discussions with other stakeholders. That's quite the experience and an interesting fact about how ICANN functions and how the GAC functions within this structure.

Of course, ICANN is not small. There are so many groups. There are so many topics of interest. My advice to the Newcomers: focus on some of the important issues that you're after, and then slowly try to learn about the rest of the organization. It took me, I believe, three or four ICANN meetings until I fully understood the various working groups. So it's not very easy to

learn, but I think that, once you learn how it functions, you'll be pleased.

As the UAE government, we focused on a couple of key issues within ICANN. I found that participating in GAC really added value from our perspective. One of the issues was IDNs. When we started participating in the GAC and ICANN, we learned a lot about internationalized domain names. Eventually, in 2010, we were one of the first countries to launch its IDN, along with another three countries. We launched .emirate in Arabic. I think that, if we hadn't participated in ICANN early on, I believe, we wouldn't be launching that soon our own IDN.

The other topic of interest that I found also is important for countries to participate in is the new gTLDs: the development of new generic names and how they are put into the root. I think that's one of the hottest topics that I've seen over the course of ten years. I think it brought a lot of countries, actually, to the GAC, just to debate on the new gTLDs.

With that, I'd like to end my introduction. Once again, thank you for being here. I hope you enjoy the rest of the ICANN meeting. Thank you.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you very much, Abdulrahman Marzouqi. Thank you for sharing your experience and your advice to the Newcomers to focus on important issues before exploring further into the complicated world of ICANN and its processes.

I'll have to agree with you that it's not an easy space to learn. I think one thing I can share with you, based on my experience, is that the ICANN staff and your colleagues here in the GAC are always available to help. So don't be shy to ask. Thank you.

We'll move on to our next topic for this morning, which is the objectives of the meeting. But before I do that, are there any comments or questions from the floor?

Thomas?

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Before I also need to leave because I also will participate in the board meeting, one thing that I think is important to remember/know is that, when the Internet was built by a number of scientists, governments, lawyers, and business makers didn't know that this exists. This went on for quite some time. It was only decades after the system had been developed that the legal and political framework around it developed. This is one of the reasons why, historically, it's not the governments or lawmakers or business makers who have

been in the driving seat in the beginning but have understood what the Internet is about and what its potential and its risks are, only with time. So this is one of the reasons – the setup, the development, and the logic behind those who created the Internet in the '60s and then continued to develop it. Also, the domain name system, which is one of the key elements that ICANN is managing, was created in the 1980s, mainly by one person, who managed it himself for quite some time.

Then, after some time, ICANN was created with its structure that has been undergoing some reforms: the basic element of a multi-stakeholder approach, where things would be decided not top-down but bottom-up, with a large involvement of the community, with public comment elements and an open process where everybody that is interested and has a stake can participate. That is the core of the logic, as my colleague from the UAE has said. It is something special, for governments to work within such an open structure as one of the so-called stakeholders among others.

Those who have been participating or know about the UN World Summit and the Information Society that has been held in Geneva and Tunis in 2003 and '05 – there had been a ten-year review process in New York in 2015 – know that all these stakeholders, including government, have learned in the last decades that, if they want to seize the opportunities that the

Internet offers and reduce the risks that the Internet also brings about, there's no other way than working together with all stakeholders in their respective roles in order to get the best out of this technology for mankind.

Also knowing that this system allows for diversity because very little Internet is centrally managed, most of the intelligence, most of the development, is taking place at the edges, which actually allows different usages in different regions for different purposes. But of course, this is a challenge to governments – to work in such an environment – and you need a certain mindset to understand how this works, how this functions, how decisions are shaped in a multi-stakeholder system, how decisions are made, and how decisions are modified over time, because nothing is carved in stone here.

So it is really something that is a special effort for governments – to work as an advisory body in an organization like this – but there are also merits I think for governments that compare to intergovernmental institutions that most of the time represent our countries. Things are maybe more dynamic. It's easier sometimes to introduce new things or to modify things because the decisions structures are different because, in a multi-stakeholder model, it's less possible to block progress or to block things from happening. We are forced to engage and try to influence what is happening in a way that is good for our people

and the people that we represent, rather than being able to hold things back. This is very difficult in the Internet environment.

So these are just the basic fundamentals and fundamental thoughts that I'd like to give you before I also have to leave. I will be with you for the afternoon when the GAC Plenary session starts.

Thank you very much.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, Thomas. Thank you for joining us this morning. We look forward to seeing you again this afternoon. Thank you.

[ALICE MUNYUA]: Tarek?

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, Tarek. And thank you for your support throughout this capacity development initiative.

TAREK KAMEL: I'll just maybe say that the Chairman of ICANN...

PUA HUNTER: Before we move on, may I call up Baher to come up to the front, please?

Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Good morning. Thank you to all distinguished colleagues. I have, first, one simple question, and then maybe some comments. My question is that: is it an appropriate time in the ICANN meeting to have this group up this early in the morning? Still some people have not yet arrived.

Second, there are other engagements. People are coming here for ten minutes, blessing us with some general speech and leaving us instead of staying with us, listening to us, and see what the problem is. All of them have, no doubt, engagement. We appreciate that. We understand that.

I know, Madam, you and Alice, devotedly, effectively and enthusiastically followed this action and continue to follow for which we have gratitude for you. We appreciate it. But I see, still, that the room is empty – empty of those developed countries that must be here. Because if you want to have an action an underserved country, we have to have other parties to assist us, to assist the underserved. When I go to some of the meetings,

they're full of developed countries, either remotely or physically. But here I don't see them, or very, very few.

So we need to find a way. First, what would be the most appropriate time to have this meeting, not to be coincident with other meetings here that prevent our distinguished colleagues from ICANN or other management to stay with us?

Secondly, to see how we could engage at least other parties because the underserved countries, even if all of them here, alone can't do many things. They need a collaboration.

We are talking of multi-stakeholders. This is multi-stakeholder action also. So we have to find out. It's not the fault of anybody, but we have to see what we can do.

These are the two small things that I wanted to say at the beginning of the meeting. In order not to be misunderstood, we just want to improve the situations. I hope that it will not be interpreted differently. Thank you.

PUA HUNTER:

Thank you very much, Kavouss. I take your point seriously and can understand that it's something that we need to look at for future workshops. There's no point in putting together when we don't have the attendants that we hope we would get. Thank you very much.

We'll move on. The workshop today will be a non-technical one. The main objective is to increase the knowledge and understanding of the GAC processes and how GAC fits into the whole ICANN ecosystem. The idea is to allow GAC members from underserved regions to effectively and continuously participate and contribute to the various work streams currently ongoing within GAC and ICANN.

I think I need to mention that the comment that the Kavouss raised is very relative to what we're doing here. So I encourage you to engage by asking questions and sharing thoughts and comments as we progress throughout the workshop.

Now I'll hand over to Alice. Thank you, Alice.

ALICE MUNYUA:

Thank you very much, Pua. I'd like to start by thanking the host, the United Arab Emirates and Abdulrahman Al Marzouqi. Thank you so very much for all your support in organizing this. And Baher. It was quite difficult to find the right timing, taking into the consideration how the week starts in this region. We felt that it was extremely necessary to have, even if it was just a couple of hours, an introduction to the GAC and to introduce ICANN to our Middle East members any to any Newcomers. So this is not just focusing on the Middle East but also on all the Newcomers to the GAC.

I also want to thank the ICANN department, especially Tarek Kamel, for all the support that he's given to the GAC Underserved Regions Working Group, and the GAC colleagues for having placed this as an important part of the ongoing agenda for the GAC in recognition of the one very specific initiative that I think our GAC Chair and GAC leadership has continuously been articulating and speaking about, not just at the GAC level but also at the ICANN level in relation to the GAC, and that is the whole concept around lowering barriers to participation. I think my colleague Kavouss here has begun to actually impact that in a different way and look at differently. So it's not just having participants from underserved regions but also how we interact with participants and GAC members and other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees in terms of supporting GAC engagement in this community.

This workshop forms part of the GAC underserved regions. The GAC Public Safety Working Group – although today we are not focusing on law enforcement, we are focusing on governments. So we are not going to be focusing a lot on the work of public safety. We are going to be looking specifically at what the GAC does, the work that it's doing, the work that we're going to be doing here in Abu Dhabi, the issues that we're going to be focusing on, and pointing out to you people that can help and teams within ICANN departments and GAC colleagues who can

help introduce and perhaps even handhold in some of the areas that we may find challenging in understanding and contributing. We have several members here. I can name them so that they can speak later: Switzerland, Iran, Egypt, and all my other colleagues. And I think the U.K. I had seen. Several of them are here. They'll be able to speak about the work that they do when it comes to cross-community working.

Very specifically going back to the objective of this workshop, it's to, apart from increasing the knowledge of the stakeholders in the functioning of ICANN, also increase to the capability of stakeholders in the operation of the Internet's unique identifiers.

Again, a very important aspect is strengthening the diversity of participation in ICANN. Here we're not just talking about participation but also strengthening the diversity of views and ideas in the policies that are developed in the various policy development processes at all levels. We look at that from various dimensions. And, again, going back to that very important factor, lowering barriers to participation.

In terms of the appropriateness of time, I agree with my colleague from Iran, Kavouss, that we probably need to plan this further. Because this falls within Tarek's department and the Global Stakeholders Engagement, we are going to make sure

that the next coming workshops are sensitive to some of these factors.

With that, I think I'd like to invite back to the Chair of this Underserved Regions Working Group so that she can take us through the rest of the agenda.

Thank you very much.

PUA HUNTER:

Thank you, Alice. We only have a limited time for this session today. We've got some exciting presentations coming up, so I won't waste any more of our time.

I'll gladly hand over to Baher to take us through the introduction to ICANN and its role and work in the region. Thank you very much.

BAHER ESMAT:

Thank you. Thank you, Pua. Good morning, everyone. My name is Baher Esmat. I'm ICANN Vice-President of the Middle East. I'd like to welcome you all to ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi. I'd also like to thank our local host, the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the United Arab Emirates for hosting us in Abu Dhabi. Also, thanks to the GAC leadership and the GAC

Underserved Regions Working Group for helping us in organizing this session today.

Before I get started, just a couple of quick points because Kavouss has raised a very important issue about timing. As Alice noted, we tried our best to find the best suitable time for this session. Normally we would have held the session one day before the start of the GAC meeting, but since it was Friday, which is the official weekend – it's actually kind of a religious holiday in this part of the world – it was impossible to organize a workshop for the Middle East region on a Friday. Since the GAC agenda was also pretty much packed, we were left with very little options. As Alice noted, even if it is for a few hours, we still hope that it will be useful.

The other thing I want to mention is that, during the closing session, we will be joined by Cherine Chalaby, the Vice-Chairman of the ICANN Board, together with Tarek Kamel, Senior Vice-President for Government Engagement, and Manal Ismail, Vice-Chair of the GAC, for further input and feedback from the audience. We'll also hear from the ICANN leadership.

Actually, I have less than 15 minutes to go through my slides, so I'll be brief and quick and will be happy to take any questions during the day or by the end of the session, if we still have time. I'm going to give a quick overview about ICANN and what ICANN

does in the Middle East. Apologies in advance if this sounds like common knowledge for some of you. I'm sure that others in the room may not be aware of what we do in the region.

Next slide, please. As you probably know, ICANN's role is to coordinate the management of the Internet key resources, the names, the numbers, and the protocol parameters. We do that in close coordination with many bodies, groups, and organizations around the world, whether technical, non-technical, government, non-government, business, and so forth.

Next slide. We work closely with our technical partners from the ISTARs, the RIRs (Regional Internet Registries), IETF, TLD regional organizations, ccTLDs, root server operators, the Internet Society – next slide, please – and many other groups from the UN organizations and regional Internet international or intergovernmental organizations, in ensuring that our policies in relation to the domain name system are developed in a bottom-up, open-end, inclusive manner. Next slide.

ICANN is comprised of three main components. There is the ICANN organization. This is the staff that facilitates the policy development process and implements policies that are developed by the community. The community is the largest and the most important part of ICANN. These are the Supporting

Organizations, Advisory Committees, and the various working groups that work on the many policy aspects of the DNS.

And there's the ICANN Board. The ICANN Board, like in any organization, is the decision-making body within the organization. It's the part of ICANN that adopts policies developed by the community. Then the board directs staff or the ICANN organization to implement those policies. Next slide, please.

ICANN has a global presence. We have staff in more than 30 or 35 countries. We have regional offices in Los Angeles. The headquarters are actually in Los Angeles. We have regional offices in Brussels, Istanbul, Montevideo, Uruguay, and Singapore. We have engagement centers in Beijing, China, Geneva, Nairobi, and Washington, D.C.

We also have partnerships centers. These are partnerships that were established with stakeholders. We have the DNS Entrepreneurship Center in Cairo. This is one of the partnership centers that ICANN has in this part of the world. We have a similar center in Paraguay in South America and another one in Seoul in Asia. Next slide, please.

The ICANN mission is limited to the Domain Name System (DNS). We do, as I mentioned, facilitate the policy development process, led by or driven by the community. We do delegate top-

level domains, whether generic top-level domains or country-code top-level domains. We work closely with our partners from the ISTARs, the RIRs on distributing Internet Protocol addresses or IP addresses. We work with the root server operators around the world in ensuring that the root server system remains stable and secure.

In addition to that, ICANN also runs one of the root servers, which is the L-root. We also work with the IETF on the assignment of the protocol parameters.

So this is, in a nutshell, what ICANN the organization does. Of course, in all that we do a lot of engagement work, not only in the regions like the Middle East and other regions, but also with many stakeholders from governments, business, civil society, academia, and the technical community. Next slide, please.

With the RIRs, as I mentioned, this is the part on the IP addresses. In this part of the world, we work very closely with RIPE NCC on many, many capacity development activities. RIPE is the regional Internet registry responsible for distributing IP addresses in the Middle East. I'm sure that those of you who work for any network-kind of operator groups do work closely work with RIPE NCC and, of course, other RIRs in other regions around the world. Next slide.

The ICANN community – as we call it, the multi-stakeholder community – it's the various groups that come to ICANN to develop policies. Government, the private sector, civil society, and other working groups, they work together in a bottom-up approach to develop policies pertaining to ICANN's mission. Next slide.

The key building blocks of the ICANN community are called Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. The Supporting Organizations are the organizations that are responsible for developing policies within ICANN. The Advisory Committees are the groups that provide advice on those policies and recommendations. Next slide.

Among the Supporting Organizations, the three Supporting Organizations we have are the Address Supporting Organization, responsible for the IP addresses, and then two Supporting Organizations for the names: the Country Code Names Supporting organization and the Generic Names Supporting Organization.

On the Advisory Committees side, we have four Advisory Committees: the At-Large Advisory Committee – this is the part of ICANN that has representation from Internet users around the world – the Root Server System Advisory Committee – this is those who operate the root servers – the Security and Stability

Advisory Committee – this is the committee that advises the ICANN Board on any issues pertaining to the DNS security and stability – and the forth one, of course, the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC). During this session today, you’re going to hear more in detail about the GAC and what the GAC does. Next, please.

This is the ICANN Board. The ICANN Board has 20 members – 16 voting members and 4 non-voting members. They come from across the community as stakeholder groups. Six board members come from the Supporting Organizations, two from each Supporting Organization, one board member from the At-Large Advisory Committee, plus the ICANN President and CEO, and then eight board members coming from the Nominating Committee. Then we have the four non-voting members from the IETF, from SSAC, RSSAC, and the GAC. Next slide.

How to get engaged? There are several ways for the community and also for Newcomers to get engaged with ICANN. Attending ICANN meetings is one way, but indeed it’s not the only way. There are many working groups that work on different policy issues. These working groups are normally open for anyone to join by just signing up to the mailing lists and taking part in conference calls and webinars, and maybe also provide input to policy documents that are posted for public input.

There are many materials available online for those who would like to learn more about how to engage in the policy development process of ICANN. There is, for example, the ICANN Learn tool. This is an online tool that offers free courses on the different topics of ICANN and ICANN PDP.

There are events that take place at the regional levels, whether capacity development events or DNS forums or others that the community can take part in.

Of course, there are also the newsletters that are sent to those who are following ICANN. They can just sign up for the newsletter that belongs to their region and get updates on what's going on in the region. Next slide.

For the Newcomers, we have three key programs: the Fellowship Program, the ICANN NextGen Program, and the Newcomers. I'm sure that many of you are familiar with the Fellowship Program today. The Fellowship Program attracts more than 50 participants at each ICANN meeting. They come from all over the world, from across the stakeholder groups.

The NextGen is primarily for students, whether undergrad or postgrad students that, again, we perceive as the next generation of the ICANN community members.

Then we have the Newcomer Programs, for those who attend the ICANN meeting for their first day. They register as Newcomers. They get the badge as Newcomers, and then they can attend all the sessions provided for Newcomers. Tomorrow, Sunday, it's the Newcomers Day, so I would encourage any of you who are attending ICANN for the first time to attend this session tomorrow. Next slide.

I mentioned ICANN Learn. It's an online platform. You can go online and check it and check out the courses that are available. And it's free of charge. Next slide.

Of course, the ICANN meetings have evolved over time. ICANN holds three meetings every year, and the meetings have grown not in terms of number of participants but also in terms of number of sessions. For this meeting, for example, we're expecting 2,200 participants. Yesterday we were close to 2,000 registrations and we're expecting more to register over the next couple of days. We have more than 360 sessions at this meeting this week. Next slide.

We're here this week for ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi. The next meeting will be in San Juan, Puerto Rico in March 2018. Next slide.

Very quickly about what we do in the Middle East. Next slide, please. The Middle East covers 26 countries – 22 Arab countries,

plus Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. This is the area that we cover. It's a population of 750 million with about 30% Internet penetration. It's a region that's covered by me as well as my colleague, Fahd Batayneh.

slide.

Next

We work with a group of community members on implementing the ICANN regional strategy. In fact, the strategy itself was developed by this group. The strategy identified three main strategic objectives. One is to support secure and stable domain name system infrastructure in the region. Two is to promote a healthy and competitive domain name marketplace. Three is to clarify ICANN's role in the global Internet ecosystem. More details about this strategy and its key elements are available online. Next slide.

I'm going to just briefly mention some of the activities that we undertake under each of the three strategic objectives. This slide will also have more details that you can refer to later.

Under the security and stability of the DNS infrastructure, we have a group of community members who work on developing rules for using IDNs at the top level. This is the task force on Arabic IDNs. Actually, it was the very first language panel within ICANN that developed what we call the label generation rules for using IDN variants at the top level. It's a very technical and very

focused working group, and currently they are working on more variant-related issues at the second level and also issues related to universal acceptance.

We do a lot of capacity development work in the region – technical DNS/DNSSEC trainings with many partners, both from the region, like RIPE NCC, MENOG, and also elsewhere like the Network Startup Resource Center (NSRC) and also the many ccTLDs. We do a lot of activities with law enforcement agencies and [certs] on DNS misuse and abuse workshops. We do also, under the same objective, train people who can become trainers themselves. This is the train-the-trainer program, and currently we have around five or six technical trained trainers in the Middle East who can go and actually do go conduct technical trainings in the region.

We do also encourage deployment of L-root servers, and we do have a lot of L-root servers with ISPs and network operators within the Middle East. Next slide.

Can we go – yeah. On the healthy and competitive domain name market, we established, with the National Telecommunication Regulatory Authority in Egypt, the DNS Entrepreneurship Center. The main objective of the center is to develop expertise in the domain name industry in all aspects of DNS, whether technical, business, legal, or other. We have conducted over 20 different

activities with the center over the past three years. The center itself has been also taking lead in conducting training in Egypt, as well as in other countries in Africa and in the Middle East.

We had an agreement with EURid, the registry of .eu, on also helping and supporting ICANN's effort in this area. We also started the DNS Forums three or four years ago. These are open forums for the community to come together to discuss all kinds of issues related to DNS and the domain name industry.

We conducted two studies related to the domain name business and industry, one in 2016, which was very much focused on DNS, and the most recent one that was published a couple of weeks ago. It was more on the [inaudible] economy landscape in the Middle East but with also an objective to identify linkages between DNS and the domain name business and the bigger digital ecosystem in the region. All the studies are available online, and you can find them on the ICANN website. Next slide.

On the third objective, we started also the program on the Internet Governance School three years ago in partnership with the Internet Society and RIPE NCC and with help from many Internet governance experts who have been in this industry for several years. This is a five-day program aiming to explain the bigger IG ecosystem which ICANN is part of. The program usually

attracts between 30 and 40 participants every year. The recent addition took place in Ankara, Turkey last August.

We do also engage with many non-commercial/non-government groups, from civil society, from academia, and from At-Large Structures. One of the key partnerships we have in this regard is with the Research and Academic Network in Tunisia. We started this initiative last year with the CCK (Computing Center Al Khawizmi) in Tunisia. The objective of this initiative is to run a program with the local community in Tunisia to raise awareness about ICANN and the ICANN mission. They do workshops on a regular basis, like every couple of months, each time in a different university, on any ICANN- or DNS-related topic. We started in October 2016. Up to today, they have organized workshops, and there are more coming down the pipeline. Next slide.

The following slides have more information about each and every project that we have in the region. I'm not going to go through all of them now. You have the information available. You can see more about what programs we run and what kind of capacity developments we do in the region, whether on the DNS technical side on the business or Internet governance side.

I think I'm going to stop here. I'll be happy to take any questions if time allows now or maybe later in the day. Thank you.

PUA HUNTER: Pakistan?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Baher, for the detailed presentation on ICANN. My question is about the ICANN Board. You presented that there are 20 members of the ICANN Board. There is about one member from the GAC and 19 members from the community that we can say is the private sector. You know there is only one member from the government, from the GAC, who is representing all the governments of the countries of the world.

My question is, what is your opinion about the balance of the Board members? Is it sufficient that one member can represent the governments of the countries across the globe?

BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, [Estohar], for the question. Well, frankly, I don't have an opinion. As staff, I don't have an opinion. But I can tell you that this is something that the community has probably decided sometime ago.

I remember when I started following ICANN and participating in ICANN. That was more than 12 or 13 years ago. The ALAC, for example, didn't have a voting members sitting on the board.

Later on, they had one, probably after many years of work, consultation, and all this.

So I think the composition of the board, like any other process within ICANN, is driven by the community, not by the organization itself.

PUA HUNTER:

Thank you, Baher. Before we move to the next question, can we please call upon the next panelist to come up the table? William Drake, Wolfgang Kleinwaechter, Chengetai Masongo, and Nii Quaynor.

Any more questions from the floor for Baher?

Yes. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Hello, everyone. I represent the government of Senegal. My question is the following. We always talk about underserved regions, but what I noticed during the presentation is that ICANN was almost not present in Africa, or very little. There is an engagement center in Kenya, but don't you think that the time has come, to be better represented, to have an engagement center in Western Africa, to have a bureau somewhere in Africa?

Thank you.

BAHER ESMAT:

Thank you. I only caught the last part of the question about the engagement center in Kenya and whether it's about time to have another one in Western Africa.

The whole concept of having more regional offices and engagement centers is relatively new. It started, like, four years ago with the three main regional offices around the world. Then we started building those engagement centers in the different parts. The most recent one was in Nairobi.

I agree with you that Africa is a huge continent with a huge population and, indeed, deserves more resources to be provided from ICANN. But this is something that is also happening gradually based on resources available, based on needs and demand.

Actually, we are in the process within each region, including Africa, on identifying exactly the demand that is there in the region in terms of resources, whether human resources in terms of training, in terms of any kind of resources that are needed in those regions.

So I hear you. I acknowledge the humungous size of Africa. I come from Africa myself, and I can see the amount of challenges that we face there.

Thank you.

PUA HUNTER: Thank you, Baher. Yes, Alan?

ALAN SALAHALDEEN: I'm Mr. Alan from Palestine. I have a request [for] Baher. Could you clarify the [structure] and the relation between IANA related to ICANN? We work with IANA. Could you clarify the relationship between ICANN and IANA? Also, could you clarify what's the difference between 2011 and 2016?

Thank you very much.

BAHER ESMAT: I will answer the question in Arabic because it was asked in Arabic. IANA functions are one of the main functions that ICANN is involved with. It's regarding the names and numbers and the unique identifiers. I don't know exactly what it is in Arabic.

IANA was one department among many others of ICANN, which is in the charge of doing specific functions, based on an agreement between ICANN and the Department of Commerce in the United States.

Also, ICANN started on the transition operation until September 30th, 2016, where that contract had been ended. That resulted

out of a long term of consultations between so many specific groups involved in this process.

That also resulted in the formation of the PTI. That is a main structure within ICANN. This is from the technical point of view.

On the relationship between ICANN and the top-level registries, there is still a great deal of cooperation between ICANN and the other parties regarding this transition and the main change that took place in the delegation of the top-level domains.

We used to have one step that the U.S. government gives an approval to check on these steps. Now no longer is this step required, starting from October 1, 2016, as the relationship with the United States government has ended, as I mentioned.

Thank you.

PUA HUNTER: Any other questions from the floor?

Criden?

CRIDEN APPI: Thank you, Chair. My question is on the GAC fellowships. One of the problems from our region is distance. I think I heard you said there are 50 or so GAC fellowships. Is that just for GAC or all of

ICANN? What are the chances of increasing the number of fellowships a bit?

Thank you.

BAHER ESMAT: I'm afraid I'm not familiar with the GAC Fellowship Program. Manal, would you – yeah.

MANAL ISMAIL: I think the GAC has 40 funding opportunities dedicated to the GAC. It's out of the Fellowship Program.

We'll look into it. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Manal. Actually, I think, Criden, your question was for the Fellowship Program, which is different from the travel support for the GAC. So Manal responded on the travel support for the GAC members.

What Baher presented on is the Fellowship Program, which is 50 spots.

Thank you.

PUA HUNTER: If there's no more questions or comments from the floor, we'll move to our next topic on our agenda. In that, I hand over to our moderator, Alice. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you very much, Pua, and thank you, Baher and all the other speakers before, for the great presentations.

I will shift gears a little bit, especially for all of those from governments who've perhaps participated or just come from the ITU WDTC that took place in Argentina. This is a good opportunity to actually try to place ICANN within that broader Internet governance ecosystem. We have a great panel to discuss this with us, each one of them with very great experience, some of them scholars having studied this issue and followed it for quite a number of years and even participated in capacity development in other areas. I'm really pleased to have them with us, especially following the question from Pakistan that was trying to place the GAC within not just the ICANN ecosystem but, I think, the broader Internet governance ecosystem at the global level.

Understanding that Internet governance is really complex, it would be a great pleasure to invite William Drake, Wolfgang Kleinwaechter, Chengetai Masongo, and Nii Quaynor. Each one

of them will give us a really brief presentation with quick questions because we want to make it as interactive as possible.

The idea here is to actually understand where ICANN is placed within the Internet governance system and why it's important for governments from the Middle East and the Newcomers to participate in ICANN and the relationship for people like us working governments have with ICANN.

I'll start off with William Drake. William, you have the microphone. Please.

WILLIAM DRAKE:

Thank you, Alice. Good morning, everybody. I'm pleased to be here in this lovely country. I thank the host and the organizers for making this session happen.

Alice just mentioned the WDTC. Could I just see a show of hands of how many people were in Buenos Aires for the ITU meeting?

Oh, not so many. Okay. A little bit. Okay. So not too much. I'm just curious about the level of crossover we have between people coming to ICANN here and participating in other international institutions.

Well, I guess what I should do as the lead-off is to try to put this in the broadest optic possible and back up to the question of

what the Internet governance ecosystem is about in seven minutes. I guess what I'll do is start by noting that the notion of Internet governance is, of course, a complex one that was debated at great length. When the term started to be bandied around in the 1990s, people were very uncertain. They asked what exactly we were referring to.

When we got into the World Summit on the Information Society process in 2002 to 2005, many governments indeed raised questions about how they saw Internet governance. We saw a lot of differences of view as to whether governance governments or meant something different. There were parties who said, "There's no such thing as Internet governance. The Internet is just this spontaneous combustion of activity," and so on.

It took a lot of time for people to sort through and come to a shared understanding. A number of us, Wolfgang and myself, were on a UN Working Group on Internet Governance that was appointed by Secretary General Kofi Annan, where we developed a working definition of Internet governance, which was included in the Tunis Agenda outcomes and has been repeated ever since then, which basically emphasizes the role of principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures that shape the underlying Internet, infrastructure, and the ways in which it's being used; so both the underlying system and this

usage for transactions, communications, content, commerce, and so on.

This meant that this had a number of different implications. One was that the scope of Internet governance was actually quite broad, that the range of actors involved was quite broad, and that what we were really talking about was not an action taken by any one party, but rather that Internet governance was a shared responsibility, something that was undertaken on a collaborative basis by many different players in an effort to try to steer and direct the development of the Internet. This could be done through public policy, but it could also be done through non-public policy mechanisms, such as the kinds of processes we have here in ICANN.

So it was an important breakthrough, I think, in the thinking: to recognize the breadth of this.

This leads to, then, three top-level generalizations I'll throw on the table for your consideration that we can debate later if we want. One is that the IG ecosystem is an inherently distributed institutional architecture. The issues that have been dealt with by multi-stakeholder processes typically have revolved more around the infrastructure-type aspects, like domain names, IP addresses, technical standards, certain aspects of network security, and so on.

The things that have attracted more intergovernmental participation through multilateral institutions have tended to have to do more with the usage of the Internet, the kinds of rules of the game for processes taking place over the Internet: cybercrime, digital trade, intellectual property, freedom of expression, privacy, consumer protection – all those kinds of questions.

What's important to recognize here is that there's a nexus of cooperative efforts that have developed on a very much bottom-up, demand-driven basis. Different institutional arrangements were created to solve specific problems as those problems came online. This meant that we started to have this galaxy of different types of institutional processes that often we're not deeply intermeshed with each other.

So the challenge has been, over the past 15 years, to enhance the level of coordination and cooperation and mutual sharing amongst all those parties to get to a stable configuration where we all understood that the governance means working with lots of different players in lots of different settings and that no kind of centralized approach, no one-size-fits-all kind of solution, could possibly manage the wide diversity of things that are covered by Internet governance. So that diversity is a very key aspect of the Internet.

Secondly, I think it's worth saying in this context that the notion that there's some sort of a conflict between multi-lateral and multi-stakeholder institutions has been proven to be quite wrong. I think in the early days of this discussion there was a lot of feeling that maybe some things that were being done one way ought to be done in another way and so on. But I think what we've come to understand is that, in fact, multi-stakeholder and multi-lateral work together. They're very complementary to each other. They reinforce each other in a lot of important aspects. I think that this is very important. The years of debate and exploration of these issues really led to a very empirically-based and rich understanding of the extent to which this is true.

It's widely understood that both played different and important roles. Indeed, there's a lot of mutual learning between the two types of institutional arrangements. So you see multi-stakeholder processes have in many ways been improved by learning from what goes on in the multi-lateral intergovernmental settings. You see, conversely, that many intergovernmental settings have started to do more in terms of at least bringing in a layer of multi-stakeholder coordination into their policy process – consultations, not necessarily full multi-stakeholder decision-making the way we do in ICANN, but definitely a higher level of engagement with the broad stakeholder communities than ever existed before. We see this

in the OECD and UNCTAD and the ITU – a lot of different organizations.

So I think this has been very good and self-reinforcing dynamic that has been very healthy for everybody.

Third, I want to say that, for both multi-lateral and multi-stakeholder arrangements, there's a range of models to pick from. The challenge is to get the optimal fit to the problems that you're dealing with. There's no simple solution as to which model works best for which policy problem.

There are areas in the world that pertain to ICTs and the Internet where you have a pure intergovernmental kind of model. Think of, for example, the World Trade Organization process. Then you have areas where the governments take the lead and make the final agreement, but they consult with the private sector a lot on things like the radio frequency spectrum in the ITU, for example. Then you see areas where, instead, governments are in more of an advisory role, working alongside a complex array of different types of communities. That would be the ICANN space.

So all of these different models are on a sort of spectrum in terms of the way they're organized. Each of them, I think, has strengths and weaknesses. Each of them has areas for improvement. Each of them offers different types of things to participants that are very important. They deal differently with

questions of asymmetries of information and knowledge and experience and so on.

The biggest challenge, I think, for everybody is onboarding new participants. I think that, here, ICANN has been making really good progress. I remember the first ICANN meeting I went to as a GNSO Councilor over a decade ago. We were in Nairobi. At that point, the ICANN program was just an Excel sheet. We went to a session on outreach to Africa. I walked into the room, and it was a room full of people that were not from Africa. We were all talking to each other. There were two African colleagues, and I spoke to one. I said, “Why do you think there aren’t many people here?” He said, “Well, there’s just this little box on the program that says “Public Participip.”” He said, “I had no idea that that’s what this would be.”

We’ve learned since then. We have institutionalized a broad range of ways to engage in outreach and so on. The work being done by Tarek and his group and the work being done by Global Stakeholder Engagement and so on has been really, really productive in bringing in a much broader range of players and opening the doors to everybody. So I think we’re seeing real movement going forward, and I think that that’s important.

The bottom line for me is to say that a distributed architecture, a distributed ecosystem, is a necessary and inevitable aspect of

Internet governance and that multi-lateral and multi-stakeholder approaches both play important roles. We now are happily beyond the point of debating which one we like better and are instead moving towards a better and more optimized understanding of the ways in which we can improve both and enhance coordination amongst them all in order to try to serve the global community better. So I think we're in a good place right now.

I'll stop there. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA:

Thank you, Bill, very, very much. Any questions or comments?

Maybe I could quickly say that, as a former GAC member myself and coming from the government of Kenya where they took the multi-stakeholder model and approach extremely seriously, to the point where it's part of our Constitution and it's still quite a challenge, as Bill mentions here, and it's got its own strengths and weaknesses as well as it works in various policy areas. It's not always the solution.

But I must say that it's worked quite well, especially in the ICT sector and you might recall the Internet governance space, in recognition especially of the government recognizing that it's very, very difficult to do ICT for development on its own and the

critical importance of working with all the other stakeholders or the private sector, they're technical community, and civil society and all the others in ensuring that we have an abiding digital economy, but also recognizing that ICANN has a very limited mandate in all of this IG ecosystem so it's sometimes quite confusing for Newcomers in terms of how governments really engage in this process.

And so, I quite like Bill mentioning the important work that the Global Stakeholder Engagement and Government Engagement and the GAC underserved regions, and the GAC generally, has been really working hard towards onboarding new participants and also what we've been talking about in terms of lowering barriers. But any questions for Bill or any additions?

Yes, Kavouss, please. Thank you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you very much and thank you for the presentations. They're quite useful, a brief summary of 20 years of activities.

I sometimes ask myself, is there any multi-stakeholder achievement in practice or is in theory? In my view, the gentleman said cooperation, collaboration and mutual information and knowledge-sharing basis. Yes, we agree with that. But there is one element is footing. Whether the footing of

each of these multi-stakeholder, do they have equal footing? I have learned that no, there is not.

Generally speaking, government is always put in something they call the minority. Yesterday, in the CCWG, they referred to minority views. I said, perhaps, or someone else said, could say dissenting views but not minority. You cannot put government at this multi-stakeholder approach today any other thing. They are a minority for various reasons. But does it mean that their voice should not be heard and acted accordingly? And whatever they said, they said, “Okay, you are minority someone, sometime.” This is a simple minority of the people talking about this. Well, we have to come to this mutual information-sharing collaboration, cooperation. Without equal footing, you cannot.

Sometimes equal footing is a fundamental and principle and kosher. If you come to jurisdictions, jurisdiction is an [inaudible] in the governments only. Any individual belongs to a government of a country. When you come to the [inaudible] of jurisdictions, it is country to country, government to government. But we heard that no. It’s not like that. So government, you may need minority.

So I don’t think that the multi-stakeholder approach or multi-stakeholder model that I agree with, [inaudible] there is no single approach, single model. Never have the reality from the

theory into the practice to put at this government together with the others on the same footing. Also, they take on the government by their nature. They could not have the same possibility of the other people they have. Resources, timing, decision-making, complexity of the arrangement and so on and so forth is not [as that].

So when somebody comes to a meeting from speaking on its own behalf or on behalf of limited group and putting itself or herself or himself at the same footing as the government of several hundred millions of the people, so I don't think that at least in that specific issue, it is an equal footing. So I think we are talking of theory as usual. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you, Kavouss. Bill?

WILLIAM DRAKE: Thank you, Kavouss. It's always great to hear you in the morning.

You asked two questions. One was whether there were any achievements. I'd say, yes, there have been quite a lot of achievements. I think everything we've done has been an achievement. We have managed to grow the global Internet name space and IP address system and maintain the stability

and security of the Internet now since 1998 through this model. So that counts, I think.

I think multi-stakeholder has worked well in contexts like the IETF and now all the other ISTAR bodies, etc. and I think it has worked well also for other kinds of non-decision-making purposes, such as in the IGF.

But on the second question about equal footing and whether governments are in the minority and so on, of course, one of the wonderful things about ICANN, like any international institution is that there's always going to be parties who believe that they are getting less than they deserve or winning less often than they should and other parties are winning more.

I have many colleagues who believe that the ICANN Board has gone too far accommodating the GAC on many points that they think are very important. You wouldn't agree. But this is the nature of the thing. Very often, people have different perceptions about where exactly the balance lies.

But I think the important point to recognize is that multi-stakeholderism doesn't mean that any one party wins or prevails all the time any more than intergovernmentalism does and often, in my experience, when a government was not happy with an outcome, the outcome was not necessarily supported by

all the other parties within GAC. And if the GAC doesn't have unanimity among itself, then it's kind of hard.

It's puzzling when one aggrieved GAC member sits up and says the whole system is broken because I didn't get what I want. There are governments there too that are also not agreeing, so it's a complex issue and it's something we continue to work on, how to accommodate all interests more effectively, and clearly, of course, there's more work to be done but I think that there's good will and commitment on the part of all parties to try to make that happen.

ALICE MUNYUA:

Okay, thank you, Bill. I'm afraid we are running out of time so if you don't mind, I'll invite Professor Wolfgang to make a brief intervention and then we can take more questions. Please. Thank you.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER:

Okay. Thank you, Alice, and thank you, ICANN, for organizing this and I think it's a great opportunity to continue with the discussion so I will not present my prepared statement but I will jump directly into the discussion because it's, as Alice has said, the plan was to have a more interactive debate and I think Kavouss raised some good

questions as the guy from Pakistan also asked the question, what is the role of governments in this intergovernance ecosystem? And I think this is really key questions where we have to be also creative.

As Bill, I was a member of the Working Group on Internet Governance and I remember our first meeting in New York where Kofi Annan gave a good speech. And I remember two key points he made in his speech. It was in the year 2003. The first thing he said, “You cannot wish away history.” So that means the Internet has its own history and it’s an un-useful history. It has grown up.

Certainly, it was originally financed by the U.S. Department of Defense as they wanted to investigate a decentralized communication system as an option. But then finally, it went out of the hands of the U.S. government, into the hands of technical persons and businesspeople and so the whole Internet was built by technical people and by private sector.

When the Clinton Administration realized after the invention of the World Wide Web, it gets bigger and bigger. It said, “Okay, let’s do it on the way of self-regulation. There is no role for government. It’s driven by the business.” And only when the World Summit started and some governments came in and said, “Wait a minute. The Internet is so big. We should have a role.”

And I remember the dispute between the Chinese government and the American government in Geneva when Madam Hoo from China argued, “Oh, private sector leadership was good for 1 million Internet users, but if we have 1 billion, we need now government leadership.” And this was a battle about leadership, who leads.

And I think this was the big invention from the Working Group on Internet Governance that we came up and said, “The Internet does not need leaders. It needs engagement. And you have to bring all stakeholders to the table because all of the stakeholders involved in the process can contribute something to the process. And no stakeholder can substitute the other stakeholder.” Certainly, business cannot substitute the government. The government is a government and it has to play its role, the parliament and the legislation and this will not disappear.

But it will be totally unwise from the government to ignore what the private sector can contribute, to ignore what the technical community can contribute, and also the engagement of the civil society, though the civil society cannot substitute the private sector. The technical community cannot substitute the civil society.

So that means each of the stakeholders have a role and the Internet as a whole will work only if all stakeholders are engaged insofar in their specific roles. It's a useful element in the definition which came out from the work of the working group of Internet Governance and also a reaction to Kavouss's questions. Is this theory or is this practice?

This brings me to the second point, Kofi Annan raised in his speech and he said, "Look, the Internet is a technical innovation. This has created something new we never had before, but policymaking is still done in the old-fashioned way. So that means we need also innovation in policymaking. We have our traditional ways of policymaking, though we have the Roots of Procedures and in the governmental organization, we have all the treaties. And this is okay. And this will not disappear.

I remember a series in the '90s that the nation state will disappear. Today, and also in the 1990s, I had a skeptical approach to this that the nation state will not disappear, but the nation state is embedded in the broader global community and here we have, also, this problem that we have the multi-lateral treaty system, which plays an important role, is now embedded in the broader multi-stakeholder environment. And here, the need for creativity starts.

We are in the very early years of developing innovation in policymaking. We realize that the traditional ways of policymaking as it was done by intergovernmental organization has reached a certain limit. We can achieve something, but a lot of issues remain unsettled if we continue in the traditional way.

I was here in the neighboring Emirate in Dubai in 2012 and Kavouss was over there, where we realized that traditional treaty making is so difficult now that at the end of the day, for the first time in 150 years of history of the ITU, at the end of such a big conference, The World Conference on International Telecommunication, could not achieve a full consensus.

So the question is if the traditional system has reached its limits, can we, at some innovative procedures which will help governments to overcome the inability to build bridges. And I think with additional wisdom, with additional wisdom from, let's say, the academic technical community, with additional resources from the private sector, with additional engagement from the civil society, this will help governments probably to consider some issues in a broader context and to split issues into smaller pieces and to say, here, we can reach consensus; here we can reach rough consensus; here we are unable to agree; let's put this on hold so that means it becomes a very flexible mechanism.

And when Bill says more or less the consensus we have achieved is one size doesn't fit all, but it means we have to build the solution around the issue. And I say if it comes to concrete achievements, the solution we found for the management of the domain name system though is a good, practical example.

So the domain name system with all its difficulties works. We have 350 or nearly 400 million registered domain names. We have 4.5 billion Internet users so every user needs an IP address or uses a domain name, so the system works. This is a big achievement and it works thanks to the multi-stakeholder engagement.

We can look for other issues which are on the horizon. Do you really believe, Kavouss, that the issues, the challenges of artificial intelligence will be managed by intergovernmental negotiations alone? Though certainly we will settle this big issue only if all stakeholders are on the table, if we hear all the wisdom and all the engagement and all the resources. And so far, governments play an important role. Nobody wants to remove the governments to the sideline.

But say a part of the bigger process, we have to discuss on many places and I just want to repeat it again. Once again, two issues. You cannot wish away history and you have to be creative in policymaking and the multi-stakeholder approach is one of

these innovations we have. In policymaking, we are in the early days. We have still more than 80 years to go in the 21st Century so let's look forward and let's be as creative as possible. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA:

Thank you very much, Wolfgang, and I agree with you. We have to think very creatively about how governments engage in this new multi-stakeholder model. But we'll move forward. There was a question from the gentleman and then we can move forward to Chengetai.

SANJAY RAKESH:

Good morning. I am Sanjay Rakesh from India. You are right. Thank you for beautifully explaining how the Internet is grown, but the Internet system has grown thanks to the multi-lateral, multi-stakeholder model in multi-fold. In fact, the growth is exponential and success is credit to all of you.

But the issue is, given the system grows exponential, past cannot be precedence for success in the future. In fact, in the financial market, there is a caveat with such performance in past, there is no guarantee to success in the future.

So now that it has grown exponential and grown beyond the [inaudible] technology and a few people, there is the issue of

deliberate violations, commission of crime in which Internet is used as a tool. And those who commit crime, how does this system propose to do the [coercive] penalization and prevention, which is usually the exclusive realm of governments, but because it has transboundary characters, I haven't found specific mechanism where different players in different countries collaborate and coordinate in multi-stakeholder model to put the criminals and violators to justice. Can you just elaborate? Thank you.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER:

Okay. I think if you go to the last proceedings from the General Assembly of Interpol, and you join Interpol Europol conferences they're organizing on an annual basis, you will find a lot of, let's say, multi-stakeholder engagement where the law enforcement agencies and police have recognized that they need to find the bad guys on the Internet.

The collaboration with the technical community, the collaboration also with the private sector, if you take the proposal from Microsoft with the Geneva Digital Convention which is very controversial, which is now subdivided into three parts, and you look in the middle part of the proposal, there's what's called attribution organization. So you can find, now,

ideas emerging that this cannot be done by governments alone. So that means in the very complicated issue of attribution, so a lot of different parties have different data, and certainly, the intelligence agency, they are not ready to share their secrets with other parties. So these are complicated issues.

But one thing is clear. Nobody alone can manage this issue if it's sitting in this ivory tower. So that means the level, how far you go out, in the concrete detail, you really work hand in hand. What is the role of the various groups sitting on this table? This has to be specified case by case probably. This is much more complex than we had in the past and I agree that the past is a source of inspiration but it will not settle the future problems.

But if we take the input, the inspiration from the past, I have trust that the multi-stakeholder community will find better answers than if you leave it in the hands of just governments which have their national agendas, and as you see, climate change and other things, have difficulties to reach agreement in a short time period. So insofar that we have no alternative for the multi-stakeholder approach.

ALICE MUNYUA:

Thank you, Wolfgang. One last question from Kavouss and then we have to move on. Thank you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you very much, Wolfgang, there. You are a very knowledgeable person. We are working together for many years. You have been 2003 and 2005 and before that, you have been board member. All of you said is absolutely right.

But I said that in practice, the situation is not like that. Domain name, although it is not natural resources, but it something that people should have equitable access. How you could deprive people? When I say government, government is composed of people – but I’m not turned off to 20 minutes or 22 minutes and the prime ministers or presidents – people of the country. How you deprive some people of the country of the whole people to having access to the DNS? A registrar remove. The domain name is saying that I don’t allow you anymore to use that because you’re under OFAC sanction. Not only I remove all of them, I don’t allow you anymore to have any registrations [that though]. This is innovative? What innovation is that? I’m not talking of any government.

So political decisions should not have technical impact on the people of the country. But it has. That is the situation. We are theory, and theory, and theory, so on and so forth. [Inaudible] says that some people, it says that the ICANN run far beyond to give more. Government have nothing to do. Any advice we give,

again, will be more or less, all time comes with the PDP of the GNSO. No, we don't give this advice. Stopped.

So we have, in theory, something even if everything is okay by ICANN Board. But then comes the other part is now. This is against our PDP. That's all. So this is innovative or innovations. This is mutual collaborations. This is cooperations. So I believe that still we are in theory. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA:

Thank you, Kavouss, and I believe this is the right place to continue to actually discuss these challenges and try and find solutions so thank you for bringing this up. But I'm afraid we are running out of time so I'm going to invite Chengetai to speak a little bit about the IGF and I know Bill had raised his hand, so speed up, Chengetai, and then perhaps you can come in. Chengetai, please.

CHENGETAI MASANGO:

Yes, thank you very much, Alice. Yes, I'll be very quick because some of the stuff I wanted to cover has already been covered so that's good.

First of all, I'd like to thank our hosts for inviting me and also you, Alice, and Tarek for organizing this workshop. Thank you.

I'm just going to give a brief overview of what the IGF is. The IGF is another multi-stakeholder process, or we like to call it the other multi-stakeholder process but there are others out there.

So I had some slides. I don't know if they're going to come up. If they don't come up, it's okay. I'll just send them and then we can post them up. They'll come up but I'll just carry on speaking.

So what is the IGF? Yes, next slide, please.

The IGF is a forum for multi-stakeholder dialogue, as you said, and its issue is to discuss public policy issues related to key elements of the Internet and we're here to maximize the opportunity for open and inclusive dialogue and the exchange of ideas on Internet governance, create opportunities to share best practices and experiences, identify emerging issues and bring them to the attention of the relevant bodies and the general public, and also contribute to capacity building for Internet governance. Yes, next slide. It's fine. We work hand in hand with ICANN, with ITU, with a lot of other institutions, especially in the Internet governance ecosystem.

As Bill and Wolfgang have explained, there was a WSIS which was a summit to recognize the need for a broad-based discussion on public policy issues and also to discuss the digital divide issues at that time. And then that summit, when they were discussing Internet governance, the question was, what is

Internet governance? Is it names and addressing or is it broader? So as the UN does, it asked the Secretary General to form a working group on this panel as has been said already. Bill was on the panel. Baher was on the panel. Wolfgang as well, and a number of other people. I think there are some people in this room that were also on the panel.

And they came up with this definition of what Internet governance is which is right there in the middle. The Internet governance is the development and application by governments, the private sector, civil society in their respective roles of shared principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures, and programs that shaped the evolution and use of the Internet. And they recommended to WSIS Phase 2 in Tunis that the Secretary General make a forum for the discussion of public policy issues related to Internet governance and also it has to be a multi-stakeholder forum. And it was quite significant in Tunis because I think it was 97 heads of state endorsed this and endorsed the multi-stakeholder forum within the UN context which is usually multi-lateral.

So they asked the Secretary General to set up the forum and in 2006, the UN Secretary General convened the idea giving it its first five-year mandate and Kofi Annan at that time said that this is a journey into uncharted waters because this had not happened before in the UN context. Next slide, please.

So it's bottom-up, multi-stakeholder inclusive, all stakeholders are involved and act on an equal footing. Usually in the UN, governments sit first and then maybe the private sector and the civil society is up there in the bleachers where they can't be heard. But everybody is on an equal footing. There is no order of speaking. It's first-come, first-served and that is one of the highlights of the IGF. Next slide, please.

The IGF is made up of the Multi-Stakeholder Advisory Group and in that group, we have starting from this year, we're just kind of tightening things up a little bit. We have 20 governments and 10 representatives from each of the other stakeholder groups which is civil society, technical community, private sector, and intergovernmental organizations can come in and participate when they feel like it. They just automatically come.

And then we have the IGF Secretariat which coordinates the overall IGF processes and work. And the stakeholders, of course, we cannot forget those and the IGF's institutional home is under the United Nations Department of Social and Economic Affairs, that's UNDSEA.

Strengths and weaknesses. So the IGF is not a decision-making organization. We try and think of ourselves as following the model of the Internet. I mean, nobody really makes the decisions in the Internet as such when you are producing the

standards, worldwide web, HTML, etc. So some people see the lack of decision-making power as weakness and they want the IGF to produce concrete results. We don't see it as a weakness as such because when people come in, it's to share ideas, it's to share policies. As Bill said, one size does not fit all and we are more into second order effects that people go home and implement what they find interesting or what they find pertinent to their own situation in their home institutions.

And it's a level playing field so you know that if you're negotiating, people change. But if you're not negotiating and you know that it's just a discussion, people are much more free and much more relaxed. And we do see the results of this. I mean, the IGF has been quoted in a lot of other institutions, the G8OECD and during our last mandate, we have a lot of testimonials of people telling us how the IGF has helped them and has helped their countries with the Internet in situations.

We have annual meetings. Much like ICANN, we move around the regions. So next slide. These are the places that we've had the annual meetings and we have two preparatory meetings and every two weeks, we have virtual meetings as well to set out the program and agenda of the IGF annual meeting. Next slide.

We also have our intercessional work. We have best practice forums, gender online, cybersecurity, ISPs, IPv6 for this year,

and we also have connecting the next billions. We have a lot of dynamic coalitions which are three or more stakeholder groups coming together to discuss an issue such as child online safety, block chain technologies, etc. And we have over 91 national and regional initiatives so that's very good because policy implementation, of course, is at the national level and we have quite a big range of national and regional initiatives.

This is the IGF in practice. I'll skip that. You can read it later if you want. And looking ahead, we do have the IGF2717 meeting which is going to be hosted by the government of Switzerland this year and it's under the theme of "Shape Your Digital Future" and it's 18 to 21st of December at the Palais in Geneva, Switzerland. I encourage you all to come. I also encourage you all to visit our website and come and talk to me. I'll be here the whole of this week if you want to know more about the IGF. And we're also trying to involve more governments into our MAG, the Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group. The deadline for submission for nominations is 10th of November and we encourage especially new governments who have not been involved in the IGF to put in nominations.

And one final thing which I forgot to mention is that we are slowly moving towards more concrete outputs such as principles and the best practices as well is one of those things

that we are going step by step to make it a little bit more tangible for those people who want that. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA:

Thank you very much, Chengetai, and thank you for keeping time and for that comprehensive presentation on the Internet Governance Forum which is an important multi-stakeholder platform.

I'm afraid we're running out of time so I'm going to invite Dr. Nii Quaynor to speak. Nii has not only served on several boards in the Internet ecosystem, but he is also well-known as the Father of the Internet in Africa. So Nii, over to you. Thank you.

NII QUAYNOR:

Thank you very much for inviting me to share a few words, and I thank Tarek and company for ensuring that I could participate.

I was fortunate to have been part of a group that predates WSIS actually. I was part of the UN ICT Task Force, also formed by Kofi Annan and that was when the technical community, to some extent, met with the UN. And it was very evident that we could be facing a major digital divide unless all hands were on deck. And hence, the strong sense of collaboration that we seem to seek since that time.

Now I am here to actually supplement what my colleagues have said, but at the same time, appreciate the particular role that nation states play for the expansion of the Internet and also the extended ICANN ecosystem. Let's bear in mind that the Internet grows fastest at the edge and that's where the most impact is also felt based on policies that are [inaudible] in the local environment.

Now aside from GAC and the growth of GAC, there has also been increasingly, an extended, you might say, participation by organizations that are really working with ICANN but are locally-based. And I'll share you no more of examples. And that's why I'm saying that governments are doing something which is worth commendable.

Most governments are running e-government networks and it's nothing other than using the Internet protocols that ICANN [administers]. So governments, nation states are already actively involved in expanding the ICANN ecosystem to their local environment.

Now the same is also true of research networks. Many research networks are actually sponsored, chartered or supported by governments. The intention, of course, is to improve education and research by having private within them networks that are interconnected with other global networks, be it Internet to

[Giant], [inaudible] and so on. So from my point of view, governments are really playing some very interesting role in the expansion of the ecosystem.

The same is true of the open data kinds of initiatives. Governments want to communicate with citizens, and oftentimes, they do so by opening up and sharing data and inviting communities to use the data and add value to it. Now that's collaboration in a way that perhaps we don't see as multi-stakeholder contribution.

The same is, indeed, true even of NOGs. We mentioned MENOG here and I was very happy because Network Operated Groups have a peculiar role of helping build up the capacity at the edge. And all of these groups, to some extent, are extended participants of the ICANN ecosystem.

Now similarly, just as GAC does indeed create communities, these groups are also creating communities and all of them are working within that local and regional environment. And it's about time for us to somehow appreciate that these organizations are really trying to practice the same bottom-up multi-stakeholder process because of the nature of their work and that, therefore, means that we need to be working on strengthening their local ecosystem and that means your participation in that local ecosystem may prove to be very, very

important because they're already there. You have chartered them. You are constructing them and they already are adopting because they have to coordinate a lot of their work. Okay? It requires that everybody knows things. They are very open, and therefore, participation of governments in our local ecosystem has a tremendous advantage from where I sit. They have a peculiar role in reducing the barriers at a local level before it arrives at a global level.

And the more they are strong in participation of these approaches are based on issues, not based on wishes, but based on issues and then addressing them to closure will improve their strength, their capacity and participation at a global level as well.

Let's remember also that these days, the problems are so complex that it is impossible to expect one style of organization to solve them all or even have the ability to understand the issues involved. I mean, it's no longer the way. It used to be small enough that we could all do it, but now I think they've become so diverse, both from the infrastructure point of view as well as from the use and the implications of the use. And so we must really play that role.

Now playing that role does also mean that we have to stick to our rule. If you begin to expand the rule and everybody can say

anything, everybody can do anything, then, of course, you don't have the rules anymore. But the rules are important for the multi-stakeholder approach from where I sit.

Now there are also regional bodies that are doing the same thing. Apart from the national ones, there are regional bodies. You have regional [RENS]. I know, for example, we work closely with ASREN, the Arab States Research and Education Network, and it has similar objectives as the national [RENS] but it's trying to bring them all together for the purpose for interconnection to other global networks.

We also know that there are regional IGF bodies as well. There are regional ccTLD bodies as well and we have regional Internet registries as well. So see how close this thing is to the edge and it's the edge that the thing grows and these bodies all benefit in removing the barriers and collaborating.

The ecosystem is forming already and with your support, even though you may not be seeing it all as together, but you have been supports in all these groups, and that is why I like to commend you for the effort.

But we need to continue to do that and the only answer is more collaboration and more acceptance that we could not have it all, and therefore, need to be appealing for the others to also participate. I think I will close here. Thank you very much.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you very much, Nii. That's a very good wrap-up, the importance of the multi-stakeholder model and working together. And perhaps if there are any, one or two last questions. Yes, Pakistan?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much for a detailed presentation from the speakers. My question is from the IGF representative. How IGF is supporting the member countries [inaudible] in terms of cybersecurity because cybersecurity is a vast subject? Thank you.

CHENGETAI MASANGO: We do have a number of ways. We have best practice forum on security issues. We have many workshops on security and I think we also have dynamic coalitions on security, so that's how we support them. So people can come to the IGF, join our online or intercessional activities and learn more about how to deal with cybersecurity issues and share their experiences.

ALICE MUNYUA: Any other questions? Bill, you had something you needed to. Please, Jorge. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much. I'm from [DRFC], the GAC representative from [DRFC]. My question would be based on the IGF presentation again.

It seems for us, a government representative, a bit difficult to make our policymakers, mainly the ministers, understand the involvement of the government both in this multi-stakeholder model, both in ICANN and in the IGF because sometimes for them it seems to be like a double action. It's a little bit difficult to make them understand that both are different kind of interactions and interest.

What will be the main keywords that you can provide to make them understand that attending both as the stakeholder party would be relevant, and at the same time, they have the feeling that mainly, even if we're ready as we discussed here, that in the ICANN multi-stakeholder model, the government presence or the government stakeholder seems to be a little bit weak or not always very much understood.

But in the IGF, we have the feeling that the decisions, we don't really come out with a very strong decision to make things move. It's as if we keep on attending meetings without really concrete actions. So as advisors to the ministers, what would be the keywords to make them understand the interaction between

both multi-stakeholder models and also, that the IGF also is obtaining main objectives and importance? Thank you.

CHENGETAI MASANGO: Keywords for the IGF, I think the IGF discusses broader public policy issues in connection with the Internet and not to speak for ICANN, but ICANN is mostly the infrastructure, the names, and the Domain Name System.

But keywords, in further enhancing and developing the Internet in one's own country, it is very important to hear how other people have done it. It's very important to hear what are the present issues. What are the issues that are up and coming. We're all at different levels of development and if you're coming from the [DRC], they're earlier on along the track than other people who are more advanced, and they have dealt with issues that you're dealing with now and I think it's very important to hear how they have dealt with it and how you can use their model, modified slightly, and implement it in your country instead of reinventing the wheel again. So those are the keywords that you can use.

Yes, and as I said, I think there is value in not having decisions as such, but learning and sharing best practices and ideas, and agreeing on principles.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you. Jorge, please.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you very much. This is Jorge Cancio from the Swiss government. I just wanted to take the opportunity after Chengetai has introduced to you the IGF, to very kindly invite everyone to take part at the Internet Governance Forum this December in Geneva.

Just to say a couple of words, the IGF this year is really focused dealing with the digital future. It's much beyond the DNS or what are the technical aspects of the critical Internet resources while trying to tackle issues that are as important as the future of the multi-stakeholder governance model, not only for the DNS but the whole range of issues that are rising and emerging with the digitization of our lives.

We are also putting on the focus, the impacts on democracy on our political systems of digitization, both the advantages and also the challenges, be it the new role of the big platforms or what is related to fake news, to political campaigning in the digital world. And of course, there is a wide range of issues that are very important to our political supervisors. I think it's an opportunity to meet people from all the intergovernmental

organizations that are based in Geneva which are going to take very actively part in the IGF, both at the very top level and also the technical experts. And we are trying to attract as many political, business and civil society decision makers and decision shapers. So it's a unique opportunity, really, to be there and not only to attend workshops and sessions where participation is really encouraged, but also to meet in the corridors, in the lobbies, in bilateral rooms, in all kinds of opportunities which, as you will, almost only find in a venue like this, in the Internet Governance Forum. So I'll leave it by that.

I'll distribute some flyers that I have here with me and I'm, of course, very happy to answer any questions you may have together with Chengetai who is really our counterpart in this endeavor of making the IGF 2017 a success. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA:

Thank you, Jorge, for more information and for the invitation. Mark and then Kavouss and then I would like to close by giving the last word to the panelists. But first Mark, then Kavouss.

MARK CARVELL:

Yes, thank you, Alice. Mark Carvell, UK government. I'll be very brief.

Keywords about participation for ministers and policymakers, senior officials and administrations is you've got to be there for better policy. As many governments now have or are developing a digital strategy, you can't do it alone. You've got to do it with your stakeholders and it's all cross-border. You've got to get to an international forum and connect into what's happening elsewhere, secure alignments, get better underpinning for your policy, for your strategy on digital, including Internet governance policy, and those are the keywords. It's better informed policy and more effective solutions through participation in the IGF, here at ICANN in respect to the domain name system evolution, and this all links into digital strategy. It's participating in international fora like this is a prerequisite of effective policy and effective solutions. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA:

Thank you, Mark. Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you, Alice. I think, first of all, I appreciated the distinguished governments of Switzerland organizing the IGF, we are sure that Switzerland have always been taking initiative and expected to improve the situation.

[Madam], I think these days you are talking of results-based budget, results-based management, results-based action. Has there been any tangible output from IGF? If yes, what and how it has been [entered] in the other activities? We believe that IGF is a useful forum that all people, private sectors, civil society, technical people, government and others getting together renew their relations, exchange their views, reestablish their fellowship or enforce and enhance their fellowship, take coffee, tea, receptions, and so on and so forth.

78 or 88 workshops, we would like to see what were or what are the tangible [inaudible] into the basic principle of governments, of the Internet that Wolfgang, one of the persons who drafted the first, among other European countries, this IGF issue when there was a fight between the two parties in 2003, the last days that [inaudible]. Okay, we can't leave it at that, but let's create this to see what we can do and so on and so forth.

So after 11 years, I'm sure that [inaudible] would take a very good initiative, try to inject the idea to the people that now let us have something. I'm not talking of a report nor of a recommendation nor agreed things. Let us have something which contributes to what we expected from that. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you, Kavouss and I know that Wolfgang wants to respond so what I'm going to do with this because I'm afraid we are running out of time is to allow all of the panelists to give their last word, and I'll start with you, Wolfgang, and then move on to Nii, and Bill, and Chengetai. Wolfgang, please.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Okay, Kavouss, you have to remember the history and indeed, it was the intention that the IGF should not become a negotiation body because it was absolutely clear when we give a decision-making capacity to the IGF, we would close the minds and mouths of the participants. Having no negotiations has indeed opened the minds and mouths, but this has created the problem, what is the output? What you said, just coffee, tea and reception, it's not enough. So I introduced and some other people also introduced a middle way, not really negotiations with resolutions and recommendations, but to send out messages. We have done this in the European context, so the European IGF produces after every annual meeting, a set of so-called messages to governments, private sectors, civil society. Messages is not a decision or a recommendation you have to do it, but this is a push. Take this into account if you draft policies.

And the second point, which you have to understand is that we have so many organizations with the mandate to take decisions so that means to have another decision-making body would duplicate the work of others. We have now the issue of e-commerce. We have the WTO. Will they come? They have a mandate to make decisions. If they are unable to agree, then probably can enhance their constitution and to invite more stakeholders.

But if you would delegate decision-making on [e-trade] to the IGF, this would end in a disaster so that means you have to see the IGF more as a clearinghouse which sends messages to the bodies which have a decision-making capacity and then you can organize pressure, the disorganization with a mandate, take the decisions, or change or broaden their approach to, let's say what you said the theory, sharing the decision-making with other stakeholders which is the most complicated part ahead of us. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you, Wolfgang. Nii, please.

NII QUAYNOR: Yeah. Okay, from my perspective, sometimes participation in the process is worth much more than the outcome, especially in the

example cited by Wolfgang where the decision is being made elsewhere so that when we come together and we can freely talk, we try to help you, the decision maker in this case, understand the nuances well enough so that when you go into the right forum, you can make those decisions. The same will apply to the technical community.

Once they get to hear what the concerns are in the technical realm, you will begin to see they are reacting to having setting technical notions about privacy and so on and so forth, which perhaps, some of that time was not an issue of concern. So coming together is worth much, much more. Having said that, I'm also suggesting that it is not possible for one organization to have all the skills these days so even discussing this subject means that we'll be here forever.

However, if we open up so that we can learn from others and come with a technique of taking a collaborative approach in determining what the real essence is and acting on them, we may make much better progress. I repeat. I think nation states have supported the expansion of the ICANN extended ecosystem into the environment, meaning countries have multiple groups working on different aspects of their information society and that's probably a very good place to practice these discussions and taking decisions in the respective organizations then becomes very natural to work the same issue at the regional

level and then when we get to the global level, we are much better prepared and closer to helping the decision makers make the right decision. Thank you.

WILLIAM DRAKE:

On the IGF, I think I would emphasize to the minister, the value of collective learning which I have seen a great deal of taking place through these processes, I've seen people adjust their perceptions of issues, their knowledge base and so on, by virtue of interaction that they wouldn't have had otherwise in ways that were meaningful and consequential. I've seen issues become institutionalized that became then part of the broader global agenda that was being taken up in a number of different environments.

I know, for example, I remember I did, for four years, I organized workshops on Internet governance for development and people kept saying "IG for D, what does this mean?" And then we finally organized main sessions about it and then we started to have a whole bunch of people within the IGF that were focused on this issue, and that then fed into discussions here and so on, which takes me to the next point. And it goes back to what Wolfgang said, the feeding into other places. IGF is a place, a clearinghouse type environment, where, indeed, a lot of ideas percolate, get tried out, tested on different communities,

whatever else, refined, and then brought into other environments where actually decision-making and work programs and so on can be pursued in a more structured setting.

And the multi-dimensional aspect of it, the fact that you can look at issues from a broad range of perspectives because you are getting one-stop shop access to a lot of Internet specialists who have a wide variety of different backgrounds. I mean, you're going to get the security people, the trade people, the intellectual property people, the privacy people, the technical people. They're all there and you can connect with them. You can build coalitions with them. You can put together groups that will help you devise solutions, etc. and you can see problems in a different and broader way than you would in a lot of other environments.

So I think the IGF, actually, is quite invaluable as a supplement to other types of activities. It has value in itself but it also adds value to participation in other spaces to the point of [simply we're] going to make. The gentleman before asked about any multi-stakeholder responses to cybercrime and so on. It's worth remembering that we have computer emergency response teams around the world who partner together in group called firsts who are often not governmental in origin, who play a very crucial role in dealing with cyber attacks. We have a massive

industry that has grown up all around the world dealing with lawful intercept of messages, of working with people in organizations that are under attack and in strengthening their infrastructures and in helping them deal with problems and so on.

Those are more private sector than multi-stakeholder, but some have got multi-stakeholder components as well. The main point is that the topography of dealing with Internet security issues broadly defined, whether it's network security or information security, whether you're talking about cybercrime or information warfare or whatever, is highly distributed, even more so than the general IG environment and you've got a lot of actors working in a lot of different ways, both programmatically and rule-making, in both the public sector, the private sector, multi-stakeholder settings and they're all part of the soup. Whether that soup is sufficient or needs some more salt and pepper, some more structure to it, this is an ongoing debate. But there is quite a lot out there now and involves a significant stakeholder component.

CHENGETAI MASANGO: I'll just say very quickly, in 2010 and 2015, we did have a review process where people came up and gave testimonials why they thought the IGF was useful and their reports are available on the

IGF website. And these reports also resulted in part for the General Assembly to renew the IGF's mandate for five and now for ten years. So those are available.

ALICE MUNYUA:

Thank you very much, Nii, Wolfgang, Bill and Chengetai for those very comprehensive presentations that have encouraged quite spirited discussions, which I believe some of the ideas and issues that have been brought up should continue to be discussed at various spaces, not just at the GAC and the ICANN space, but actually in a broadly, the Internet Governance Forums and spaces, not just the IGF but others that have been mentioned.

I would like to thank Tarek, especially, and my government engagement colleagues for planning this critical session and I hope we can continue with all the other workshops because it's an important one in terms of placing ICANN within the broader Internet governance ecosystem. And to thank the Government Stakeholder Engagement for all the support.

Right now, I think we don't have that much time. If we could break for only about ten minutes for coffee and then we go straight on into another very critical session, understanding the GAC and how the GAC works, GAC working methods, and working groups, and how it works with other constituencies. So ten minutes. Coffee is right behind so please only ten minutes

and then we get back and start the session on the GAC. Thank you so very much.

BAHER ESMAT:

Okay. We need to get started. May I ask everyone to take their seats? Can everyone please take their seats? Thank you.

Okay, thank you. We're going to carry on with the next session. This session will be more about the GAC, how the GAC works, the cross-community work within ICANN, interactions with the ICANN Board, and I'm glad to be joined by Khaled Koubaa, ICANN Board Director and Manal Ismail, Vice-Chair of the GAC.

There was a question in the previous session about IANA functions and the PTI, so this is also something Khaled is going to cover. So I'm going to start with Khaled to give us a quick overview about the IANA transition and then we'll go to Manal to hear more about the GAC. Khaled?

KHALED KOUBAA:

Thank you, Baher. Good morning, everyone. Can I ask the team, please, to put the presentation on? No presentation? Okay, one minute.

So in the meantime, I would be more than happy if everyone come back to our side, please. So for those who don't know me,

my name is Khaled Koubaa. I'm from Tunisia. I was appointed as a board member by the NomCom since last year and here we have the presentation. Thank you, team.

So I will be going a little bit fast because I know that there is different other questions that we need to answer there but because there were a few questions about the IANA transition, we wanted to have those slides available for you. Can I have the next slide, please?

So I will be talking about two things in that presentation. The first one would be the IANA stewardship transition, but before that, let me explain a little bit what is the IANA function, if we can have the slide in a better way to see the title, please.

So the IANA function, in fact, has three main functions, the names, the numbers, and protocol parameters. Those functions include the coordination of the assignment of technical Internet protocol, the administration of certain DNS root zone management and the allocation of IP addresses.

Obviously, the ICANN was created to perform that IANA function from the beginning and did so for 15 years with a no-cost contract between the ICANN and Department of Commerce. The next slide, please.

The transition of the IANA function to the global community was really an unprecedented multi-stakeholder effort and this chart, in fact, explains a little bit how [inaudible] through two different paths. The first path is the stewardship of the transition by a coordination group and the second path was a path to enhance the ICANN accountability after the transition and was coordinated by Cross-Community Working Group. That effort is really unprecedented because the numbers are huge, more than 800 working hours in meetings, 33,000 total mailing list exchange, 600 calls and meetings. Those numbers explain something. It's that the multi-stakeholder effort may succeed to [relay] something. One of the questions in the previous session was about the success of the multi-stakeholder. I think the IANA transition is one of the success stories that we can be proud of. Can we have the next slide, the one after?

So one of the outputs of the IANA transition is the creation of the public technical identifiers which is, in fact, an affiliate of ICANN and the PTI is now responsible to perform the IANA functions under contract with ICANN. So as you can see here, there is a contract that is between ICANN and PTI and the contract is for implementations of the IANA function. Next slide, please.

So the PTI is a separate entity. It has its own board with five directors with CEO with staff that was in the past from ICANN, officer, staff has its own organization with an annual budget and

a strategic plan, and it's a non-profit legally created in California. Next slide, please.

This slide shows that, in fact, different things stayed the same, almost. So from a consumer perspective, nothing has changed but we are performing the IANA function now in a different methodology after the transition. Next slide, please.

So the PTI here came in the ICANN ecosystem and it is part of the mission of ICANN which is domain names, the numbering and the protocol parameters and where we can see that the PTI is contacting mainly function at the domain names and the numbering resource. Next slide, please.

I will not go into details on those two slides, this one and the next one, but I want to stress on a very small box. It's called the CSC. The CSC stands for Customer Standing Committee. This is a very important committee in ICANN. It's the committee that is responsible to monitor the PTI work on behalf of the consumers of the Internet and global.

There are details that will be available later on, on the slide, that you can see about the relationship between the ITF and PTI, and the next slide, please. You can see, as well, the details of relationship between the regional registries and PTI. Next slide.

The other part, one of the most important parts, in fact, of the IANA transition is the creation of what we call the Empowered Community. And the Empowered Community is, in fact, let's say it's a solution or it created the capacity of the community to hold the ICANN accountable. And to do that, it has different powers.

As you can see here, the main power it has is it can remove ICANN Board, it can approve or reject the budget, it can intervene, do inspection, approve any fundamental bylaws. We had already done that in the last ICANN meeting in Johannesburg where we had the Empowered Community approving the change that we introduced in the fundamental bylaws by creating the Board Accountability Mechanism Community. That was the first time, in fact, that the Empowered Community intervened in any action and it has exercised its power. Next slide, please.

So the Empowered Community, or the EC, intervened. In fact, in a very large way because it includes all of ICANN SOs and the At-Large and the Governmental ACs and everyone can participate in the Empowered Community. Next slide, please.

This is my last slide. It will explain a little bit the steps of the escalation of the process. Until now, we have not seen it in practice. I hope we will not but it's a process that was made in a way that it preserves the capacity of the community to act but

act in a very informed way and in a very respectful way for the mission of the ICANN. As I said, I'm sure the slides would be available for you later on and if there is any question, we would be happy, myself and the team, to answer any questions. Thank you so much.

BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Khaled. I think we can proceed to Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Baher, and thanks, Khaled. Can we have the slides please?

Okay. So actually, the slide that was planned for a bigger session but we'll try to go through all the slides. But if not, then you'll have them for later referencing.

If we go to the next slide, for the outline, so we'll try to quickly introduce the GAC, its role, working methods, working groups, how the GAC participates in the Empowered Community, in inter-constituency activities, bilateral working groups, cross-community efforts, and finally, provide a few highlights from the agenda of this meeting as well as some links to get you engaged.

So going to the following slide, please, the GAC, as you all know, stands for Governmental Advisory Committee, established in

1999 and is considered the voice of governments and intergovernmental organizations in ICANN’s multi-stakeholder structure, and it mainly provides advice to ICANN Board on issues of public policy.

The membership of the GAC constitutes 173 governments as members and 36 intergovernmental organizations as observers. Both members and observers participate equally in all discussions, but only members are eligible to voting which normally takes place only during elections.

The GAC leadership is comprised of the GAC Chair who is normally elected by members. Currently, he is Mr. Thomas Schneider from Switzerland who was with us during the opening of this workshop. We have up to five Vice-Chairs also elected by GAC members. Currently, those are China, France, Peru, UK and Egypt. Vice-Chairs are to come from different regions to the extent possible and the Chair and the Vice-Chairs, we sometimes refer to them as CVC, are collectively referred to as the GAC leadership. The term of the GAC Chair is two years with a maximum of two consecutive terms, and the term of the Vice-Chair is one year also with a maximum of two consecutive terms. The GAC leadership elections result will be announced under Agenda Item 19, and we’re trying to link what's presented here with the agenda items of the GAC schedule this week, so we’ll be

referring to the relevant agenda items throughout the presentation.

So the GAC is provided support from ICANN support staff and also from independent secretariat provided by ACIG and funded by some GAC members. Unfortunately, due to lack of funds, services of the independent secretariat may be terminated after the Abu Dhabi meeting, and again, this is an item under discussion under Agenda Item 4.

So the role of the GAC, the key role of the GAC is to provide advice, as we said, to ICANN Board per ICANN Board request or on its own initiative. It provides advice on issues of public policy, especially where there may be interaction between ICANN's activities or policies and national laws or international agreements.

So this is the description of GAC advice. The text of this description will be adopted here at this meeting, again under Agenda Item 17. I won't get through reading the text for the sake of time. You already have it. And this is an output of a joint working group between the GAC and the board.

So per ICANN bylaws, GAC advice is duly taken into account by ICANN Board, and GAC works to provide GAC consensus advice. The GAC usually conveys its advice in the form of a communiqué issued at the end of each GAC meeting, and this is a reference to

the drafting sessions of the GAC communiqué. But in practice, the GAC also produces other various forms of written advice to the board, including letters signed by the GAC on behalf of the board, overarching principles, issue documents and other written communications.

So those are the types of GAC advice. GAC consensus advice, which is understood to mean the practice of adopting decisions by general agreement in the absence of any formal objection, and there is GAC advice which is advice that enjoys broad agreement but receives one or more formal objections. And again, I have to note here that the exact threshold here is still under discussion, but also, failing to reach consensus or broad agreement, the full range of views are conveyed to the board. But I have also to say that the GAC has been working to provide GAC consensus advice, which has been the case up until now in our communiqué.

If we go to the following slide – yes, thank you – it's raising formal objections. And again, this is also under discussion this week under Agenda Item 5. So if only we have one objection or a small number of objections – and again, the suggested threshold here is three, but it's still under discussion – it is proposed that the GAC either approves a GAC advice by broad agreement because we have a number of objections, or if it is only one

formal objection, then allow some time to discuss the issue and see if other GAC members would support this objection.

If this objection is supported by more members, then again this would be considered GAC advice by broad agreement. If not, then this one objection would have lost its blocking power, and advice would be considered GAC consensus advice. Again, this is being discussed here at this meeting, and I hope you participate to those discussions throughout the week.

This is how the new bylaws are written on expected reaction of the board. And when I say new bylaws, this means the bylaws post IANA transition which was just explained by Khaled. So the bylaw says that the advice of the GAC on public policy matters shall be duly taken into account both in formulation and adoption of policies. In the event that the board determines to take an action that is not consistent with GAC advice, it shall so inform the GAC and state the reasons why it decided not to follow the advice.

Any GAC advice approved by full Governmental Advisory Committee consensus – understood again to mean without any formal objections – is referred to as GAC consensus advice and may only be rejected by a vote of no less than 60% of the board. And the GAC and the board will then try in good faith and in a

timely and efficient manner to find a mutually acceptable solution.

So this is how it's written. The following slide, I tried to sketch a flowchart just to make things maybe a little bit visual and easier in understanding, but if it doesn't serve the purpose, you can just refer to the text. This is a reference.

So going to the following slide, now we're talking about working methods. Let me just pause here quickly if we have any questions. And if not – yes, [Salem,] please.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] Internet Society. Can you go back to the flowchart? Because I didn't understand this.

MANAL ISMAIL: The text?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, because at the end, the policy – are you talking about another policy or the PDP process? Because a PDP process has its own ways to become a policy. So how could the board of ICANN – or the GAC through the board of ICANN – change that PDP process, that policy process?

MANAL ISMAIL:

So this is GAC advice to the board and how the GAC advice is being reacted to by the board, what is the procedure if the board rejects GAC advice and what is the threshold for rejecting GAC consensus advice. And as you rightly mentioned, sometimes when the GAC advice comes at a very late stage, this makes problems at a later stage. So that's why we're trying to work on GAC early engagement in the GNSO PDP so that we can sort things very early, at early stages. So by the time it's being finalized, there are no surprises, and we'll get to this also.

So if the GAC advice is consensus advice, then the board is obliged to have 60% objections only to not to follow the GAC advice. Otherwise, they have to follow the GAC advice. And if they do not follow the GAC advice, they have to work with the GAC to find the mutually acceptable solutions. So this is the weight of the consensus advice.

So if we go to the following section on – yes. So the GAC sets its own operating principles. The current operating principle dates back to 2011. They were slightly amended in Buenos Aires in 2015 to allow for five vice-chairs. Previously, we had only three. Then slightly amended again in Johannesburg to allow for electronic voting. And currently, the overall GAC operating procedures are under review, and this is Agenda Item 29 on the GAC schedule at this meeting. So the following slide, please.

Those are the current sections we have under the operating principles, which is currently being reviewed, the scope, the membership, the working methods, meetings, leadership, elections, advice to the board, interaction with the community, participation in the Empowered Community, secretariat and revision of operating principles. Can we go to the following slide, please?

So the GAC works intersessionally on priority issues, either over e-mail or through conference calls, and compiles the meeting agenda typically over two conference calls, which is circulated in advance of the meeting along with the necessary briefs related to the different agenda items.

During the GAC meetings – if we go to the following slide – we have three face-to-face meetings a year. All GAC meetings are open by default, and this is a radical change in how the GAC used to work before. Now all meetings are open. Still, the GAC can hold a closed meeting if deemed necessary. We have real-time interpretation in six UN languages, plus Portuguese, and we also have remote participation available at all meetings.

At the end of each meeting, the GAC produces a communiqué including advice to the board, and sometimes also follow-up on previous advice to the board, as well as reporting on internal matters and interconstituency activities. And some specific

topics of interest to the GAC also sometimes are included in the GAC communiqué. Previously, we had a permanent item on IANA transition, and now a permanent item on participation in the Empowered Community. The communiqué as well as the minutes of the meeting, the transcription, recording of all open meetings are posted online.

The current working groups we have – can we go to the next slide, please? So the working groups are created as deemed necessary. They focus on issues of substance or administrative issues. Each has an agreed terms of reference. Leads and participants are volunteer GAC members. The working group may have a dedicated mailing list, separate face-to-face meetings or their own conference calls. The working groups also provide necessary briefs for face-to-face meetings and provide regular reporting to the GAC plenaries. Some are ongoing working groups, like for example the Underserved Regions Working Group, and others are closed as soon as they achieve their mandate.

So if we go to the following slide, this is a listing of active working groups. On substance, we have a working group on underserved regions as mentioned before. We have another working group to examine protection of geographic names. We have a third working group on public safety, and we have a fourth working group on human rights and international law.

And again, what's between brackets is references to the sessions of those working groups.

We have other working groups on administrative issues, and those include GAC Working Group on Participation in NomCom, GAC Technology Task Force to Create a new GAC Website, GAC Working Group on Revisions of the GAC Operating Principles, and finally, a newly formed Steering Group on GAC Participation in the Empowered Community.

So now to the Empowered Community, if we can go to the following slide. So as Khaled just mentioned, this is the mechanism in the new ICANN bylaws through which the community is empowered to exercise a list of nine powers to make ICANN accountable. I will not go through the list again. I think you have them for your reference, and Khaled has gone through this before. So if we can go directly to the following slide where the GAC has decided to be a decisional participant.

So the GAC has the formal obligation under the new bylaws to receive and initiate petitions, participate in the conduct of community calls and forums, and support, reject or abstain from a collective exercise of one of the new powers.

The community communicates its decisions through the Empowered Community administration which is made up of the chairs – or their representatives – of decisional participants from

the different SOs and ACs, the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. So far, the GAC agreed to be represented by its chair in the interim until the final discussions are finalized.

So the general principles for GAC participation is to adopt a flexible approach and make changes as necessary, have a clear, consistent, predictable and transparent process in taking and documenting decisions, engage in issues with public policy implications, participate in early stages with a view to assisting resolution of the issue, and approach each case on its merits.

I have to stress again that this is under discussion here at this meeting, so please be involved in the discussions. This is by no means a final thing. Can we go to the next slide, please?

So this is the escalation process. We have petition, conference call, community forum and then the exercise of community powers. And as I mentioned earlier, this is Agenda Item 5 on the GAC agenda. So the GAC participation at the early stages, one to three, the proposed procedures are just first to know that these stages are designed to expose an issue and resolve it without recourse to formal community powers. Active participation of course is desirable in support of resolving such an issue.

We have to allow for some flexibility for issue resolution rather than exercising the powers. And if GAC consideration is required, GAC leadership will submit a proposal to the GAC with one of the

bylaws options, either to support, object or abstain. The proposal will be subject to GAC discussions over e-mail, and if there are objections, this will trigger full GAC discussion through a conference call. And if no acceptable solution is found, the GAC will abstain. If the GAC doesn't participate at these early stages, it may still monitor developments with the assistance of the secretariat.

At stage four, the proposed procedures are to exercise a community power – I mean this stage is for exercising a community power which is significantly different from other stages. The GAC members' views will be actively sought by the GAC Chair. Consensus position will be sought also on the basis of a draft proposal, again prepared by the leadership to the GAC either to support, object or abstain.

The proposal will be subject to GAC discussions, again over e-mail. If there are objections, then this will trigger a conference call. And if GAC position is not possible, again, the GAC will abstain.

The following slide is how a request for the GAC to submit a petition, what is the process for this. So as a decisional participant, the GAC can initiate the escalation process by submitting a petition. Only GAC members and observers are allowed to submit a request for the GAC. The GAC leadership

examines the request and proposes a course of action, again subject to discussion within the GAC. And if no acceptable solution is found, a decision will be made at the following GAC plenary.

So now it is the GAC within the wider community. I'm not sure, Alice, would you like to take over from here? And before I give over to Alice, do we have any questions? So if not, then Alice, would you like?

ALICE MUNYUA:

Thank you very much, Manal. And just to remind everyone that this is an important workshop, especially for Newcomers. So if you have any clarifying questions or you'd like to comment, please go ahead. And Baher is chairing. So yes.

In terms of ICANN Supporting Organization, I think as mentioned earlier during the multi-stakeholder, the Internet governance ecosystem, ICANN supports and works within the multi-stakeholder model and so we have various what we call Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees that work within their specific mandates.

We have the Generic Name Supporting Organization, the Country Code Name Supporting Organization, the ASO, the Address Supporting Organization, and the At-Large called ALAC,

Security and Stability that looks at the Security, Stability and the Resiliency, as well as the Root Server System Advisory Committee, and of course the GAC that Manal has very ably and comprehensibly explained its work and working methods.

I'm not sure whether we have the time to go deeply into some of the Advisory Committees and Supporting Organizations. Perhaps what I'll do is leave it here, and if we have any questions regarding any of them and the relationship with the GAC – because we're going to go into that, especially very specifically how the GAC works with the GNSO, the GAC works with the ccNSO and all of these Supporting Organizations. But this is just briefly the four Advisory Committees and the three Supporting Organizations. So, any questions on those before we delve more deeply into the bilateral activities we have with these Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees? So then no questions, I'll hand over back to Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL:

So the following slide describes – if we go to the following slide – it's the Board GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group. This is a joint working group between the board and the GAC. This working group was initially formed to look into the GAC-related recommendations of the first Accountability and Transparency Review Team and then extended for the same task

for the second ATRT. And it was recently reconvened with the mandate of looking into and reviewing effectiveness of GAC advice.

So far, the outputs of this joint working group is the description of what constitutes GAC advice, as well as regular GAC Board post-communicé exchange which takes place after each meeting and which actually turned to be very useful.

If we go to the following slide, this is just the agenda of the board GAC meeting at this meeting here. We have six questions so far that we've already conveyed to the board and will be the subject of our discussion with the board. Again, I won't go through them one by one. You will have them for your reference, and I'm sure you already have received them over e-mail as well.

So if we go to the following slide, the one – yes, thank you. So this is the GAC-GNSO consultation group. And back to your question, [Salem], this is a working group that was formed to explicitly look into the early engagement of the GAC in the GNSO policy development process.

So this working group has concluded its work, but it had a few recommendations, and those include having a GNSO liaison to the GAC, having a GAC quick look mechanism to facilitate GAC early engagement in early phases of the GNSO PDP, have regular updates provided to the GAC, and also, we have joint GAC-GNSO

leadership meetings prior to each ICANN meeting just to synchronize our work. So the following slide on GAC participation in PDPs. Would you like to take that?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You can go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL: I'll go ahead, okay. So those are PDPs of interest to the GAC. The IGO/INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanism, the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures, and these have five work tracks. The review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms, the next generation gTLD Registration Directory Services, and finally, the retirement of ccTLDs.

And we have to note that we do not have enough GAC participation on those PDPs which is really needed to help convey any concerns or shape the decisions early within the process. So more organized GAC participation is needed in those PDPs, and others of interest as well.

So I'm sure we have other GAC colleagues in the room, and they may chime in of course at any time. So we have bilateral meetings with the GNSO, the ccNSO and the ALAC. Again, I will not get into the details for the sake of time. The first part is the agenda of the meeting here, and the second part will be other

topics of common interests. So this is the GAC-GNSO agenda. The following slide has the GAC-ccNSO agenda with reference to the relevant session as well, and the following is the GAC-ALAC agenda for this meeting.

So if we continue, please, for cross-community efforts. So quickly, we have some guidelines for GAC participation in cross-community efforts, if we can go to the next slide, please. So the GAC may wish to participate as a chartering organization, and if so, as a chartering organization, the GAC may appoint members to the cross-community working groups. Typically, we nominate five members and may choose to appoint a co-chair.

Other GAC members can still participate as participants or observers, and GAC members and participants typically represent their individual governments' views. But of course, if there is a GAC consensus position, then it should be referenced through the discussions. So the following slide.

Again, those are expectations, and those are agreed expectations of GAC-appointed members. Normally, they have to participate actively and report regularly, seek feedback from members and coordinate with other GAC members or participants who are participating to the same CCWG. So if we can move on to the following slide.

Again, the expectations from GAC participants. Similar to GAC members, they have to participate actively and coordinate with other GAC members, but they do not have the obligation of reporting back and making GAC briefs.

So moving on, again for the sake of time, this is a listing of GAC participation in community efforts whether previous cross-community working groups. We have the IANA transition as Khaled mentioned earlier, the ICG, the CCWG on the names part, the CCWG on Accountability, the Work Stream 2, the PTI Customer Standing Committee, the Cross-Community Work Track 5 on geo names which is just starting. Also cross-community on auction proceeds, and the ongoing Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance.

The following slide lists, again, GAC participation in specific reviews, and those are reviews that were mandated in the contract with the Department of Commerce, but post-IANA transition they are now moved to the new ICANN bylaws. And again, the GAC has been participating across all of them.

So moving to the Abu Dhabi agenda, those are the cross-community sessions, and they are of interest again to the GAC, and I hope you can find the time to attend those cross-community sessions. And the following slide provides a few

highlights on some GAC agenda items. If we go to the following slide.

So again, we have a discussion on the .amazon independent review panel final declaration, ICANN jurisdiction, the subsequent procedures, the WHOIS and the RDS, and the GDPR, and those are under Agenda Items 22 and 37. Again, the IGOs and the INGOs, the Red Cross protections, DNS abuse mitigation, and finally and most importantly – and maybe it relates very well to our workshop today – is lowering barriers to community participation.

And the GAC has been leading this topic within the ICANN, and in fact, we have it on all our mutual bilateral meetings with the other SOs and ACs. So I hope you can participate again on how we can lower barriers to community participation. So the following slide just provides a few links for you to get started and try to get engaged. And I'll pause here for questions, and over to you, Baher.

BAHER ESMAT:

Thank you, Manal, and thank you, Khaled, for your valuable presentations. So we still have maybe five minutes, and we can take one or two questions before we proceed to the closing. I can see that Cherine Chalaby is already in the room. So any questions or comments on either the IANA transition part and

PTI that Khaled presented, or on the GAC? Okay, I can see Kavouss, and I can also see someone in the back. So let's take the question from the back first, and then we'll come to you, Kavouss.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I have a question regarding the relationship between the PTI and the ISO. I do not understand what the link is between the two.

BAHER ESMAT: As far as I understand, the relationship between the IANA function in general, which is now carried out by PTI, and ISO is in relation to the ISO list or the ISO lists that contain the country codes. So in order for IANA to be able to delegate a country code top-level domain, this code must be included in the ISO list of country codes. This relationship as far as I know has not changed since IANA was a department within ICANN towards the new development of having PTI conducting or undertaking the IANA function.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you very much, Baher. I think perhaps I should complement what you said before raising my question to Manal. You said that if PTI include the ccTLD into the ISO, it should do something. I think it's not inclusion. Any action in that regard

should be in conformity with ISO, but not separate from that, because that is prevailing. So this is not to include without any coordination. So should be in conformity with what ISO has already been put into or several category alphanumeric. So we have to just perhaps clarify that. That is one thing you may [inaudible] later on. My question was –

BAHER ESMAT:

Kavouss, just to clarify. Sorry. I'm not sure how you got my answer. All I said is IANA does not – or PTI does not – add any country code to the DNS root unless this country code is included or available in the ISO. So what you said is correct. The ISO list has to be there, and it comes before IANA can take any action on the specific country code.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. Now it's correct. The way you reexplained it is correct. Thank you very much. Now, my question was that, Manal, you mentioned that there is a cross-community working group on geographic names, right?

MANAL ISMAIL:

It's a cross-community Work Track 5 on geographic names. It's part of the PDP on new gTLD subsequent procedures.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: This is not a separate cross-community working group on geographic names.

MANAL ISMAIL: No.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: It's Track 5, work of new gTLD PDP. This is what you... Okay, thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Exactly.

BAHER ESMAT: Thank you. Any final questions or comments before we close this session and proceed to the closing session? I can see none. Okay, thank you very much for joining us, and I'd like to invite Cherine Chalaby and Tarek Camel to join the panel. Thank you. Thank you for our speakers, Manal and Khaled. Thank you.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you very much, Cherine, and thank you very much, everyone. Very honored to have Cherine here, and so I'd like to

hand over this session to moderate and chair this session to Mr. Tarek Camel. Tarek, please.

TAREK CAMEL:

Thank you very much, Alice, and I'm glad to participate in the closing ceremony. And I will delay my remarks after Cherine starts his remarks. But let me introduce him. Cherine Chalaby is our board member since 2010. Yes. And good news also that he is our incoming board chair by the end of this week. For the first time, we have a board chair for ICANN from the region, so this is great news. Definitely.

And Cherine has been very active in the business community for several decades. I will not say how long. As such, in Egypt, but also in the Middle East, here in the UAE very specifically and in Dubai as well as in Europe he has extensive experience in the area of governance in general and also related to the area of Internet utilization and ICT as such. So we are glad that he was able to take 15 minutes out of his busy schedule and share with us. Definitely, when I asked him, he said, “This is my region and I need to be definitely with the GAC community for my region.” So we welcome him and ask him to take the floor. Cherine, please.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Sabah alkhayr and good morning, and bonjour. I heard some people speaking in French too. So I'm really delighted to be here. I wanted to touch quickly upon the succession from Steve Crocker, because I think this is important to the community. And I have to say it is a great honor personally for me and a great sense of deep responsibility. But it isn't about me, really. It is about the maturity of ICANN.

This is almost a follow-on from the transition. The moment has come where the [board felt] that ICANN has matured, its legitimacy established, and that it felt free to appoint a professional like myself who doesn't come from the long line of Internet pioneers. And frankly, that freedom of choice is priceless, and I think it should be preserved. And I have to thank the board, and I think the community for its support. And I'm very encouraged by the quality of the board and look forward with a lot of enthusiasm and hope for the challenges ahead, and we will rise to the challenges. So I just wanted to say those few words about the succession because a lot of people have been asking me, and I thought probably start with that and address that as an issue.

I am very pleased to be here in Abu Dhabi, and obviously in the Middle East. This is where I come from, where I belong, and I'm delighted to be amongst you all. And I wanted to thank particularly our host, the UAE government, and Mr.

Abdulrahman Al Marzouqi from TR for all the efforts they have made. And you've been a very gracious host. And thank you so much.

So this is the first capacity building workshop targeting GAC members in the Middle East. It is also the first ICANN public meeting hosted in the Gulf. And I'm already looking forward to coming back again, so hopefully, we'll have another one in the future.

But ICANN's involvement in the Middle East and in the Gulf is not new, and we are frankly dedicated to this region, and you all know our very capable vice president who is sitting here to my left, Baher Esmat. He's been doing a very good job, and I wish that that effort continues and continues.

And in fact, at Baher's invitation last February, I participated in another type of workshop in Cairo related to the DNS. And I was really very impressed with that workshop, and it left on me two thoughts that stuck in my mind. The first thought is how the participants were really hungry for learning, for building skills, for knowledge, and for finding ways to participate in ICANN and policy development.

And the participants came from across the region. A lot of them are our stakeholders. Seeing that enthusiasm really drove me to believe that this capacity building is an essential thing of what

we do. We need to reach out and we need to help everybody to participate.

The other thing that struck me very much is that the involvement of the participants became clear. It wasn't just about them, it was about creating a better future for the next generation. And that was very evident in the questions they were asking. They were thinking forward, it wasn't just about them. It was about the next generation.

And I am really very supportive of capacity building workshop, and I believe this one for example is a very important one. So I want to thank you all for participating in this workshop, and I sincerely hope it meets the objectives you had in mind.

And this workshop should really increase your awareness about ICANN policy making processes and how governments play a very important role in ICANN. It should also increase your understanding that the active participation of government is vital for the well functioning of ICANN and our multi-stakeholder model.

Excuse me. I've been talking a lot and my voice is going rapidly, so I'm going to drink some water.

So I repeat that again, the active participation of government is vital for the well functioning of ICANN and our multi-stakeholder

model of governance. And ICANN needs that widespread involvement in order to tackle all the issues, whether they are global or whether they are local. But we need that widespread involvement, and we need the government involvement.

So I hope that this workshop will help strengthen diversity. And not only that, I hope this workshop lowers the barrier for your participation and gives you means to feel more confident and all the tools you need to participate more.

And I'm glad to see that many of the countries in the region here are members of the GAC. And I'm sure that our colleague, Manal, Vice-Chair of the GAC, will agree with me that having a continuous increased, meaningful and effective participation of GAC members and governments from the region in the GAC itself is very important. Your voice needs to be heard. You need to speak, and we need to help you achieve your objective in doing that.

So looking to the region – and I've been coming into the region quite often over the last 10-15 years. It is without doubt a region that is booming from a digital economy point of view, and it's a region that has great potential. It continues to grow in importance, and it is a leader in technology adoption. And we see what's happening in terms of the various media-centered, digital-centered, digital cities and so on and so forth.

The population is young, it's very literal, and it's very digital savvy. The infrastructure is exceptional. You can see what's been built here around. For us, this is enormous in terms of capacity. It can hold 20,000 people, not just 2000 people. So please work hard, participate, because I'm sure you want the point of view of this region to be heard and to affect the policies that are important for you. So your participation is essential. Please don't be bashful. Please, I encourage you to talk to our team and ask them how they can help you to participate more. If anything you need, they should be able to help you and support you.

So with that, I want to thank you again, and I hope you've had a good workshop, and I hope it's been beneficial to you. So thank you.

TAREK CAMEL:

So the good news is that Cherine will be with us for the next five minutes if there are any questions to him, and then we'll proceed with the closing ceremony with the rest of the colleagues, Abdulrahman and Khaled and Baher and Alice and Manal and myself. Please, gentleman, our GAC member from Palestine.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: How can you set the collaboration that took place between the executive committees or bodies here and the local authorities?

CHERINE CHALABY: This is about the relationship between ICANN and the various governments, right? Well, ICANN respects the participation of all governments into the GAC. And it is very important that each government present their views in the GAC. And we always look at GAC for advice, and that advice we take very importantly and address it with a lot of care and with a lot of due diligence.

I don't want to single out a single country because that will not be appropriate, but I think the participation of – how many governments now?

TAREK CAMEL: 173.

CHERINE CHALABY: 173 is a very strong and powerful representation. And as I said earlier, the role of the GAC is essential for the well functioning of ICANN and the multi-stakeholder model. Tarek, I don't know if you want to add something to that.

TAREK CAMEL: Yes. Thank you. I mean we'll continue definitely the discussion about this topic in the closing ceremony, but since you are only here for five minutes, I want to give the floor the opportunity to ask you further questions if there are further questions. Mr. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Before giving some comments, first of all, I don't know whom we have to congratulate. We have to congratulate first the board with their wise decisions to have Cherine to be Chairman of the board. That is very wise decision [inaudible] unanimously to have this.

Second, we should say that some events in the history, whenever there's a critical situation or moment, you find a competent person to deal with that critical situation. Why critical? We have spent about two and a half or three years to have the transition, with about a few months to end up with the accountability. Then comes the critical moment: to implement that. And we need somebody quite capable, with the collaboration of the entire board members, to put those decisions into actions.

With all of the problems, difficulties that we have faced, one of them was the jurisdiction yesterday. That all of those things have not been answered need to be answered, and if at the end

there is no answer, the board and the ICANN should go to the community to find a way how to resolve the issue.

Cherine has been with the board for many years. He's one of the most competent, experienced, knowledgeable, neutral – very important – and from the regions that now we come to the point that some sort of equality of footing has been now implemented. And we would not leave that without congratulating Steve Crocker, a computer scientist who came to the ICANN, who managed, and during his leadership this transition has taken place and going to be finished. That is very successful things. And also congratulate him to nominated Cherine as Vice-Chair during the time. And together, working in order to prepare the way for [inaudible]

We are sure that under Cherine, we will achieve whatever he expected, and we ask him kindly to be quite careful on the situations that we face in that sometimes government are seen to be in minority. But in fact, we are not minority. Government are representing the people of the world. It's not minority. So I don't think we should refer to the GAC or decision of the GAC or some of the GAC people as minority decisions. We work together, we want to put the hand in hand and try to push this organization towards. So I may say some of these words at other occasions, but Cherine, thank you very much, welcome, congratulations.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you, Kavouss, very much for your kind words. And Kavouss has always been open, transparent and a good friend over the years and always speaks his mind, and we really appreciate that. So thank you very much.

TAREK CAMEL: Thank you very much, Kavouss. Moctar Yedaly, African Union.

MOCTAR YEDALY: Actually, thank you very much, and I just want to second what has been said before Kavouss because I don't want to repeat myself. He said it all with regard to you, with regard to what has been done and what will be done. I just want to wish you, again, a lot of success. You have many challenges coming because the word is changing, the Internet landscape is changing, the Internet governance is changing, the cybersecurity is coming, the [inaudible] still isolated, and we need to make sure that with your board and with all of us contributing, that we'll make it happen. Thank you very much.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you.

TAREK CAMEL: And on this positive note, if there are no other comments or questions to Cherine, we thank him very much for being with us as a keynote speaker in this closing ceremony, and we wish him a successful week and successful meeting, and to all the community a successful meeting. And thank you, Cherine. We'll continue our ceremony with the panelists.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you very much.

TAREK CAMEL: And Tarek seems to be leaving us as well now to go to the board lunch, so thank you, Khaled, for being with us. Yes. Okay, so let's proceed with our closing ceremony. I want to say a few remarks about the workshops.

We have listened today to constructive comments from Mr. Kavouss as well as other colleagues about these workshops. Indeed when we started this back in Nairobi in January according to the GAC communiqué that was issued in June 2016 in Helsinki, and then again in 2016 again in November in Hyderabad inviting the GSE GE teams to invest in the area of capacity building together with the underserved working group that is chaired by Pua.

Alice has been helping us and doing a great job in this aspect as well as definitely different staff members from the GSE and GE. We are doing this as a new attempt for the first time. It differs from one region to the other. The needs of Africa are different than the needs of the Middle East, than the needs of Asia very soon. And we are adapting and learning while we are going forward.

In some cases, we hold general workshop as we are doing here. In some other cases, we are focusing on thematic issues like law enforcement, for example. And we want to hear from you during this discussion and the closing ceremony. What do you wish as GAC members from the region? Whether the Middle East or even the wider region from Africa that we proceed together with the underserved working group in the GAC as well and other working groups, and with the GAC leadership going forward. What do you want us to be investing efforts, time and money of panelists and of moving things forward?

So I hope that we focus the discussion in this closing ceremony for the next 20 minutes along this subject. And we have definitely capable panelists to guide us as well. And then at the very end, we'll ask our host Abdulrahman to say a few words at the very end when we finish before we adjourn. Thank you very much.

ALICE MUNYUA:

Thank you very much, Tarek, and thank you all for staying long [in all the very spirited discussions. I think for me, what we'd like to find out together with the chairs of the Underserved Regions Working Group and the Government Engagement and Global Stakeholder Engagement is whether or not this very limited time that we've had together in understanding the ICANN ecosystem and the GAC has met your expectations.

Perhaps if anybody is able to speak up to that, or perhaps we can continue this discussion within the GAC, or perhaps as part of an evaluation that we will definitely be discussing during the GAC plenary as part of the Underserved Regions Working Group work plan. So perhaps if anybody has comments regarding whether or not some of these objectives have been met, once again, the objectives are to increase knowledge of the functioning of ICANN, the capability of stakeholders in participating, and then of course that contributes to the broader objective of strengthening diversity of participation in ICANN as well as increasing participation, which again plays more broadly to the ICANN initiative of lowering barriers to participation in ICANN generally. So if there are any comments, including from Manal or anyone else. Yes, please, Manal.

TAREK CAMEL: Baher wants to speak after Manal. Manal and then Baher.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alice, and thank you, Dr. Tarek. And just to share a few remarks, and maybe food for thought even to the floor, we've heard this morning about the importance of participating to the GAC and to the ICANN work in general from Abdulrahman Al Marzouqi, our host. And for governments, this is generally a very challenging process, and specifically for Newcomers.

So coming from the government myself and from a developing country as well, the process and the pace that we work with at the government, so people have to build the necessary knowledge on a certain topic, closely follow up the developments which is a very demanding process, and then also knowing the positions and the views of other countries but also of other stakeholders, and linking this topic to the national agenda and trying to seek necessary approvals to develop a national stance.

And this sometimes doesn't only involve the governmental authority being represented at the GAC, but sometimes also need coordination and communication with other relevant governmental authorities at the national level. And of course, all those challenges may be even magnified when it comes to our region and to other developing country with the limited

resources and sometimes complex issues, and maybe different national priorities and the need for dedicated time and continued participation. Sometimes even barrier to acronyms and maybe to language as well.

But again, it's only fair to acknowledge a few things that are already in place and are extremely helpful. The translation of some documents, the real-time interpretation we have at the GAC and at the ICANN meetings in general, the transcription and the recording of the meetings, the availability of remote participation, the infographics we have and the online popup glossary as well, and I think also the webinars that were recently introduced in the region before the meetings. Also, there are funding opportunities for people to join the meetings.

And I would also like to note the high-level governmental meetings that we have in place every other year, and those are specifically for bringing to the attention of the higher management or the senior officials the work of the GAC and the ICANN in general and how this is important so that they can spare their delegates the time, the authority and the resources to engage in a timely and effective manner.

It's important also to note that the GAC is already leading a community discussion on this topic, on lowering barriers to community participation, how the workload should be managed

and how to have prioritization and global prioritization across the organization so that we can work with a synchronized pace to the extent possible.

So general suggestions were along the lines that we have a better coordination among the different SOs and AC leaders, collective prioritization of PDPs and workload, work on a common agenda to optimize resources. Sometimes we have multiple processes or overlapping processes repeating some of the discussions. And finally, as I said, consider the pace of the work to allow more engagement, better participation and better quality of contributions.

And before I hand the floor to Baher, just a few suggestions. Maybe in our region, we can consolidate resources in exchanging knowledge or sharing knowledge. We can try to utilize our mailing lists as a comfort zone for anyone to ask any question without feeling embarrassed or feeling that it is a silly or naïve question. We can also try to distribute the workload, for example, having topic leads from the region on each topic of interest. Maybe also have preparatory calls, and again, webinars like the ones Baher has been coordinating. We had a couple of ones before this meeting, and I hope they were useful to you as they were to me. And maybe also having coordination meetings onsite if necessary.

So although this may be the end of this session, but I hope it's a beginning for a process to increase participation from our side. Thank you. Baher. Thank you.

BAHER ESMAT:

Thank you, Manal. So one of the things that became very clear during the development of the regional strategy in the Middle East, and many of the strategy working group have emphasized the importance of strengthening our engagement with the governments. That was very clear, and over the course of the past 10-12 months, we've held several engagement activities and outreach activities with governments in the region. But at least in six, seven countries, and they we're all coordinated with GAC representatives. Some of them are here in the room today. I can see Sudan, Bahrain, Oman, Palestine, Tunisia, so these are activities that were coordinated with the GAC representatives, and through them, we were able to reach out not only to other government departments but also to other stakeholders.

The other recent development is what Manal mentioned about the webinars. So the concept of the GAC webinars is not new in ICANN. Actually, our friends in Latin America started this practice maybe more than a year ago. And we thought to consult with GAC representatives in the region to see whether such connectivity would be useful. And the feedback was quite

positive, and we started the webinars with the GAC representatives maybe in July this year, so we had a couple of webinars before we came here in Abu Dhabi, and we plan to continue this practice and to be on a regular basis. So we plan another webinar with the GAC after Abu Dhabi to maybe debrief those who were not present in Abu Dhabi on what the GAC has discussed.

So we continue to look for different ways to engage GAC representatives in the region, and we would be very interested in hearing your views directly on how we can do better in that regard. Thank you.

TAREK CAMEL:

Thank you very much, Baher. And before we go to our final comment from our host, Pua, you are the Co-Chair of the Public Safety Working Group that is the umbrella within the GAC that is providing stewardship to this effort. You want to say a few words before we adjourn with our host?

PUA HUNTER:

Thank you, Tarek. Just from the last capacity development we did in Fiji, one of the outcomes from that workshop was the participants, the GAC members from that workshop wanted continuous, say an annual workshop for GAC members. But

partnering with an existing workshop in the region or a meeting. For example, like APNIC sessions like the one that's going to be happening in Nepal.

And so they want to be able to attain something that they were already going to. That will eliminate problems with resourcing, funding that is, from ICANN's perspective, and even from the other organizations organizing it.

And the other thing I took from that session is the technical trainings that we have in ICANN that the GAC members wanted to be involved with. For example, the DNSSEC, they wanted more focus on those rather than just the policy side. And just from this session, I think it's important that we consider making this compulsory for all ICANN meetings, a session within ICANN, a morning session or an afternoon session, because I too found it very helpful. I found the presentations very helpful.

And just from my colleague here from Tuvalu, he wanted to see presentations rather than talking because he wants to refer to those presentations. So if that's something that our panelists can add when they come to the table. I think that's all I have for now, Tarek, and thank you so much for all your support for this initiative. Thank you.

TAREK CAMEL: Thank you, Pua. And Alice, you want to comment about the way forward before we move to Abdulrahman?

ALICE MUNYUA: Yes, please. Just to dovetail what Pua has mentioned, so many important issues were brought up and discussed, so we'll take them forward not only within the GAC underserved regions but ICANN broadly and other IG spaces that are relevant. All the content from this workshop is going to be made available on the GAC website, the Underserved Regions Working Group working space, as well as to all participants.

As is traditional, we are going to develop a workshop report with links to all the presentations. To my colleague who requested presentations, the presentations were available and we requested all panelists to either make PowerPoint presentations or one- or two-page content that is going to contribute towards building a capacity building package for GAC members. So that's also going to be available in the long-term.

So I just wanted to say that, and also to mention that there are several other regional sessions coming up in 2018. And I also want to thank Tarek for all the support, and the GSE for all the support, and the ICANN Board. Thank you. And back to you, Tarek.

TAREK CAMEL:

Thank you very much, and I want to add also to thank the GAC support team, very specifically Julia, and from the Government Engagement, our new colleague [inaudible] who has helped put the program of the agenda of this workshop together. And we'll be working closely with Alice in the coming workshops for South Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean and other regions while we go forward.

Finally, Abdulrahman, it's your turn.

ABDULRAHMAN AL MARZOUQI:

Thank you. So I think from my point of view, I think I wished I had this session in 2006. It would have made things much easier for me to learn. So I think it has been a good morning. Definitely, the time is very short. We wished that we had more time to have more discussions and more, let's say, focused sessions as well on some of the issues.

I just wanted to say that I think we're in a unique time, a unique opportunity for our region, especially that for one region, we have an ICANN meeting in the region and also we are having a new chair also from the region. So from that perspective, I think it's really an important and unique time, and I think it's an opportunity to have more heard voice from the region.

So I think although I've heard this morning comments about what's the role of the GAC and how the GAC interacts with the board and whether GAC really has decisions in some of these issues – and I must say that although maybe the GAC does not have a vote in the board, but I've seen over the past years that the advice of the GAC is really taken into consideration very importantly. And a lot of these decisions in the ICANN have actually either started from GAC, or it was influenced by the GAC.

So my message is that having active and meaningful participation in the GAC will have impact. It will not be just general talk or general opinion. It will end up somewhere in the DNS. And I've seen that personally, and that's why I really encourage more participation from the region and from the other underserved regions in the GAC.

And I also want to also encourage not just participating in the GAC, but also would like to encourage participating in other groups. Our region still lacks in the domain name ecosystem from a business side, from a technical community and from the users. So I think there's an opportunity to develop this further, not just in the GAC.

I think the region has really great potential, as for example, in the UAE, we adopt technology very quickly. And technology develops really fast, and I think as a GAC and government, we

have a lot of catching up to do. I always think of Internet and ICANN as a fast moving train, and if we don't adapt quickly and try to catch up, then we miss that train, and our voice will not be heard if we don't speak up. And then decisions are made, and then we come back a few years later and say, "Why these decisions made this way?" Well, basically, we didn't speak. So that's my key message.

At the end of this note, I just wanted to really thank Pua, Alice, Baher and Manal and the rest of the team to put together this program. They had been very helpful, so all the credit goes to those people. So I'd like to really thank them, and at the end, I wish you a successful ICANN meeting in Abu Dhabi, and good luck with all your deliberations for the coming week. Thank you very much.

TAREK CAMEL: Thank you very much, and the session is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]