MONTREAL – ccNSO: Internet Governance Liaison Committee
Saturday, November 2, 2019 - 13:30 to 15:00 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

PIERRE BONIS: Hello everyone. Thanks for being here for this IGLC face-to-face meeting. First of all, maybe waiting for distant participants to be correctly connected. I suggest that we identify ourselves in the room, starting with the table, very quickly, and maybe the room also. So, I start. I'm Pierre Bonis, CEO of Afnic dot fr, ccNSO member and Chair of the IGLC. Joke?

JOKE BRAEKEN: My name is Joke Braeken, ccNSO staff support.

MARIA OTANES: Ria Otanes, ccNSO staff support, as well.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Lianna Galstyan, APRALO Vice-Chair.

AJAY DATA: Ajay Data, ccNSO council member.

LAURA MARGOLIS: Laura Margolis, ccNSO council member.

SOULEYMANE OUMTANAGA: Souleymane Oumtanaga, ccNSO council member.

LUC MISSIDIMBAZI: Luc Missidimbazi, ccNSO new member.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Peter Van Roste, General Manager, CENTR.

LEONID TODOROV: Leonid Todorov, General Manager, APTLD.

SEAN COPELAND: Sean Copeland, NIC.vi.

PETER MADAVHU: Peter Madavhu, IGLC member.

ANGELA MATLAPENG: Angela Matlapeng, I'm the manager for the Top Level Domain dot bw.

MIRIA NATASIC: Miria Natasic, ccTLD member, dot rs and dot srb.

LAURENT FERRALI: Laurent Ferrali, ICANN Government Engagement Team.

QUOC PHAM: Quoc Pham, Neustar.

PIERRE BONIS: If this is too complex, maybe when you will ask for the mic, you will introduce yourself. Is it okay? Thank you. So, let's start the second face-to-face a IGLC meeting. The first one happened in Marrakech. There is some work to do together. First of all, I would like to thank the regional organizations that are present in the room. We have invited AROS to participate actively to this face-to-face meeting and more broadly to IGLC, because we believe in the group, that the regional organizations have plenty of information that are very useful to share. Of course, their members already know, but to share with the ccNSO membership when it comes to Internet governance. So thank you very much for your presence. Thank you very much to all the participants.

And we shall start with the presentation and the agenda. So, I think we've done the welcome. Then after we will have a review of the survey that we launched, first of all, internally in the group of the IGLC, and secondly, to the broader ccNSO community. Then we will discuss with the regional organization in a 'tour de table' manner, and that's Peter who told me that it works in English also, the regional organization contributions to this group. You know that we will have a panel discussion on Wednesday during the ccNSO session, so we will

try to fine tune, first of all, explain what we are intending to do with this panel discussion and then fine tune it if needed. And there will be a discussion on next step for the IGLC with the members of the group. Of course, with the people who are not member of the group also, they can participate to this discussion. And we will go to the end of the meeting at 3:00 p.m. That's it.

So I'm going to give the floor to Joke. And while I'm giving the floor to Joke for the overview of the survey, I would like to take the opportunity to thank very much the staff, Joke, Maria and Bart, for not only their help, but in a way, they are leadership. In this group, they are very active, very dedicated. And truly, we could not work without their wisdom first and their health. So Joke, you have the floor.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thank you very much, Pierre. This is Joke speaking. So as you can see now on the slide that is being displayed in the Zoom Room, will have an overview of the results of the IGLC survey which was recently being held. And as Pierre already mentioned, the survey consists of two parts. Once there was a survey which was shared with the members of this group. And then we had a second one which was shared outside the members of this group, with a broader community, the broader ccTLD community.

So the idea of this survey was really to share information among ccNSO members on Internet Governance related topics, and to foster

the cooperation between country code top level domains on the eight topics that were selected by the IGLC as being relevant for ccTLD managers. And lastly, but very importantly, the aim is, as well, to advertise the important role that ccTLDs have in the Internet Governance talks.

So here you see a link to the results of the two surveys that we previously referred to. What you will see in the next slides is a combination of the results from both surveys, both both input, that we received. I think the next slide gives you an overview of the topics, exactly the eight topics that were selected by this group as being the eight Internet Governance related topics that are relevant to ccTLD managers. You can see them listed here. I will read them for you convenience.

The first one was local content. Then you have internationalized domain names, regulations, technical topics, topics regarding the digital divide, cybersecurity, the role of the ccTLDs as promoters of the IGF dialogues, and lastly, capacity building. So the idea is to collect input, via the survey, on these eight topics and then have an overview of which of these topics are being addressed where and at which occasion.

On the next slide, you can see the first results of the survey, the combined results. The respondents to the survey added a number of events, listed events, in their input. And you can see a list of some of the events that were being listed by the respondents. I will not go into detail. You are able to review these slides that at your leisure. They're

being posted on the workspace of the IGLC, and they will also be posted on the ICANN public schedule.

On the next slide, you can see an overview of the distribution of the events per region. So you can see here that of all these different events that were being listed by the respondents, the vast majority came from the European Union. So those events took place in the E.U., and followed closely by events taking place in Africa, Asia Pacific and Latin American and Caribbean region. There were no events listed in the North American region.

Then the next slide gives you an overview of the type of events, programs or initiatives. The majority of those were national IGFs, as you can see from this slide.

Next one. We also wanted to know whether ccTLDs are participating in these events or programs or initiatives, and a majority of the respondents said, indeed, that they are aware of ccTLDs that are participating. Most of the respondents were, of course, ccTLD operators, and that influences the results as well.

The next slide. Then regarding the type of role that the respondents were having in the events or the initiatives or the programs that were being listed, most of them were part of the organizing team or they were sponsors, visitors or having a different role.

Next one. And then you see this overview of the eight topics that were previously listed. And the respondents selected whether those topics were being addressed at the event or the program or the initiative.

EN

And the majority of the events addressed the topics of cybersecurity, followed closely by capacity building and regulations. And then local content ,and then so on. You can see the results there.

PIERRE BONIS: Digital divide.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Absolutely, thank you very much, Pierre. And Digital divide, as well. So, that concludes the overview of the survey results. If you have any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

PIERRE BONIS: No, thank you very much, Joke. Just before opening the floor for questions or contribution, two or three very quick remarks. First of all, the eight topics that you've seen have been discussed previously, ahead of the Marrakech meeting. We finalized these eight topics during the Marrakech meeting. So it's always possible to look at this list, and if someone in the room think that there is something huge that is missing, we are still open to add some topics that are supposed to be relevant for CC's in Internet Governance talk.

I personally feel that this is a very broad list already. Talking about this list, you've seen that there is no topic that is not addressed, which is interesting. It means that on this list, we didn't make mistakes, because there is no topic that is of no interest at all. They are, at least, a little bit discussed in one or the other Internet Governance talks.

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL
66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

The other remark I wanted to make about the figure showing the number -- I mean, the percentage of IG events in regional areas where you see that there is no North America events and you see also that Latin America and Caribbean are behind E.U., Africa and Asia, let's remember that it's not exhaustive at all. It's just the ccNSO members who voluntarily include one event in the survey. So it doesn't give a picture of the dynamics of Internet Governance in these various regions. At least it gives a picture of the involvement of the CC's Internet Governance talks in these various regions, because the CC's who have responded are expected to be involved. And that's what we've seen also with a vast majority of CC's that are organizing and/or sponsoring the events.

And that was my last point on that. One of the aims (and we'll talk about that later) one of the aims of the IGLC is to showcase and to make other constituencies within ICANN and in the broader community, to let them know the involvement of country code organizations in the Internet Governance talk. And I think, even if it's not a huge survey, because you see that a little bit less than 20 members have answered, the figures are pretty clear about the involvement of organizations in the Internet Governance talks.

And maybe this is something that we should send to, when it comes to IGF, to the Multistakeholder Advisory Group to help him not deny each and every proposals that are coming from CC's when it comes to organizing a workshop for instance. Which is very often that the CC's proposing something at the international level when it comes to international IGF have negative answers from the MAG.

At the national level, it's pretty obvious that the CC's are involved. At the international level, maybe we still have some advocacy to do towards the MAG showing these kind of figures and explaining them a little bit better than we are, at the heart of the organization of Internet Governance dialogue. That was the point that I wanted to make. Maybe I'm not the only one to find some things about the survey. Yes?

LEONID TODOROV: Thank you, Pierre. Leonid Todorov, for the record. It's not a question, I would rather raise some concerns about this survey -- I mean, the outcome and the findings -- because it seems to me that the sample is not representative enough to make far reaching conclusions and to develop some recommendations. I didn't know whether it's due to ignorance or busy schedule, but many ccTLDs were obviously not present and did not contribute to this survey. And it seems to me that the picture which we had, Joke showed that slide, those proportions across regions is not quite accurate.

For example, I'm pretty sure that with as many as 73 ccTLDs across Asia Pacific -- yeah, I mean that round one. Yes, exactly. So, I would imagine that very few actually are engaged in Internet Governance events. Whereas, across Latin America, I'm speculating, but it seems to me that Internet Governance events are proliferating across the region. So in other words, I think that we should treat it with much caution and probably, I don't know, it sounds too bureaucratic to me to have yet another survey as to why ccTLDs have not contributed to this one. So anyway, just a comment. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, Leonid.   Just to know that I think that this survey is not closed yet.   So there is still possibility to add some events.   I hope that in the Latin America and Caribbean, and in Asia Pacific, there will be more contributions.   But it shows something.   It shows that within the IGLC, at least, there is involvement from all these regions and maybe a stronger involvement from Europeans, Africans and Asia Pacific.   This is the facts that we see there.   I see, talking about Africa, that Mary Uduma wants to take the floor, from Lagos.

MARY UDUMA: Thank you very much.   Good evening, here from Nigeria.   First, I want to apologize that I'm not able to make it to Montreal.   But technology is helping us by meeting.   I think I will miss nothing.   I will continue to contribute from here.

First, I want to appreciate the work done for the meantime.   We could take this as a pilot.   And my suggestion, just like the last speaker said, is not -- would take decision with caution.   But we have an opportunity in Montreal to be able to do a quick survey, since we have most of the ccTLD organizations or operators around.   And we could also redo the survey, since we have members -- during the members meeting between today and the end of members meeting, maybe you will get a better result.

I do also feel that it's better than doing nothing. We have started on a good note and would continue. As you said, the survey is still open, so if we could announce to participants, the ccNSO participants at the Montreal meeting, to be able to complete the survey. I think that would also help to beef up the figures and also present a better sample. I think our sample size is still very low, compared with the number of ccTLDs that are in the ccNSO. I believe that we have started well, so we could also do a second one or ask members to also participate in the survey, since we have face-to-face meeting. Thank you. That's my comment. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, Mary. I think it's duly noted. And we will try to seize the opportunity of the ccNSO members meeting, to remind members that they can fill the survey. Yes?

PETER MADAVHU: Thank you. Pierre. Peter here from .za. I just want to share the same sentiments with the previous speakers. However, I want us to have some way to put a date of the end of the survey, because if it doesn't have a date it will continuous and people might not be able to put it. I want to believe that the issues that we're raising, the issues of Internet Governance, are issues that are addressed at the local level. And as ccTLD managers are here, some of them are even part or participant of the planning commission. So indeed, these things are happening from the region, as well as within the countries throughout. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you, Peter. So you would like us to put a date, saying after that it would be too late?

PETER MADAVHU: I think so. Because otherwise, if it's open ended, then when will you be able to have results that final?

PIERRE BONIS: Okay. For this first round, this is something that we can do. I would not like to anticipate on the fact that maybe in the future this kind of tool could be an ongoing one, with people sharing what they are about to organize. But for this first round the first figures, okay, duly noted. We will try to find a final cut, maybe a little bit later than Montreal, but I think the end of the year would be a good one.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: I would compliment what Pierre told about the whole year round of keeping such kind of information update, data update, because all of the IGFs, the National IGFs, and regional one, happening throughout the whole year. So if you want to keep this participation and involvement of certain ccTLD into their national and regional IGFs, you cannot put a cutting date, a deadline, for that.

Depending on what is the purpose of that survey, if that is for gathering the information and seeing the relevance and participation

ccTLD, then that's really fine if we keep that for the whole year. If the purpose is just to have a picture and showing to ccNSO members, what is the relevance of ccTLD to the IGF, then okay, that could be one-time exercise, and what's next? I would keep it still for for for the next rounds for the whole year. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you. I think we can do both. And that's exactly what we're about to do, just have a first look at them and then say, if you still have something to share, it's out of the current figures and stats that, of course, you will be able to share with a ccNSO community. Thank you.

Okay, I think we are on time to go to the next point of the agenda, which is not the panel discussion, but the contributions by regional organization. So, in the room we have AFTLD. Who's representing AFTLD? It's you, Souleymane? Barack? You represent AFTLD? Okay, great. Who's representing CENTR? Okay, Peter. Who's representing APTLD? Leonid. Who's representing LACTLD? So, I didn't miss any regional organization, did I?

No. North America regional organization, no?

Okay, so the idea is to listen to you more than you listen to us. And very quickly, why did we want you to be involved in this group? I think, for two main reasons. The first one is that there is a level of Internet Governance talkings that is a regional one. And we think, and you're going to tell us if we are wrong or right, that when it comes to regional Internet Governance events or talks, the ccTLD regional

organizations have a special role and are involved. So, that's the regional view that we want you to share with us. As we are all individual members in national context, and even if we know that there are regional organizations and regional events, we need your views on that.

And the second reason, maybe there are others from the group, but the second reason is that if you are convinced that what we are doing is of interest for the CC's, you may help us to reach out to the members of the ccNSO that are usually members of your organizations. A good example of that is the survey. Can regional organization push the survey to their members and try to help us reach out to all the members that could participate to this group?

So, these are the two main reasons. I don't know if in the IGLC group there are other expectations from regional organizations. Okay, so maybe we start with Latin America and Caribbean. Rocio?

ROCIO DE LA FUENTE: Hello everyone, I'm Rocio de la Fuente. I work at LACTLD, the Latin American and Caribbean ccTLD Association. ICANN commenced some of the work we have been doing at LACTLD. We support the Latin American and Caribbean IGF, and we are part of the program committee, we are involved there. And we also try to bring our members to that process and to include the sort of technical community interest in the development of the program. We also

participate along with other organizations at the IGF. We try to propose workshops that have an impact for ccTLDs issues.

And regarding the national IGF in the region, we know how ccTLDs work with the multistakeholder community in each country, and we try to support them on that issue. I think we can definitely communicate with our members that are not involved in this committee, the work you have been doing, and invite them to participate in the survey. I don't know if you have any questions on this.

PIERRE BONIS: I have a few. Okay, three questions. The first question is, is there any Internet Governance event that is not an IGF in Latin America and Caribbean, and that is regional or national? That could be an IT event or an event organized by another organization that is Latin American and that is not called IGF. That's the first question.

My second question is, what are the main national IGF in Latin America and Caribbean? Let's say, in terms of numbers of participants, and maybe a kind of international flavor. Because you can have big national IGF with some neighbors that are coming. And my third question is, when you talk about some workshops that you are sponsoring or organizing in the Latin American and Caribbean context, and you say they are relevant for CC's, what kind of topic do you put on the top of the pile? In the eight topics that we've shown, do you have special expectations?

ROCIO DE LA FUENTE: Okay, I will answer first the third question because I don't want to forget. Currently, at the IGF 2019, we presented our proposal along with the Brazilian ccTLD and our organizations, related to content of use, because I think it's a topic that has been very popular lately. We think it's important to express the ccTLD's role in the matter. And I think that's the way we try to support ccTLDs in those Internet Governance events, to show the perspectives that are important to communicate, and the topics. I don't know if that answers your question.

And other events related to Internet Governance in the region, I think there are a lot of events going on. For example, there is a diploma on Internet Governance. Maybe it's not an event, but there are like kind of spaces where these discussions take place. I can send you more information in email. But there is like telecommunication events that also are beginning to discuss Internet Governance. And maybe before as LACTLD, we were not so involved on those spaces, and now we have started to maybe pay attention to those kinds of events.

And regarding the question on which countries had the most attended event, the IGF, Brazil has a lot of events and forums related to Internet Governance, NIC.br, and we have a representative here; they organize a lot of events, support a lot of activities in that matter. I can send you also, there is a very interesting paper written by [inaudible] -- I don't know if many of you may know her -- and other researchers, and this paper, I think it's very important for your community because it maps

the Internet Governance initiatives in the region and how they develop and how they relate to the global IGF. And there you will have all the numbers you need. I don't remember now, but you can refer to that.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you, Rocio. Thank you very much. Let's move to Angela.

ANGELA MATLAPENG: Hello, again, I'm Angela. I would just like to express that I'm the very newest member of the AFTLD, so most of the work that has been done in the past, I may not be really aware of. But one event that I can really talk about that speaks to Internet Governance is the PRIDA, policy and regulation initiated for digital Africa. We've recently had a meeting in Addis Ababa this September, where we were discussing what our countries are going to do for the next two years.

Basically, the PRIDA brings together ministries, regulatory authorities, your regional economic sectors and all those people, to discuss on Internet Governance and policies, and mostly, harmonization, like what to do as African countries to move forward towards reaching a digital Africa, in terms of harmonized policies. And some of the issues that were being discussed were cybersecurity, as we all know that it's borderless. So we were trying to figure out ways and measures of how to attend to such issues, policy wise, across African countries. So that's the major Internet Governance kind of forum that brings about everybody together. I'll let my colleague add more points.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you, Angela. Excuse me, there is a comment from a remote participant, just before you.

JOKE BRAEKEN: I would like to read out the comments by Alex Corenthin. He says, "Internet Governance training sessions are developed by some countries in Africa, Burkina Faso, Benin, and the ccTLDs can participate actively on promoting this kind of event and share the ccTLD concerns. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: And that was the word for the Chair of AFTLD, himself. So thank you, Alex, for that.

SOULEYMANE OUMTANAGA: I think if the Chair has talked online. We are the small members. So, I think he has summarized -- that was a heavy statement. I think the Chair has summarized.

PIERRE BONIS: I have a quick question for all the AFTLD members that are in the room and those who are remote. When it comes to regional events, because Angela talked about a Pan African event, not a regional one, is there any events or organization of Internet Governance talks that are linked to the economic integration regional organization just like [inaudible]

or others? Are you aware of these kind of things, or it's just national versus continental?

SOULEYMANE OUMTANAGA: Yeah, there are regional IGF events. Like, one week ago, the East Africa IGF just concluded, where AFTLD was a big resource. And I think [inaudible] represented AFTLD in that event. That's one of the regional IGF events. So I think that's one of the examples of the regional events in which the ccTLDs represented AFTLD.

PIERRE BONIS: Peter.

PETER MADAVHU: Just for the record, I'm not a member of the AFTLD, but I do know that the sessions and the events that are held by the Africa IGF, that happens annually. This year, it happened in Chad and it was a session that takes four -- roughly there was last four days and that was successful. So it happens annually. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, Peter. There is a remote participant comment or question, and then after we will move to Asia.

EN

LEONID TODOROV: Thank you, Leonid Todorov for the record, I'm speaking on -- well, rather in my personal --

PIERRE BONIS: Leonid, sorry… we have a remote participant from [CROSSTALK], I have to move to Asia.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thank you very much. This is Joke speaking. I'm reading out a question from [Sharama] from Bangladesh. He writes, "Affiliation with BDIGF and BDSIG." His question is as follows: "Does ccTLD help or support in organizing national IGs? For example, providing speakers or financial support for organizing IG events.

PIERRE BONIS: Leonid, you can answer this question because it comes from Bangladesh.

LEONID TODOROV: Sure. Well, I must admit that things may not be that rosy for Bangladesh, but in certain areas and within certain jurisdictions, ccTLDs do cosponsor, at least, IG events, various kinds of IG events. When it comes to countries like Bangladesh and some others (and I will talk about that at some length) it might not be the highest priority for a local ccTLD administrator, simply because they have too many things on their plate, being a government agency tasked to do

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL
66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

everything in the IT area for the country. Which means being a telco regulator, a ccTLD manager, also tasked with IP addresses allocations. So, everything. So that means that it might well happen that Internet Governance is not on top of their agenda or on the scale of their priorities. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, Leonid. Some questions? Asia Pacific is the hugest regional organizations, in terms of geography. What is the role of a regional organization, such as APTLD, when it comes to trying to make a kind of synthesis between the problems that can arise? For instance, in Georgia, and those who can arise in New Zealand, are they the same? Or from your point of view, which is very wide, do you see that some topics are more important in some parts of your organizations?

LEONID TODOROV: Actually, I'll try to squeeze everything in 10 minutes. So first of all, some personal observation. Until recently, I had been absolutely sure that IGF, as a concept, has run out of its narrative and it's no longer relevant and adequate to the modern realities. And I was one of those who would call for a radical revamp of IGF, as a concept and as an event, and for bringing about more credible ideas to propel its further transformation. That said, some recent developments sort of changed my mind a little bit, because as you would imagine, I am from a

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL
66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

country which has just introduced the sovereign Internet. And I think that was probably the biggest development, recently.

Anyway, so speaking of Asia Pacific, 78 ccTLDs out of 88 countries, territories and jurisdictions in the region. In terms of the U.N. classification, the region is unbelievably huge. So it covers the Middle East, minus Israel, the whole Asia, minus Turkey, all those nice islands in the Pacific, and also Australia and New Zealand. So, we can observe two poles, as far as APTLD and its involvement in our members' Internet Governance efforts.

So, there are two poles. There is a small portion of ccTLDs which are mature enough to give rise to very sophisticated formats, like for example, in New Zealand they have NetHui, which is a very special event. It's not completely IG, but it's more than that. And I would say that they ensure that the greatest community participation and all the stakeholders are there. Just for the most recent event there was the Prime Minister to open that.

The opposite pole is formed by quite a number of small ccTLDs with a little or no awareness of Internet Governance issues. They tend to not participate in any Internet Governance events. Even if they hold those events, then the format might be very nascent or sort of peculiar. I remember, for example, one of those events was all about government talking about digitalization. So no other stakeholders, but only government agencies talking how they transform themselves preparing for the future.

Now, with that, given that the region is so huge and so diverse, there are very interesting formats. As I mentioned already, there are classical IGFs, I mean, national IGFs. Like for example, in Japan or in Indonesia or in Australia. There are very special events which go beyond and above that classical IGF format and agenda. Like, for example, NetHui in New Zealand.

There are some other initiatives which are unique for the region, and even globally, and that's Asia Pacific Academy -- Internet Governance Academy -- which is a joint initiative by the Korean registry and ICANN. And this is truly a regional event because they get together, people from at least 30 countries or so across the region. There is also Asia Pacific Internet Governance School, which is right now in the process of transformation, revamping itself. So it's still premature to judge its further development.

There is a very special event which I have just attended and I would be happy to give yet another lecture on this, and it's called the World internet Conference, which takes place every year in Wuzhen, China, nearby Shanghai. Very special event, sort of eye-opening exercise. I think that those who will be attending the IGF in Berlin would have an opportunity to attend a session. There will be people from that World Internet Conference organizing committee to talk about that.

And there is a number of Internet Governance schools, national schools. Like, for example, in Armenia. And there are sub regional IGFs, and this is a very interesting thing because as the region is so diverse, it's really hard to imagine what Georgia and New Zealand

have in common, although they have a lot. I would rather put it in such a way what, for example, Cambodia and Georgia have in common. So, these sub regional IGFs, they are sort of emerged in different parts of the region.

I know about the Pacific IGF. There was Middle East IGF but it's no longer in existence. It's just gone, for four or five years already. And there is a quasi sub regional IGF across the biggest area, which is Eurasia, the former Soviet countries. And that's kind of interesting experience because all those post Soviet countries, although they got divorced, officially, still have something in common. You know, like that family which gets together anyway. So, this is a very interesting one.

And APTLD is involved in different ways and we are quite active, I just realized. I just drafted the list. Of course, we update our members about these major events, understandably. I attend them in my capacity as General Manager. So I do participate in those events as a speaker as well. We also do fellowships for our members. We actually send our members to different IG events, which means that they come on our dime to the Asia Pacific regional IGF -- I will be talking about that to the Academy.

Sorry, I know, I'm running out of time. I'm about to finish. So we are sending them to quite a number of events and they it works well, because when they are there, they got to report back. It's not like you just attended that and it's done. No, they got to report to the

community. And those reports are in writing and you can find them on our website.

Then we are going to have a specific session, a dedicated session, on the ccTLDs and Internet Governance at the upcoming meeting in Melbourne, Australia. And finally, we cosponsored National IGFs, mostly by deploying speakers, or just encouraging our members to do what I call "cross pollination". When you come with your experience, and then you help others by sharing your insights.

As to topics, I think that very high on the least of those, are cybersecurity, obviously. Secondly, which is very unique for our region, that's IDNs, because you would imagine that the region is full of native languages which are non Latin, and local content, but in a very specific context. I would say a rather Shakespearean question, to ban or not ban. So in that case, ccTLDs have to deal with that reality. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: No, thank you very much, Leonid. That was very, very interesting. Just to let you know that your country hasn't invented the sovereign Internet. France did it with Minitel 35 years ago.

LEONID TODOROV: Yeah, but we implemented that.

PIERRE BONIS: Peter.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Thank you, Pierre. My name is Peter Van Roste from CENTR. So what I would like to do in the next couple of minutes is just give an overview and share some of the IDs that I see coming up in our region. On the highest level, CENTR's involved in two different types of initiatives: IGF, which is always a collaboration with the colleagues from the other regional organizations where we submit proposals for workshop, and then on the European level, on the regional European dialogue on Internet Governance, EuroDIG.

I think it's important for us to look back at where we come and what has changed, and where we are now. CENTR is actually right in the middle of reviewing what we're going to do with our IGF involvement because we're facing a different landscape now. First of all, the participation of ccTLDS 10-12 years ago, and from the start in Athens onwards, was massive. We had lots of members attending all the IGFs. We had a long list of experts that we could ask to sit on panels and to participate in working group discussions. This is dwindling down. If working groups in Rio de Janeiro in 2008-2009 had 100 active participants in that room, we are looking at participation rates of anything between five and 15 in the last couple of IGFs, half of which our own members. So then you have to wonder why you keep doing that.

We see two structural issues. And I understand this is out of the scope of this committee, but it's important to understand these issues for us to be able to predict on how we're going to move forward. The one

EN

thing that's changed significantly, and everybody looking at an attendance list can see that, it's less about the infrastructure providers and more about civil society, these days.

So, that means that there is less interest from our members in some of the topics that are on the agenda. [Inaudible] with our hat on as General Manager of regional organizations in order to give feedback to our members about what's happening at an IGF, we would suddenly be covering 50 topics, not three, to reflect what is happening there. So, there's a bit of a problem, which is probably one of the best incentives to to keep on collaborating as regional organizations.

Maybe just to add on that, on a sub regional or national level, I think we see a completely different picture. So where we have structural questions with global and regional initiatives, the ones on a national and sub regional level seem to be working very well to the level that some of the organizers are actually struggling or starting to struggle with the impacts of their own success. The meetings have become too large. And just in terms of resources, to run it again next year, is becoming a bit of a daunting exercise. So that's it for CENTR. Thanks.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, Peter. You explained the diminution of the involvement of ccTLDs in IGF by an evolution of the topics, if I understood well. And especially, you talked about, not only the evolution of the topics, but the number of topics that are discussed. Do you think that the eight topics that we put on the table here with

the IGLC that are still discussed in IGF are not interesting for ccTLDs, or maybe that ccTLDs are not interested to talk about that in the broader community and it's easier to talk about that within our own organization?   Because, I feel that all these topics are discussed in every IG event. So, what is your explanation about this kind of fading of interest? I mean, this is a tricky question. I'm sorry.

PETER VAN ROSTE: But it's an essential one. The way I see it is that the unfortunate trigger of some of the active or high ccTLD involvement in the early days of IGF was defensive reasons. We all go there because we want to make sure that nothing goes wrong, that no bad thing is happening to the ccTLD community, or DNS in general. It's not an egocentric view, but it's an industry-centric view. That threat has gone away. People now understand, and have seen after 10 years, that at IGF actually nothing is happening. So, nothing bad, but also nothing good so far. Except for some of the things in the margins, by the way.

So I think that is a bit of the trigger for the shift in attention from our industry. When I'm looking at these, at this list, I think they're still highly relevant, but this is not -- you have to start looking carefully at the IGF agendas to find these topics.   They might be hidden somewhere still in larger discussions.

But what you see now more is, what is the morality of blockchain? It's probably a great topic for discussion, but that is not a topic that, with our scarce resources, we as regional organizations can spend any time

on. And I think most of my member ccTLDs would think the same. So, these are still great topics, but I don't think there's a lot of interest in that typical IGF community.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, Peter. So now we have Lianna and Leonid. We have some remote participants, wanted to take the floor also. So if you allow me, maybe we will go to the remote participant now. And we will finish the talks with Lianna and Leonid -- with both of you -- and I'll do a very quick wrap up of this discussion and then move to the next point of the agenda.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thank you, Pierre, this is Joke. I will first read out the comments and the questions from the remote participants. First we have Mohammed Yousif from Sudan. His comment is as follows: "The Sudanese ccTLD play a major role in national IGF in Sudan by providing speakers, financial support and organizational help."

Then there was a second comment by Alex Corenthin: "In order to get more ccTLDs involved on IG-relevant topics, we can add a specific session on the regional events, like the Africa DNS forum in the African region." And then I noticed that Mary Uduma had her hand up, but she lowered her hand recently. Mary, could you please clarify whether you still would like to speak?

PIERRE BONIS: Okay, Lianna.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Thank you, Pierre. I do have different hats and different roles. I would speak on behalf of the Armenian IGF and also the sub regional Southwestern European IGF.   And in terms of partnership with different organizations, this is in the role of the Armenian IGF, we have a unique situation that we partner with RIPE as a member of that organization, but also with the associate member of APTLD. So, with sponsoring and partnering, we get, for instance, money for the local IGF from RIPE, but we also go ourselves to the APTLD meetings and we have this outreach with the ccTLD community of that Asia Pacific region, which is really huge. And we share the experience and the topics.

Now, with the events that we're doing, it's not only the IGF itself, but also the capacity building, which is in the school of IG. And we do plan, it's not only the national IGF, but we also plan to have a regional school, which is from the Eastern partnership countries -- that includes six countries -- that is also coming for the smaller sub region. I think talking about the topics and relevance of IGF, maybe for their global IGF, the topics are being repeated and maybe they're losing or diminishing the importance, etc. But for certain countries, these discussions are still coming to those countries, and especially with the developing countries. So that will be really important if the process and the platform still goes on.

And besides the IGFs as a classical way, we do have also the DNS forums and discussions, and we share them. The common topics, which are not only the technical, as we see all these things, the local content and yes, the ccTLD registries, they are highly involved in this. Depending on a topic and a country and region, their involvement -- we saw, also, in a survey that the participation is different.

And for instance, in the case of RIPE NCC with [inaudible] participation, I also need to say that the staff members, they participated with the program committee, which was really important in shaping the program itself. So, it's not only the community, but also the sponsoring and supporting organization. They've been a part of the program shaping, which is important. Thanks.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, Lianna, to very shorten because we --

LEONID TODOROV: No more than 20 minutes. So, two things. Let me just speak on what Lianna just said. We should understand that there is a huge gap between, let's say, the CENTR community, and to some extent, LACTLD community on the one hand, and AFTLD and APTLD. So I guess for Africa and Asia Pacific, one of those very characteristic features is that ccTLD is in these regions (this is my guess) are the one and only gateway for whatever IG concepts. No one has any clue, but ccTLDs in a particular country, in a given country, about the mere

existence of IGF and Internet Governance. So it's up to ccTLDs to develop this concept further on the national level.

Secondly, when we come to the international level, here is a huge problem. And the problem might be described in institutional terms. While the internet is continuously and increasingly becoming a public good, which is like for everyone and for some symbolic fee, let's say, at least for a part of the global population, the Internet Governance per se is like a [inaudible] good. You've got to pay for that. And pay a lot, especially if you're from a remote region. So just to give you an example, we have recently flown our member from a tiny Pacific island of Vanuatu to the European School on Internet Governance, and the ticket alone cost us more than $3,000. So how would you effectively talk about participation and outreach? Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Okay. Thank you very much. Very, very quickly, because we ran out of time. So I'm not going to do the wrap up extensively. Just two or three points. First of all, in each and every region there is still a regional approach of Internet Governance, which means not a global one and not only a national one. That's the only definition that fits for everyone. Second, there is a kind of consensus here on the fact that there is still a vibrant national Internet Governance talks in a lot of countries, with various models and some of them being more and more sophisticated. But there is room for Internet Governance talk at the national level. The involvement from the CC's is important.

But at the international level, there has been an approach that was a defensive one. And since the international approach is relying on Internet Governance Forum, this toothless animal -- if it's toothless, you don't need to be defensive because it's a kind of a nice animal. So we are less and less involved in that.

And I heard also that there are still a lot of initiatives about -- Internet Governance schools or academy or training initiatives. Some of them, not so much in Europe, even if there is one Internet Governance school, I think, in Europe, but I've heard a lot of these examples in Asia Pacific and in Africa and also in Latin and Caribbean. That's not exhaustive at all. But this is, to me, one of the points that are very interesting.

And the last, but not least, because we're talking with regional organizations, is that it's getting more and more difficult for regional organization to inform their members about what happens in international governance forum in the IGF. Because it's so huge that it's become almost impossible to find the very important thing that was talked about.

I hope, in that regard, that the initiative taken by the Swiss, then by the French and, I hope, by the Germans, this year, which was an attempt to have some kind of very straight messages every time we go out of an IGF, will help. Because that's so huge that it's really difficult to go back to the members. And that's a difficulty that we face in IGLC too. If we were asked by the membership of the ccNSO to report on what happened in Berlin, we would be very, very afraid. And please,

don't ask us that, by the way. So this is a challenge for regional organizations also, to cover the IG talks.

So thank you very much for this exchange. Really, I hope that we will continue to cooperate. And if you have any remarks on the survey or on any initiative that the IGLC takes, in order for you to convey it to your members in an easier way, don't hesitate to come to me and the staff. Thank you very much for that. We move very quickly to the panel discussion planning.

I think that we will not have the time to talk about the next step of the IGLC. So, we will try to talk with the members of the IGLC during the ccNSO members meeting and find one hour sometime during Montreal's meeting to talk about that together. So for the panel discussion planning, Joke, can you remind us when it is, where it is and who's participating?

JOKE BRAEKEN: As you can see from the slide here, the panel discussion will be taking place on Wednesday afternoon. That's the sixth of November, starting at 15:15 until 16:45. The room will be the ccNSO room 516C. That is this hallway. If you're unable to participate in person, remote participation will be available. And on the next slide, we have some pictures of those that will be participating in the session. So, Young-eum Lee, she will be the session Chair for this slot. And then the moderators will be Pierre and Laura, together.

You can see the picture of Mary still on this slide. Mary is, unfortunately, unable to participate in person, but I understood that she will attempt to participate remotely. But on the panel, we will probably look for a replacement for Mary. She was supposed to speak on the national perspective on Internet Governance, together with Irina from Russia. And then we have Eduardo, who will speak to the regional approach for ccTLDs, and Jorg, from the global approach. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you. Can you go back to the previous slides, please? We didn't see any picture of ICANN .org. So, Laurent is here; Laurent Ferrali, you all know him, of course. Mandy was here a little bit before. I think she left. So on Wednesday, we will ask ICANN, at the beginning of the session, so Mandy or Laurent, I'm not sure, this is up to ICANN to decide that, to explain us what is ICANN doing when it comes to Internet governance.

One important thing about the work of the IGLC, it's sometimes a little bit frustrating, but it's that way is that we are not going too much in the substance. Otherwise, we are going to have face-to-face meeting, we last 12 hours instead of one hour and a half. We just try to do a wrap up of who is doing what, where.

So, what we expect from ICANN is, of course, not to tell us what are the important topics to fight with, but why ICANN is involved, as an organization, what is the view of the organization on the importance

of being aware of what happens in Internet Governance, and how they are organized internally to follow all that at the governmental level, maybe, the regional and the international level.

Then after, we will go from the, let's say, regional and global perspective, to the national ones. And once again, the aim -- So Mary, we will miss you but we will have a view from from Armenia instead of Nigeria, for the national view. Once again, it's always about giving publicity about what is the interest and what is the importance of CC's in Internet Governance. Making a bridge with a topic that we will not have the time to discuss today, which is the next steps before IGLC.

The idea of the group, I think, is that the reason why ccNSO asked for the creation of the Internet Governance liaison committee was to make sure that there is still interest in the community for these topics. What Peter said before about the lack of interest of some of the members, the fatigue of Internet Governance talks, make us try to make sure that there is still something to do, something to talk about and something to get involved in.

When we will have done that as a group, maybe we will have done our work as the IGLC itself. And we'll be able to share it with the other constituencies and the other parts of ICANN, maybe the engagement group on working on Internet Governance, and tell them that we are still ready to talk, to organize, to sponsor, to participate, to this kind of events.

So, this session will be important for the group. And if it's a success, maybe it will be 90% of the work that was expected from IGLC. And then after, we will kind of put that on the table and avoid to become on the next step a group that is thinking about the substance of Internet Governance, because we are all doing this work in our own organizations. But it would be difficult to have a specific group in ccNSO that works on the topics themselves.

So, I just want to share this quickly, this personal view, in a way, because we still have a little bit more than five minutes to have a discussion about that. It's not a conclusive one, we will have another opportunity to discuss the next step of IGLC. But that was just putting in perspective, this session of the ccNSO members meeting and the next step of the IGLC, and the view I wanted to share with you. Is there any frustration about the fact that IGLC is not aiming to become the group of experts about the substance of Internet Governance?   No frustration? Okay. I would have expected a little bit more frustration.

PETER VAN ROSTE: This is Peter from CENTR. No, indeed, no frustration. I think this is a realistic and useful purpose. I think it's an element of synchronization that has been lacking so far. If they can highlight the reasons why ccTLD managers are participating in the area of Internet Governance, will be difficult to answer without looking at why they are not participating. Apart from that, I fully support the aim here.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: But in response to what Peter said, I think it's solicits the reasons why people are not participating. So you have to facilitate who can go into the room and ask that question.

PIERRE BONIS: Yeah, Leonid.

LEONID TODOROV: Very quickly, sorry. I can see good publicity to the work of the the IGLC serving as a repository.   Can we just compliment this sentence, because it seems to be incomplete -- repository of what? Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Yeah, serving as a repository of the answers to the survey. We still have very humble expectations. And as from what [inaudible], yes. We could have think of having a panelist that is not explaining what he does at the national level, but what he doesn't do because he doesn't want to get part of the Internet Governance talk, for instance. But at the national level, if you know someone who doesn't want to get involved in Internet governance, there is someone in the room that has a disposition, that would be very interesting for the group. Because we will ask him or her to talk. As the room has been silent, is it because it's boring or because it's very complete and concrete?

Still silence. Okay. No intervention from the room? Yes. Thank you. Because we are not talking a lot about North America, so I think you

should take the mic here. We said that there were no IG event in our surveys from North America. This is a shame. Allan.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Thank you, Pierre. It's Allan MacGillivray from .ca from Canada. Certainly, we are very involved in the national IGF for a number of years. The registry fully financed and organized it recently. We've opened up to a multistakeholder approach to organizing, and it's been very successful. And I'm happy to answer questions about that. But actually, what prompted me to put my hand up is, just looking at the aims here, and I'd offer a comment.

I think we're seeing more and more -- we're going to see what can be called this basket of internet regulation. All this fear about what's happening with the fake news, etc. Certainly, things are gone very far in France. And I think many, many DNS operators are concerned that national governments will look to the DNS as a platform for regulation. And I assume that many of us don't feel that that is appropriate.

And so, the comment I would offer is, what makes the cc community unique is we all have people in even small countries who understand how the DNS actually operates. And I think one of the roles or aims that the community could consider, is to take on that educational role as to how the DNS interacts with other platforms, for example. Because many national governments do not understand this, and I think that we have, in the cc community, many members of national

governments. So I think there is an opportunity there for us to take an educational role with respect to our national governments, that we as registry operators and as DNS operators, are actually uniquely positioned to do on such a wide scale. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, Allan. And I think that it's very fair that you close this meeting, as the host here in Montreal. Thank you very much to have shared this educational approach, not only to the broader community, but specifically to the legislators and the governments, when it comes to regulating the Internet.

Thank you all. We are two minutes late, but I think it was a very interesting, at least for me, discussion. So see you all on Wednesday. And for the panelists, we will have another meeting on Monday. Thank you very much and thanks a lot to the remote participants.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]