
ICANN76 | CF – ccNSO: Internet Governance Liaison Committee
Saturday, March 11, 2023 – 16:30 to 17:30 CUN

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hello and welcome to today's ccNSO IGCL meeting held on the 11th of March at 21:30 UTC. My name is Joke Braeken and I'm the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will only be read out loud if put in the proper form as I will note in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you're done speaking.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Annaliese Williams, IGLC chair.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Good afternoon, everybody, and welcome to this session of the Internet Governance Liaison Committee. It's nice to see so many people here today. I think this is only the second time the committee has met in person since COVID lockdowns, so it's lovely to see you all here.

Even since our last meeting, we have had some new members join the committee, so welcome to those new members. And just so that we all

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.

know each other and know who we are, we might just do a quick tour de table so people can just briefly introduce themselves. I'll start.

My name is Annaliese Williams. I'm from the DotAU domain administration. I've been the chair of this committee for perhaps a year. We'll start down at this end if you could please introduce yourself. Thank you very much.

TATIANA TROPINA: Hello, everyone. My name is Tatiana Tropina. My daily job is assistant professor at Leiden University but here I'm in a capacity of ccNSO Council Member NonCom appointee. Thank you.

MARTA DIAS: Hello, everyone. My name is Marta Dias. I'm from Portugal from the Portuguese registry, DotPT, and this is my first meeting together with the group, so thank you so much for having me here.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Good afternoon, all. My name is Pablo Rodriguez. I am also a ccNSO council for the North America region and it is a pleasure to be with you all here.

JAVIER RUA JOVET: Hola. Javier Rua Jovet from Puerto Rico, ccNSO councilor, NomCom appointed, and member of this IGLC.

PIERRE BONIS: Bonjour, hola. I'm Pierre Bonis, CEO of AFNIC, DotFR, and member of the IGLC.

LAURA MARGOLIS: Hello, everyone. My name is Laura Margolis. I was a ccNSO councilor elected by the NomCom and now I am an ALAC member but I am continuing in this group since the beginning of the IGLC. That's it, thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Hello, everyone. It's Chris Disspain. I'm a ccNSO councilor for the European region.

DAVID MCAULEY: Hi, everybody. My name is David McAuley. I'm a new member to the IGLC employed by Verisign, participating in ccNSO by virtue of our management, DotCC, country code top-level domain. Thank you.

LUIS DIEGO ESPINOZA: Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Luis and I'm part of the ccTLD DotCR from Costa Rica.

JENNIFER LOPEZ: Hi, everybody. I'm Jennifer Lopez and I'm a ccNSO councilor.

ABDULLAH CEMIL AKCAM: Hello, everybody. I am Abdullah Cemil Akcam. I am an IGLC member since 2021.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Hi, everyone. My name is Joke Braeken and I am a ccNSO staff support.

BART BOSWINKEL: My name is Bart Boswinkel, ccNSO staff support.

ALI HADJI: Hello, everyone. My name is Ali Hadji. I'm a ccNSO council member for Africa region.

MOLEHE WESI: Hello, everyone. My name is Molehe Wese. I'm from DotZA. I'm a member of the IGLC. Thank you.

SABRINA WILKINSON: Hi, everyone. My name is Sabrina Wilkinson. I'm Policy Program Manager at CIRA, DotCA.

ALLEN MACGILLIVRAY: And I'm Allen MacGillivray also from CIRA and a regular participant.

SEAN COPELAND: I'm Sean Copeland. I'm the ccNSO councilor from the North American region.

FERNANDO ESPANA: Hello, everybody. Fernando Espana with GoDaddy registry and here representing DotUS.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, everyone. We also have some online participants. So, if you're a member of the committee online and would like to introduce yourself, perhaps just raise your hand now and I will invite you to speak in the order of hands raised. Ellen, go ahead, please.

ELLEN STRICKLAND: Hello, all. I'm Ellen Strickland from DotNZ, Internet New Zealand.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: And we also seem to have a few observers both online and in the room. So just an invitation to any observers who would like to join the committee, come and speak to me and Joke at the end of the session. Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL: A hand raised.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Heidy, go ahead, please.

HEIDY ISABEL HERNANDEZ LOPEZ: Hi, it's nice meeting you. I'm new. I'm a fresh join to the committee and I am so excited to go to my first event and I'm looking forward to working with all of you. I'm Heidy.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, everyone. And welcome, Heidi and Ellen, online. So, the purpose of this session was you'll recall we circulated a survey and the purpose of that survey was to try and prioritize or see if there was some priority order of the large range of issues that were identified as part of the heat map exercise that we did before that. The meeting before that.

The survey didn't perhaps give us the results we were hoping for. I think many people may have found the questions confusing or difficult to place one topic under one topic basket that we had identified. So I will perhaps invite any comments on the survey that people wanted to share or any particular difficulties they had or any sort of suggestions for how we might perhaps in the absence of a result from that, how we might perhaps prioritize the topics or choose the next topic for discussion.

We do have the heat map topics I think that Joke will pop up in a moment, but if there are any comments on the survey—Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Not on the survey itself but maybe it might be useful to explain the heat map because a lot of new people who have no idea what we're talking about.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Bart. Of course. So the heat mapping exercise was a repeat of an exercise that was first done last year and we had repeated it to see whether there were hot topic issues across the various regions. The Internet governance issues that were of importance to IGLC members from various regions.

And the list that we have up on the slide at the moment is the list that was developed as a result of the heat mapping exercise that we did this year. Many of the topics on there were also on the list last year but there were some new issues identified, including the Internet fragmentation, the WSIS review, and digital sovereignty I think were all new issues that were identified as priority issues for this year. So that's how the list of issues was developed.

But as it appears on the screen that's sort of in a random order. It's not in list of importance or it's not in order of priority that we are going to discuss them. The purpose of the survey that we had sent out was to try and narrow down the list a little and place them into baskets they were called—a topic basket—and some issues would ... We were hoping it would show some clear priorities and way forward, but unfortunately the survey results didn't come back with anything clear.

Again, I'll invite any comment that anyone has. Sean, I know you sent me a note but I'm not sure if you'd like to speak on that or whether anybody else wanted to make any comment on the ... Thanks, Joke has just put up the topics baskets that we had tried to group the issues into.

BART BOSWINKEL:

The exercise is ... If you go back to the list that Annaliese has just presented, it reflects the topics in which the people in the region found interesting. And what is fascinating about this list, this is at least in two or three regions of importance. So that's why you see this top eight of the top list. If you go back to the ... Or we will not because this shows it very nicely. So this is across regions. From a CC perspective, these are the top eight topics. That's the way ... It's not correct.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Not quite. So these were the broader headline issues that we thought that the large list might fit under. So this is not so much the top eight issues. This was trying to narrow down the big list that we had into perhaps a more—

BART BOSWINKEL: Manageable list.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Yeah, a more manageable list. But unfortunately the survey results ... These were suggestions that were developed by Abdullah, Joke, and myself but the survey didn't quite give us what we were hoping for and I'm not sure whether that was the way it was the questions or phrased or whether there were any other issues that people wanted to ... Sean sent me a note saying that a number of the issues on the bigger list could have fitted into multiple baskets and the survey design didn't allow for that.

So whether the purpose of today I guess is to see whether we can identify a narrower list to tackle or perhaps even just the next couple of issues that we might want to address next. There were some on the list that were issues of importance across a number of regions. So perhaps if there aren't other suggestions, I will propose that we start with the ones that were of interest across multiple regions. But just inviting any comments from any committee members on any other way forward or any topics that they would like to start with. Javier, go ahead, please.

JAVIER RUA JOVET: Thank you. I think that in our process, throughout the process with the heat map we came up with several topics, etc. But towards the last meetings—maybe just the last ones that we had—it seemed like we had not spoken at all or very little about really cross-cutting issues like Internet fragmentation and geo-political things to that effect.

Maybe that has to do because it's such a big issue that it might be the specific [province] of this committee but maybe it is. I definitely have a lot of interest in that topic but it doesn't seem to fit within this eight, I don't think. Or maybe it could.

I guess my only comment is that seemed to be something important, that discussion about just the Internet itself. It might be too broad. But I perceived a big interest in that and it was not well reflected in documents. I do see it in this other checklist and in the actual heat map. It's in there but it's not ...

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Javier. We just have an online participant, then I'll come back to you. Thanks. Ellen, go ahead, please.

ELLEN STRICKLAND: Thank you so much to everyone for their work on this. I think it's really useful to see everyone's thinking. I know I found the survey also similarly. Oh, well these don't really fit or could fit multiple baskets and had that same thought process myself.

I guess what I'd like to offer is I think that topics and having baskets and ways we look at it as a committee makes a lot of sense. But particularly what stood out to me—and I'd love us to just think about how we [inaudible] some of the processes. So I noticed the GDC and WSIS were listed there and that those very much are ... They're processes that encompass many of these topics. So whether we might ... And I couldn't think about the topics as one way to approach it but we might need ... And the previous speaker just mentioned if they're cross-cutting topics or processes, that it might just need a slightly different approach. Thanks.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Ellen. Go ahead, please.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you. I actually think that Internet fragmentation will be a cross-cutting topic because when you think about what contributes to the debate about Internet fragmentation there is suddenly infrastructural issues, content policy, legal and regulatory issues, human rights and so on and so forth. So it's just, in a way, how do we approach this? Because if we put Internet fragmentation we will never be able to decrypt it without going through all of this. But I think that it should be definitely on the radar. But then again how do we approach it?

We can approach this from the very narrow point of view. How does it affect the technical layer of the Internet? Because we are the ccTLD space here. But on the other hand, we can look at how it affects user experience, how it affects something else.

I absolutely think that if we approach it from the Internet fragmentation point of view, this will all fit into this debate.

JAVIER RUA JOVET: Thank you for explaining my thoughts way better than me.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Pierre. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, Annaliese. On this topic that can be affected by other topics, I think we have to remind us that when we talk about WSIS, for example, or when we talk about Internet governance processes, initially it was how does it affect ccTLDs and what could be the voice of ccTLDs within these processes.

So if we keep that in mind, the fact that the WSIS has hundreds—or maybe not hundreds but dozens of action lines and things like that, it's not a problem for us. What is our role within it? That's the first point.

And the second point maybe is—and I think this is a very important debate that we have to have together. When we talk about Internet fragmentation, for instance, there is two ways of looking at it. Of course there is a way saying, okay, it can be fragmented because of legal and regulatory content, human rights, etc. And another way to see it is stick to the technical community part of the ccTLD and look at obvious attempts to change the technical layer of Internet, such as UIP, these kinds of things.

If we focus on that, maybe it will not be enough but it will be—we will be able to discuss about it. If we have to discuss about all the eight points when it comes to Internet fragmentation, I think it's going to be a little bit difficult for us.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you. This is absolutely right and absolutely true but I think there is ... I would like to add an important caveat. I don't run a ccTLD. I'm not a ccTLD manager. But I think your role here essentially becomes—it is defined by the priorities. When you think about Internet fragmentation and all these, what is your priority? What is your goal here? Is it to protect status quo as a ccTLD, current status quo? Is it about [resist] these developments? Is it about participating in these developments? What's your role here? What's your priority and your priority will define your role, because for example if you look at what ICANN is doing, they're trying to preserve the unity of the Internet and the unified domain system, the system of unique identifiers, because some of the interventions, for example from the European Commission, was trying to intervene exactly at this core.

So I think the role of ccTLDs will depend on what's your priority here. What do you want to have? What's your reason in this process?

JAVIER RUA JOVET:

Very quickly, my point of view but I think of the point of view of some CCs is that when it comes to security, stability of the Internet, we exactly have the same point as ICANN has because we are on the technical layer of it. And this is not the status quo, per se. It's just that it's an enabler to

everything that is here. Of course, it can be seen as a very conservative position at the beginning and maybe we are the new incumbent after the telcos in the 90s, I don't know.

But what most of us are saying is that this technical layer is an enabler to everything else and that when you touch it you may break everything else. This is not to say that we are not interested in the other topics and the point is we are very interested in it because they are here.

But I think when it comes to Internet fragmentation, if we can stick to we are DNS operators, we know how it works, we have interaction with the root zone servers, and this is what we want to fight for. It's not because we don't have a purpose of priority.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS:

Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Sorry, a very quick intervention. We are talking about the same. When I participate in the discussion on Internet fragmentation, I'm just saying when technical layer is lost, you will not talk about security, human rights, and the Internet. You will not talk about the Internet, because once this is lost, everything is lost. So I'm in agreement with you here. But I think it would be good to be spelled because this looks like a bunch of very wide topics in [inaudible], but once you go to the core and you say we are here to protect technical layer, because once it is lost, everything else is lost, then you have the goal, then you can define your role.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Allen. Thanks.

ALLEN MACGILLVRAY: Thank you. I would go one step further. I agree with what you're saying. My view is we shouldn't be duplicating what's going on in other fora. There's no point in us having a debate about Internet fragmentation generally. I think we should be focusing on what perspective can the ccTLD community bring to this topic? What perspective is not being discussed that we could? I think that's where our focus should be and it could narrow this down quite a bit. I think one characteristic of our community which perhaps distinguishes it from many others is our relative proximity to our national governments. Many of you are national government employees. So I think this creates a unique opportunity for us to input into some of these governmental processes. Actually, as Pierre says, we understand how the DNS works. There is still many government people who don't understand these things. So I think that is a prism or a filter that we should be applying to these topics. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Allen. Pablo, did you want to?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you. Pablo Rodriguez from the registry DotPR. I would like to contribute to the dialogue that is taking place between Tatiana and Pierre. I think those are very valid points. The one thing as an operator

that comes to mind immediately is that, as I look at this list of different topics and their subtopics, there are some things in which as an operator I can support and do something directly related to that. There are other topics in which I will be able to support indirectly because it is not within the scope of the things that as a ccTLD operator I can do, but without a doubt I can support that as well.

We can also help out in bringing that message, and that goes to Allen's point. And even though we are not—I am not—a government official but I can certainly bring the message to government officials and distribute it.

So, ccTLD operators don't have to take everything at hand and put that on our shoulders. What we can do is do our part where we can, support the parts we do not have a direct involvement. And I hear what Pierre is talking about, the technical layer, and the technical layer is the facilitation, is that track where we mediate. So yes, don't fix what's not broken. Thank you. That's my point.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS:

Thanks, Pablo. Any other comments? I'm not seeing any. I'm not seeing any hands online. Javier, go ahead.

JAVIER RUA JOVET:

Just quickly and just to build up a little bit on Pablo's comment. It has to do with a particular prism and point of view of ccTLD managers and the varied opinions that they might have. But the nature of ccTLD managers are some very close to governments and others not. That spanning, the whole ecosystem of multi-stakeholder governance ... So

that particular view that we have here that is at the heart of multi-stakeholder governance and should be at the heart of conversations that are of kind of like a geo-political nature, like Internet fragmentation, in a way our view is of the variety and diversity of this community is the strength of the value that the CCs bring into this topic. Just a different view. The viewpoint from DotPR, it's an NGO and then others that are purely governmental, that are pure businesses, that is what multi-stakeholder is in a way. We should never forget that important point.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Javier. Pablo, go ahead.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Javier's point brought a cascade of ideas. As a result of that, without doubt it is that variety of the various natures of what characteristically identifiers, as Javier already mentioned and numerated. Some of us are academia, others are government, others are private companies and NGOs. Each one of us have a particular scope of objectives that we want to achieve. As a result of that, where I may not be able to reach government, for example, other ccTLDs may. And where others may not be able to be as agile to do something because there is a large bureaucracy there are others of us who have a different nature as a private company and so on will be able to act very quickly.

So, it is precisely that. I absolutely agree with Javier that it is the difference of nature of each one of us as ccTLDs, it's our strength. It's

what will allow us to accomplish many of the objectives that are described or enumerated in this list. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS:

So, thank you for all of your comments. In terms of perhaps a way forward or prioritizing the next ... There is a lot to unpack in a lot of these issues. And as Allen said, it's not the purpose of this committee or the ccNSO or of ICANN to duplicate work that is happening elsewhere, but rather to unpick some quite big issues on that list and think about what it means for CC managers and how we might perhaps think about the issues or engage in some of these processes that are taking place outside.

Does anybody want to propose a particular next few set of issues or a next issue to discuss or to unpack a bit further? Bart, did you want to speak?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yes, please. What I've done and I'll pass it in the chat, so I don't [inaudible] can see it. I've looked at the terms of reference, as Pierre said of the IGLC and it's the objective—and I'll quote it—has been establish, coordinate, facilitate and increase the participation of ccTLD managers in discussions and processes pertaining to Internet governance. And Internet governance is in itself a broad topic, and if you go back through the history of the heat map, it was to identify common threads across the regions, because otherwise you discuss regional problems. And the list that Joke published ... Excuse me, I'm tired. That list, yeah. What is fascinating about it is that you see ... On

the top line, you see all the regions and there are only a limited set which really cuts across all the regions. And what was interesting about your discussion right now, you start to look at Internet fragmentation in a way with the objective of the IGLC in mind how to make it interesting for the ccTLDs. And tearing it a little bit apart of what are the interesting aspects that you may discuss, if you just do the same kind of exercise for these other topics—and there are just two or three which are really important at this stage that were identified. So one is Internet fragmentation, the other one that is really cross-cutting is cybersecurity.

Cybersecurity, going back to your list that you used for the survey, was one of the topics. And everybody knows it's very broad. Again, what is the focus and interest from a ccTLD perspective on this one? And then share and how does it effect. With digital divide, that's why we use it and in the past as well. So how does this mix and match across the regions and what can we learn from each other across the regions?

But if you do it this way, then you have already a very interesting agenda going forward, and without the need to prioritize but really try to drill down what are the aspects that are really of interest in each of these topics for the ccTLDs? And I think that's one of the core discussions you could have, and I'm building on that is how can you share and engage the broader community in these topics? That's probably by now the method you've been using to organize all these sessions, like the one on—which I'm really looking forward by the way—is the digital divide one because ... And that's the method, as I said, that you've been using. And now you got the cybersecurity by itself is interesting from that perspective as well. So that would be my suggestion for you. Thanks.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Bart. Any responses? No? Pierre, you're agreeing? Nodding. Yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL: So the next step is really ... And you did it with respect to Internet fragmentation. If you have a ccTLD hat and wear it, what is of interest for you when you start discussing Internet fragmentation and what would be the next and how do you want to share that type of information with your peers? I think that is the real question. And how do you want to engage them? So unpack the bit of Internet fragmentation, which you've done, and you can do the same with all the other topics like cybersecurity and maybe with capacity building. Then you have the top three already that are relevant across regions and you don't need any more prioritization in my view.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thank you. There seems to be general agreement for that approach. Ellen, I see your hand up. You can take the floor. Thanks.

ELLEN STRICKLAND: Thank you. I would agree with that as well. I would kind of extend it, I suppose, and I appreciate the purpose being added by Bart again into the chat. To extend what I said before about processes and discussions and thinking about those separately—and this is, apologies, I haven't been able to engage in the committee as much as possible over the last year or so. But that we think about our topics and our priorities but also

about the timeline and the upcoming events and processes that are taking place and what topics are relevant to those to help coordinate, facilitate, and embrace that engagement. So, I think in a way that's saying the processes are a bit different, but in a way, some kind of calendar and thinking about those processes and sharing information about them to identify the topics that are of interest to us and how we might engage in those processes is something that I think could certainly be useful for us and I would appreciate from this group that kind of sharing and facilitating and linking what we've agreed here is a good approach with the processes and opportunities to engage more broadly.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS:

Thanks, Ellen. Yes, I agree. Thanks, Joke. We'll go back to the agenda. I did want to perhaps consider or invite some discussion on the possibility of inviting further guest speakers. We had Lise Fuhr come and speak with us at our last meeting or the special committee meeting and we also have an opportunity only for those who are here in Cancun—unfortunately there's no remote participation for another session with her on Monday. But I was wondering if there were any other suggestions, if people have them later please feel free to send them through to me or to Joke. But other people who we might invite to come and speak to the committee, find out a bit more about a particular issue or a particular stream of work that somebody is working on. I certainly appreciated the opportunity to hear directly from Lise and if other people would like to have further guest speakers in the future, if you have ideas please let me know now or let us know later. But firstly I just would like to gauge whether guest speakers is something that people

are interested in doing again. Yes, I think I'm seeing general agreement. Thanks Pablo.

We also have later this week we are doing a ccTLD news session on the digital divide. We are also thinking about planning for a potential new session at the next ICANN meeting. Marta, I believe you had proposed an idea. I wondered whether you might like to tell the rest of the group a bit about your proposal.

MARTA DIAS:

Well, my idea is not such a new idea but I think it would be nice to present the impact of the European regulatory framework on ccTLDs. So mainly I would love to focus my presentation on the Portuguese environment, but of course the Portuguese environment reflects the set of regulation and legislation that is been done at the European level so I believe it could be something important and interesting for all of us. And of course it is one of the main thing regarding Internet governance itself. So I believe it could be a good idea to do it, if possible.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS:

Thanks, Marta. So is that something that perhaps we could extend out to another new session with input from other regions or are you mentioning a proposal just on European?

MARTA DIAS:

No, I believe we can do it with our other regions. We can do something like compare the different systems. It would be interesting.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: I think that would be really interesting. If there are comments from anyone else from other regions? Pierre? Pierre first and then Tatiana.

PIERRE BONIS: I was not speaking from my region, that's why. I think this is very important to make sure that we have a regional approach, various regional approach, on that because there's a lot and, as Alan said, we don't have to do in IGLC what is done elsewhere. I think one out of two sessions in ICANN are about is the new European regulation is applying to me, yes or no. So we really have to get a regional approach, otherwise it's going to be this kind of debate.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe again as an example the session you did on the—what was it named? The Geographic Indicators. That was again one of those examples where you see how developments in one area and you check what is happening in the other area. It's a good example. That was, again, one of your sessions. That went very well I guess again.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Bart. Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah. I don't know if this fits the entire thing, but another European her. I think that for the purpose if you want to look at other process and not work in silos, I want to put in the spotlight on the spotlight Sandra

Hoferichter who is responsible for EuroDIG and there is a big Internet fragmentation session at EuroDIG, for example. And if anybody is interested, there might be some synergy here. But again, I'm talking about Europe. Another European.

But a bit of a caveat here. I do think that the European Union putting forward all these regulations and coming up with them is at the forefront of regulation that have effect on the technical layer. And other regions might follow the suit or at least it will have transnational effect anyway.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS:

Thanks, Tatiana. Yes, I agree. When we're thinking about things like Internet fragmentation, I think competing regulation from various countries and regions is something to thinking about and there is or has been quite a lot of discussion around ICANN meetings about various European proposals, but Europe isn't the only region that's regulating in this space. So I think it would be really interesting to have a sort of comparison like we've done with the GI session and other sessions just about what is happening in the regulatory space across the various regions.

BART BOSWINKEL:

[inaudible].

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS:

Yes. Just for those who are online, Bart was saying just to focus on the impact on ccTLD managers when we're talking about regulation. We're

not looking to duplicate if it's discussions that are taking place elsewhere.

So I think there seems to be agreement on the idea of doing a regulatory regional comparison. Joke I'm not sure what the next step is, whether we talk to the meeting program committee and put out a call for ... Yeah. Come up with a proposal. So we will come up with a proposal I guess and get back to the committee on that. Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL:

A question. That's a nice one. But Internet fragmentation, is that something that you want to ... Because there was a lot of discussion about this. Keep it on the table and discuss it within the IGLC or make it a topic for Hamburg. You can easily decide to do it that way and get informed and see how to make it most interesting. That way you've got a bit of a work plan going forward.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS:

Yes, we can certainly do that. I think there is quite a lot to unpack when we're talking about fragmentation. What exactly do we mean and what does it mean for CC managers? I'm open to putting it on the table for another session in Hamburg. That would at least give us a deadline to define what the committee, the scope of the committees discussions of it would be. I'm seeing some agreement over there, so perhaps we will mark that one as an action item, too. Thanks, Bart.

So that is bringing us to the end of our agenda. I would invite anybody now if they had any other items that they wanted to raise. Chris, go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Annaliese. This may be an intensely naïve question and I apo in advance if it is and if it's already been discussed because I'm relatively new to this committee. But everything I've heard today is great. Have you talked about sending information the other way, into the Internet governance area, so to have ccNSO go to, for example, Internet Governance Forum and to talk about ccTLDs, to have some sort of education program that educates the world about what ccTLDs ... Have you talked about that? And you decided not to do it.

I ask the question because if you take a simple example—and I'm fine with that. When you take a simple example—you just talked about Internet fragmentation. It strikes me that if the ccNSO was to come to an understanding of what they generally thought about that, providing that information out into the wider community would actually be incredibly useful and quite powerful. Not policy, just these are our thoughts. We don't necessarily always agree with each other.

It just sprang to my head, so I said it.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS:

Thanks, Chris. There are certainly processes coming up. If the ccNSO wanted to provide some kind of input into the global digital compact or the WSIS discussions or something, that's something that we can consider further. I'm not sure whether we would settle on a single position within the committee, let alone with in the ccNSO. But Pierre, perhaps I'll invite you as previous chair to speak on discussion on this in the past.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Hello, everyone. My name is Sandra Hoferichter. As mentioned already, I'm participating in this ICANN meeting in my personal capacity, but I'm also responsible for the European IGF, for instance, and I would encourage this committee to put more effort into participating in these foras, like IGF, global IGF and regional and national IGFs for several reasons.

On a national level, you definitely can do capacity building with your local government so that they really understand the issue. That's important. On a regional level, of course we have these regional regulations that can be debated if they are useful, yes or no. But it's even more important at a global level, I would say, because here we are really debating cross-community wise, and while at the beginning of this WSIS process and of the IGFs, we had a huge number of ccTLDs participating in those that kind of disappeared in the last years and this I find really, really sad. Some of them are still supporting national or regional or the global—I don't think the global. Oh yes, the global IGF as well. But they are not there anymore. They have no voice anymore. Actually, they are missing.

Speaking for EuroDIG, for instance, we have a huge session on Internet fragmentation. We don't have yet really participation from the ccTLDs but we actually would need your voice and we would need to explain that the technical level basically is the most important one, because without the functioning technical level, you can forget about everything else that we discuss in Internet governance foras.

So I would really encourage all of you not just to participate silently but really to participate in the sessions. Speak up. Those foras are designed in a way to speak up. But we are actually really lost your voices throughout the last years and this is really something I would encourage you to come back.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS:

Thank you for that, Sandra. That's really interesting and it's useful to know. I think the purpose of this committee is to share information and raise awareness of things that are happening outside of the ICANN meetings. And some committee members are quite engaged in other processes. Some less so. But thank you very much for your intervention. Pierre, I'll offer you the floor.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you, Annaliese. First of all, I think there are still [inaudible] things to the IGLC. We got the information that there are still a lot of CCs who are deeply involved in their national IGF. And through their national IGF are involved to the messages that are sent to regional ones or to the global ones. So maybe they are not as visible as it was at the very beginning of the WSIS but they are still a very important player in this.

For instance, sometimes also ccTLDs are sending some people from their own staff that are specialized on the specific question and that are not identified as the ccTLD manager which is exactly the point for [inaudible], for example.

But coming back to the history and very quickly, having the ccNSO, having a voice, a message to send to IGF is something that, as a chair in

the previous years, I was not able to do. I really thought that it would not be possible. And the group thought that was not our role to try to get a common ground between so much variety of ccTLDs. I'm very sure that Annaliese is more capable of doing that than me and I will support [inaudible] to have a common voice of all the ccTLDs of the world to be conveyed to the world IGF. And if you cannot do that, that's a pity.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Pierre. We do have a number of ccNSO councilors in the room, so perhaps they think it's possible that we can get a single ccNSO voice. Chris, go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. Good luck with that. I speak from 20 years' experience. So, Pierre, I agree with you and perhaps I maybe need to be a little clearer. The thought, for example, of having a session—and again, this is straight off the top of my head. Having a session at the IGF of ccTLD managers discussing Internet fragmentation.

In other words, what you're doing is you're going to the world and the technical people who deal with this every day are talking about it. Not politicians, not people [inaudible], but actually the people down dealing with it. Having a session like that. It doesn't matter about whether we agree. In fact, it may be very valuable that we don't agree. But the concept that we're out there actually doing that and saying, look, here we are, we are a bunch of people with a significant amount of expertise and we're happy to come and talk to you might just be useful and valuable. Thanks.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Chris. Tatiana, I'll go to you, and then I will read out one of the comments in the chat.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you. I very much agree with Chris and Sandra, but I want to ask something to this. You know I sometimes feel that when gTLDs are talking, like European Commission or government saying, "Ah, these guys are making money out of technical layer. Of course they will talk like this." But when ccTLDs are talking, from many governments, they are a trusted medium for this message and I think it is so important to have them there."

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Tatiana. I'll just read out a comment that Jordan Carter has put in the chat. "A ccNSO generated contributory view, not binding, not a statement, not an opinion, not representing the ccNSO. Just a view added intelligently to a debate or a discussion." Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: What crossed my mind is more a question for Tatiana. Those people who were attending the [inaudible] meeting this morning. I think if you look at the survey it is reinforcing that message of diversity in ways of dealing with DNS abuse. It's out of sight of the remit of this group but not really completely. But I could imagine that something like the results of that survey would be ... The IGF would be the perfect audience for something like that. And especially showing the diversity

and maybe that's something like the IGLC whether whoever goes takes on that role to present that view, saying in the IGLC we've discussed this across with these various people, like the geographic indicators or the other stuff and this was the result. And this was the result. [inaudible] the outcome and like the [DAS] surveys is a very good example outside the fora of ICANN. Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA:

If I may respond to this, I think that this is also very important. I participate a lot in general Internet governance process. I think that, for example, DNS abuse has become like Frankenstein of everything. Like DNS abuse and we have to intervene and whatever. And it also relates to fragmentation as well. Keeping clear message, reporting on the results, showing what is being done, informing the broader community is very important and I agree with you, Bart, that that might also be projection of what is being done in terms of capacity building and conveying the message. And not only DNS abuse results. There are plenty of things that can be actually put out there. But this is the clear one.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Maybe that's something that ... And this goes back to the discussion about the ccNSO statement. It's not the ccNSO statement. It is just the result of consulting ccTLDs and this is what they do in this particular area. So there is no concern or there is a concern or whatever. But people need to know. For example, I think from that perspective, I think you were going down that direction, Chris.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Allen?

ALLEN MACGILLVRAY: Thank you, Annaliese. At the risk of repeating what's been said but I'd like to wrap it up in a bit of a bowl, I like the idea of a statement but it's nowhere near as powerful as a panel of ccTLD managers sitting at the IGF geographically and regionally diverse, and yes we're not Gs, we're not money, and we are regionally diverse and it will surprise a lot of people how diverse we are as a community, and I think that would be a very powerful message and take that opportunity to talk about the technical layer because they may be more receptive to hearing that message from such a group as opposed to someone from the Gs. I don't mean to beat up on them but it was Tatiana that started to stick it to them. So anyway there I am, thanks.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Allen. I think that does give us a lot to think about. There was another comment in the chat from Jordan about whether a panel of CC managers would in fact be diverse enough for an IGF session being all from the one stakeholder group. But I think that we definitely have ... I'm seeing two more quick comments. We have two minutes. One minute. Definitely have further discussions on this on how CCs might contribute to the broader discussion. I'll go Laura and then Tatiana.

LAURA MARGOLIS: Hello. I think that maybe we could create like a subgroup on this committee and work on that. Pierre wants to be the ...

TATIANA TROPINA: There is a lot of stakeholder diversities in ccTLDs because some of them are run by academic institutions, some of them are run by non-commercial organizations, some are run by governmental institutions. So you can always bypass the diversity requirement exactly because of diversity of who runs the ccTLD. Just a note.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, Tatiana. And just a reminder for those of you who are here in the room, we are meeting again on Monday at 3:00 PM. Joke, do you have the room at hand?

JOKE BRAEKEN: So the room is Xcaret 3 at level 2. I will pass it again in the chat as well. Thanks.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: Thanks, everyone. If there isn't much to continue to discuss, we will send out a little note with the action items from this meeting and I look forward to seeing you again on Monday for another discussion. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And on Wednesday, too.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS: And on Wednesday, yes, we have the ccTLD news session on digital divide on Wednesday as well. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]