
ICANN82 | CF – Geopolitical Legislative and Regulatory Developments Update
Thursday, March 13, 2025 – 09:00 to 10:00 PST

BECKY MCGILLEY

Hello and welcome to the Geopolitical, Legislative, and Regulatory Developments Update. My name is Becky McGilley and I am a participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. On-site participants, if you wish to speak, please form a queue at the microphone located in the center aisle. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English, and please speak at a reasonable pace. Our panel will give a short update and the rest of the time for this session will be used for Q&A.

Interpretation for this session will include the UN languages plus Portuguese. All are welcome to use the chat. Please note that private chats are only possible among panelists in the Zoom webinar format. Any message sent by a panelist or a standard attendee to another standard attendee will also be seen by the session hosts, co-hosts, and other panelists. I will now hand the floor over to Veni Markovski.

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.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thank you, Becky. And we are going to present with my colleague, Elena Plexida, and we have remote participation with our colleagues Elizabeth Oluoch and Jamie Hedlund. We're going to do a little recap of what was discussed in the Prep Week session. So, those of you who have been at the Prep Week session, I'm afraid you have to hear a little bit of the same from that session. Those of you who have not been at that Prep Week session, it's available online, so please take a listen after we are done.

This is a new format which was decided earlier this year to have a Prep Week session on geopolitical developments, and to have this session here for Q&A so that you can ask us on everything that you want based on the Prep Week session and also on recent developments. So with that, let's-- Oh, and I have a question for the tech support. If you can enable the video for Jamie and Elizabeth, because apparently, it's not enabled. Thank you. With that, let's move to the next slide, which I believe is the agenda. Yeah, so we'll do a quick legislative development, IGO updates, and WSIS+20 review, and then we go into Q&A. With that, I think Elena, it's you.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Thank you, Veni. Hello, everyone. Good morning. As Veni said, this is going to be a very quick recap of what was presented during the Prep Week. Our colleague, Dimitris, gave a very comprehensive presentation of all the different items. I'm just doing the recap for the sake of the recap as such, so we follow the comments and discussions that you might want to have.

Okay, it was mentioned by Dimitris at the Prep Week that there had been a targeted consultation on internet governance by the European Commission, which had the aim to land with a strategy in light of WSIS+20. The update here that Dimitris already has given you—or maybe not, I don't know, this might be fresh—there's not going to be a standalone strategy on internet governance at the end. It seems that the Commission is opting for a wider scope communication on digital diplomacy, which will include a dedicated section on internet governance, but also will comprise several other key areas in digital policy and its external aspects.

There was another consultation that also is now closed, which is about the virtual worlds and Web4. The idea is to feed into the development of guiding principles for the governance of virtual worlds and Web4, which will be discussed at the conference that is taking place at the end of this month in Brussels. Our CEO will participate at the high-level panel organized on the first day of that global conference at the invitation of the Polish Presidency of the Council of the EU and the European Commission.

On the Council front, meaning the 27 EU member states, ICANN was hosted by the Polish Presidency of the Council of the European Union in January this year to deliver a workshop on internet architecture. The aim was a deeper understanding of the technical functioning of the internet, dive deeper into the topics of internet governance, and of course the ecosystem, its stakeholders and recent developments and debates such as the ones happening at the UN level.

The workshop was timely planned in expectation that the Polish Presidency will be focusing on internet governance in Council conclusions that they planned to adopt. It seems that the timeline has shifted, so now it is expected that the next Presidency of the Council which is Denmark will emphasize internet governance in its Council conclusions, which again will be wider and will be about digital diplomacy overall, including a section on internet governance.

Recapping again, NIS2 implementation is ongoing. As of today, and if I have my numbers right, nothing has changed in the past days or week. 10 member states have transposed partially or fully the NIS2 Directive into their national legislation. We are already seeing some deviations between these member states that have transposed. Of course, it remains to be seen where we land, because we need to see all the national implementing laws of the remaining countries.

As regards new and upcoming initiatives, there has been a proposal for an EU blueprint on cyber crisis management, so cyber crisis across incidents that might be affecting across the EU. There is reference there on the DNS specifically on strengthening resolution capabilities, EU-based resolution capabilities to be more specific.

Aside the updates that were given at the Prep Week, we had the request to touch base on the geographical indications issue, which we did not brief during the Prep Week because there were no updates as such. But since we had that request, I will touch a little bit briefly on the geographical indications issue. As regards the EU,

there have been two regulations that were adopted last year, one was on agricultural products and one was on industrial products, trying to protect geographical indications across the EU.

There was reference there for these protections to apply also in domain names. You might recall initially it was only about European ccTLDs, but then in the course of the discussion, there were considerations to expand to all TLDs. Where we landed is that with one regulation that didn't happen, with the ag regulation there is some reference to protections applying to all domains. Importantly, both regulations mandate that in one case by November 2025 and in the other case by June 2026, the Commission has to evaluate the feasibility of an information and alert system and if necessary, may propose a legislative initiative. So, this study is anticipated, and we will see what it will contain.

Now, as I mentioned, one of the two regulations does expand somehow the protections to all domain names that are operating in the Union and as we know domains have no borders, so meaning across the globe. The practical enforcement is a little bit unclear, again the practical enforcement, so how will an EU authority take action against a non-EU based registry. Again, practically how that will happen given that there are no clear mechanisms in place for that is a little bit unclear.

I will say on our part, highlight that countries across the globe do not see eye to eye on geographical litigations, that is they do not agree on how to protect geographical litigations as such. And I would emphasize on our side the importance of resolving such

issues at a global scale, preferably through collective efforts among countries at the WIPO level where such issues belong.

And at the very, very high level I will say on the topic that we do have a concern, remember it's our job to be concerned, of potential impact of transferring unresolved decisions of a political nature that have to be resolved at a unilateral level in technical bodies like ICANN which might create issues existing political debates in ICANN when they cannot be addressed in ICANN, could undermine if you will in the long run the multi-stakeholder model. Thank you, with that I will stop here. Should we open for discussions?

VENI MARKOVSKI

Do you guys do want to ask questions on that now or do you want to listen to everything and then go into questions? I'm open to either. Okay, I don't see anyone at the microphone so let's continue with the next slide. Next slide. Thank you. That goes to Elizabeth Oluoch who is online.

ELIZABETH OLUOCH

Thanks, Veni. Hi, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon. During Prep Week, I had the chance to share insights from our recent engagements in the ITU, so just following with the approach we're taking with the session, I won't go into much detail. I covered some of the Council Working Group meetings that we attended in February. One of them was the Council Working Group WSIS and SDGs.

During Prep Week, I had just highlighted two inputs that had come from a number of countries to the Council Working Group WSIS and SDGs consultation. You may recall that ICANN had made its own submission which is on ICANN's website. One of the multi-country contributions was from Saudi Arabia, Tunisia and UAE. And in their submission, they recognized the WSIS significant contributions over the past two decades and among some of the key considerations for WSIS+20 review. They included reinforcing multi-stakeholder collaboration and addressing the digital divide. And in their input contribution, they also emphasized the need to continue the WSIS process beyond 2025.

There was also a second multi-country contribution. These contributions were sent directly to the Council Working Group WSIS and SDGs and so that's why they were discussed during the Council Working Group meeting. The contribution from a number of countries that included Armenia, Azerbaijan and the Russian Federation. The contributors underlined the challenges in the WSIS implementation particularly the lack of international legal frameworks for internet governance. They also noted a need for the multi-stakeholder model to evolve and to implement initiatives to strengthen the multi-stakeholder model.

During the Council Working Group meeting, a representative from the European Commission delivered a statement which noted the efficacy of the WSIS process as a global framework for digital cooperation collaboration and the importance of maintaining a multi-stakeholder approach to internet governance. And in their statement, they also noted its support for renewing and

strengthening the IGF mandate ensuring it has sustainable funding in the UN budget.

We also participated in the Council Working Group internet open physical consultation. The topic for this consultation was the role of public policy in promoting multilingualization of the internet. ICANN made a submission. It's also on our website. My colleague, Pitinan, from the IDS program team participated. There was a panel session that preceded the physical consultation. It was on the same topic. Pitinan was joined by a speaker from UNESCO as well as the Permanent Mission of India. It was opened by the Director of the Standardization Sector, Seizo Onoe, and it was moderated by the Council Working Group vice chair from CEPT, Nigel Hickson.

Some of the key takeaways from this consultation. ICANN and the ICANN community were recognized and referenced as an expert on IDNs. Further awareness was raised on the technical challenges of Universal Acceptance. You may recall that last year at the World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly on the IDNs or multilingual related resolution, some new language that recognized the technical issues of Universal Acceptance were included in the resolution. So, this is just building on some of that important language.

Also, there was good visibility for Universal Acceptance Day and then the IDN standard which is managed by the IETF was recognized as well that any further work on the IDN standard should be taken to the ITF. So, this overall was a good outcome for

ICANN which also generated new collaborative opportunities as well on IDNs. The Council Working Group Internet which is closed to non-governmental stakeholders and sector members also met and they made a decision for the next topic for the consultation which is titled Ensuring Meaningful Connectivity to the Internet for Landlocked Developing Countries.

As far as WTDC, which is the World Telecommunication Development Conference, which is the major ITU conference this year which will be held in November time frame. As sector members of the development sector, we plan to participate, and I will share more details later in the year. I'll pass it over to Veni to cover the WSIS+20 review.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Okay. So, guys get ready for the questions because we have had so many sessions this week on WSIS+20 that it won't take more than a minute probably for my recap. So, WSIS+20 as you know the modalities were agreed upon they're going to vote them later this month by the general assembly. There is no yet the new co-facilitators appointed. It's expected that the co-facilitators from the modalities will be reappointed but that is still to come. The negotiations will be taking place at the UN in New York in October-November and culminating in a meeting on December 16 and 17. You can all read the modalities if you search for them, they're publicly accessible. They're the same modalities from 2015 from the WSIS+ 10.

We have discussed these topics in several of the Board meetings, SO/ACs also have been very actively involved. We had meetings with the discussion group and also with the TCCM which were very productive. We'll continue working with our community in the weeks and months to come and we will keep informed everyone about the briefings that ICANN is organizing at the UN so that the community members can reach out to their governments and urge them to participate in those briefings in New York and in Geneva. So, with that, I guess we'll open the microphone for questions. I see someone walking to the microphone. Oh, Chris. Yes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Morning, Veni. This is Chris Disspain. I wonder if it might be helpful just if you could just briefly explain what those modalities actually mean for the ability to participate in the prep sessions in is it July in Geneva. Is that right? And then going forwards what it actually means for the community, how they can participate if indeed they can. And then we can start to think about what one, ways of doing it and two, if there aren't anything that doesn't spring to mind getting creative. Thanks.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thank you. So, the timeline is not yet published. The modalities basically define how the negotiations will be taking place. As soon as the co-facilitators are appointed, it is expected that they will publish a timeline with explanation of how from our perspective, the stakeholder consultations will be taking place, whether there

will be one or more what the participation will be and how we're going to engage with them.

We are hopeful that this time around, the consultations will be done in a better way than this was done during the consultations of the Global Digital Compact. Back then those of you who have participated, we have people in the room who have participated in the GDC consultations, they know that there was no recording, there was no note taking and if you haven't been in the room, you don't know what was said.

The negotiations themselves though will be only for governments. Stakeholders will not be allowed in the room, and this is again based on the 2015 experience and this is how the rules of procedure the UN General Assembly function. So, if anybody here wants to be in the negotiation room, they have to get on a governmental delegation and be in New York. It's very unlikely that they will be in a hybrid format unless there is a new pandemic which I don't wish for.

I hope that answers your question. We are staying in touch with UN DESA who are going to be the secretariat for the negotiations and trying to see how else we can be of help in respect to provide information. We will try to do the briefings for one or two we are still-- It depends on the requirements and the requests from the member states but we would try to put them in the context of the schedule when it's published so that the impact is optimal in terms of diplomats participating in these briefings. Thank you. Next.

JORGE CANCIO

Thank you and thank you, Veni. Jorge Cancio with Swiss government for the record. So, thanks very much for the information. And on the modalities, I just wanted to share that it's a piece of paper. It's a UN language. It can be read in many different fashions. There's this experience about the GDC that wasn't really very satisfactory for many stakeholders. I think the co-facilitators if they continue in the job, and that's the assumption of many, and also UN DESA the department of the UN in New York, they are aware that the GDC wasn't the best experience, so they are open to ideas on how to involve stakeholders as much as possible.

And there the stakeholders have to kick in. It's really up also to the stakeholders to go and cry and ask for more and be a little bit pushy in taking as many possibilities out of that language in the modalities. So as we have been discussing many times in the corridors in many different venues and public meetings, I would urge stakeholders to really get organized, get in touch with DESA, with the co-facilitators, be bold, ask for a thousand and maybe you get a hundred and that will be very helpful for those countries and those governments who want you to be involved in that process. Thank you.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thank you, Jorge. And it's important that it comes from you as one of the people who actually have been involved a lot with the diplomatic negotiations.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Next. Michael Palage for the record, speaking in an individual capacity. And before I pose my question to ICANN org, a lot of people are saying, "Mike who's paying you to speak?" The answer is no one. So, what I want to do is just actually address the ICANN community.

26 years ago, I was exposed to this thing called the ICANN multi-stakeholder model experiment. I was exposed to it by a great group of people: Esther Dyson, Mike Roberts, Stuart Lin and others, Louis Toutant, and that inspired me to devote most of my professional life to try to make that experiment work. A lot of the things that I will say and I have been saying and I have been writing is I'm speaking because I think that experiment is not working in an optimal fashion. So, I just want to make that clear. These are individual statements. No one's paying me. They can't pay me that much.

So back to my questions. One of the things that I would like to know if you could perhaps elaborate, how does ICANN when they engage their lobbyists to engage governments, how is that decision made internally regarding what those talking points are what those issues are done? Is that something ICANN org with the Board? So, question one, how are those decisions made and how are they communicated?

Question two, Elena, you engaged the registry constituency a number of times over the past couple of years regarding engagement regarding NIS2. What is ICANN's state of policy

regarding outreach to all stakeholder groups and how they can perhaps engage with those governments and engage in similar lobbying? So, that's question two. And then question three is what happens when a particular stakeholder group may not align with the state of policy of ICANN? How does ICANN go about facilitating that? So, those are my three questions.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Michael, thank you so much for the question. I will start with the first one. So ICANN engages this with governments in activities that governments are taking, initiatives that the governments are taking based on our charter. That charter clearly states that we engage only when and if there is a need. We feel there is a need to explain how things technically work as in this is how the internet works.

You policy makers, please be aware. And then, of course, it's up to you to make any informed decisions that you deem necessary and good for citizens and also engage to explain and bring to light. This is what the ICANN community is working on. This is the policies that the ICANN community has put in place or is working to put in place in the future. So, these are the instances where we engage.

Based on that, we do not run a consultation with different constituencies of ICANN to tell us what our engagement talking points, if you will, or lines to take would be. Again, as I said, because what we engage on is just to explain how things work. Different parts of the ICANN community represent different interests. And that's the beauty of this multi-stakeholder model

because everything comes together. That said, we're not out there talking to anyone about these different interests that different parts of the community might have. That is, if they want, it's completely up to them. If they want to reach out, they can individually. But as regards ICANN engagement, we have nothing to do with that. We are there, again, only to explain.

Now to your question about engagement with the registry and the registrar groups. So me, as part of the government engagement team of ICANN, I am there as an available resource to the community whenever they want to know something that has to do with developments that are in this region or another region because our job as government engagement is to follow this development. So, we know pretty well what is going on. So different parts of ICANN, in this case registries or registrars, have called on me, as you know very well, to share information about what was going on on different occasions, in this case that you mentioned NIS2.

I'm available to anyone that is asking to know more information. For instance, I have a regular exchange with RSSAC, again, exchanging on what's going on. And also, this is a journey, if you will. Remember, we started off by this kind of session. When it originally started, it was just updates. Now we are trying to move a step forward to make it more of a conversational nature. So yeah, it's a journey. We go forward together. We are an available resource to the community. And again, I will highlight, we engage

to explain how things technically work and what is the work of the ICANN community. Thank you.

VENI MARKOVSKI

And I'll add a little bit, Mike. So, it's not only Elena is available. She's the one who is coordinating with Elizabeth our conversation with the discussion group, which consists of representatives of each SO and AC. We do regular webinars using the WSIS+20 Outreach Network. And even though it's called WSIS+20, we discuss a lot of items. They are not just necessarily WSIS, although from now on, it most probably will be WSIS oriented.

And we do engage in conversation with governments, both in capitals and in the GAC and in other settings like the UN or other intergovernmental organizations where we, as Elena said, we are basically explaining how the internet works, what is our function, making sure that they understand it and that when they go behind closed doors, there are enough people who can set the record straight if there is a misunderstanding of what and how the internet works.

So far, I would say in the last 10 years or so since we have government engagement team at ICANN, this has turned to be very successful because we have received information and feedback from those meetings that there are people who have been engaging with ICANN, have come to ICANN meetings or have talked to their GAC representatives and have managed to provide that information back to their colleagues who are not so familiar. I mean, people know that the conversations and negotiations at the

UN are taking place among diplomats and they're not necessarily technical geeks. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Thank you, both. And Jamie, maybe if possible, I know there was an exchange in the Q&A pod between you and Rick Lane. Hopefully, Rick would be able to have access to follow up on that because I think that goes to a relevance regarding US legislative initiatives. Thank you.

JAMES KUNLE OLORUNDARE

All right. Thank you very much. My name is James Kunle Olorundare and I'm speaking for myself. I'm from Nigeria. And my questions to comment has to do with the GDC and of course, one of the critical objective of the GDC, which has to do with responsible use of technologies, so to say. And for me, I think it is high time ICANN started looking at responsible use of DNS too. I know that we have dwelt so much on DNS abuse and so on and so forth. And perventure, we need to now switch to the other side and try to bring up something on the responsible use of the DNS.

What I'm saying that is because the age at which we are now talking about the artificial intelligence and other emerging technologies, there are concerns about their usage because these are technologies that are going to shape our futures. And for us too, yeah, some of them, we definitely have to use DNS in one way or the other. So, we need to start looking at responsible use of the DNS.

And I heard you when you talk about, yeah, maybe there may not be direct engagement of ICANN as a community in that discussion. But I believe that we have the GAC community, which of course are composed of people that deals with governmental issues and perventure, that could be like one of the objectives for them or a point of action when probably if some of them are going for the meeting or probably when they get back home, they can help us to preach that gospel so that when their contingents are going for the meeting, definitely that's going to be one of those things they will be hammering on. So, I don't know if ICANN is doing anything on that. If there is none, then I think it's high time we started looking at that. Thank you very much.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thanks. It was more information than a question, I think. And thank you for that. We are still waiting to see what the modalities for endorsement of the GDC will be. They were not published as expected by December. We are happy with the texts that are touching on ICANN's mission in the GDC, which is on internet governance and the importance of the IGF.

On the other issues, artificial intelligence and other stuff, they did not touch, by the way, on the DNS and in any way they did not touch on the ICANN's mission. The GDC was a much bigger document. And we believe that if any conversations are going to go into that detail, that will be probably done within the WSIS+20 review, because the portion about internet governance there is much bigger than it was at the GDC.

But we'll see. I mean, the GDC is a new document. We'll see how it's developing, how the endorsements are going on. They're published on their website. We haven't seen many of the organizations that are engaged within ICANN to be endorsing it. And again, most of us, I believe, are waiting to see the modalities so that we understand better if we endorse one part of it, could we do that or we have to endorse all of it. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Hi, it's Chris Disspain again.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Chris, one sec. Sorry, my apologies. Just to check if there is anything online.

BECKY MCGILLEY

Yes, so we do have a follow-up question from Rick Lane. Jamie had answered one of his questions. So, we will allow you to unmute you now, Rick.

RICK LANE

Well, thank you so much. Rick Lane, for the record. And thank you for taking my question.

VENI MARKOVSKI

We can't hear you, though.

BECKY MCGILLEY

Yeah, we can't hear.

RICK LANE

Can you hear me now? Can you hear me now? Does that work?

BECKY MCGILLEY

Yes.

RICK LANE

Sorry. So, thank you. Rick Lane for the record. And thank you for taking my question live. I'm usually ended up only answering in the pods for some reason at all these ICANN meetings. So, thank you, Michael. So, my question is a follow-up, and you can see it in the chat. But basically, my question to Jamie is that did ICANN know and have the conversations that Senator Portman Stafford told me they had? And he said I could ask this question, by the way, so I'm not saying anything out of context. And that ICANN was specifically covered by the CIRCIA language, but not the contracted parties. And if ICANN did know that, which Senator Portman told me, Stafford told me that they knew, did they convey that to the contracted parties either before or after their filings?

JAMIE HEDLUND

Thanks, Rick, for the question. I'm not really sure what the point of it is, though, because we've never taken a position on whether or not the exception should cover the contracted parties. In fact, we've been very transparent both in our filings and in several of the sessions that I'm sorry you apparently missed, in which we talked

about CIRCIA, and we talked about the scope of the exception. And I just would point you there so that you can see that we've never taken a position on whether or not they should be covered, never lobbied for them or advocated for them to be covered either on the Hill or in front of CISA.

We have also been very clear on what our objectives were in advocating for the Hill about the potential consequences for being covered by a cyber incident reporting regime that is effectively US regulation of the IANA functions. We are all in favor of cyber incident reporting. We do it. And the issue was not with the requirement to perform cyber incident reporting, but rather the concern that it would create the perception, once again, of US regulation of the IANA functions and the implications for that abroad in other governments and how they may respond to the US government reengaging in direct regulation or oversight of the IANA functions. So, I hope that helps.

The last thing I'll say is in terms of whether the registries or registrars could be covered, we also had lots of constructive conversations in public with the contracted parties, with all stakeholders at ICANN meetings who attended those sessions about the fact that within ICANN, there is currently no cyber incident reporting mechanism for registries and registrars. We have offered to facilitate discussions that could lead to the development of such a reporting regime. And we pointed to the success of the DNS Abuse amendments as a great example of the

community coming together and solving, at least providing initial solution to a vexing problem.

And so should there be developed within ICANN a cyber incident reporting regime that is governed by the multi-stakeholder model and that covers contracted parties, we would of course go back to CISA and the Hill and brag about yet another success of the multi-stakeholder model. I hope that answers your question.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thanks, Jamie. Chris? Thanks for waiting.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

No problem at all. This is Chris Disspain. Two points or two questions or comments. Firstly, we heard Jorge say that the community, the stakeholders need to start crying, I think he said, to get the organisation sorted out so that we can have access to stuff and so on and so forth. And I completely agree with him. We've got TCCM that can work to do that, etc.

I do think there's a role for ICANN in that because I think ICANN's mission, security, stability, resilience and all that, is important in their discussions. And so therefore it's important that ICANN is represented in the room in those discussions. And so therefore I think it behooves ICANN to also be crying, to use Jorge's term, to actually make sure that the discussions are held in a way that gives ICANN a voice. And of course, if that happens, then there's a good chance that the community will also get a voice as well.

And the second thing I wanted to say was just to say that hopefully the WSIS process, we'll get through the WSIS process this year and it'll be a good outcome and everybody will be equally unhappy, as is the way with these things. But it's important to remember that this is not just WSIS. This whole internet governance thing is not just about WSIS. It just happens to be the biggest thing in the room this year. And that there are a vast array of other things going on, fragmentation, bits of legislation that seek to cover the world and so on and so forth.

And I just wanted to say I think it's important, and I ask the question, does ICANN have as a part of its ongoing strategy, a plan for dealing with internet governance, let's call it that, internet governance stuff moving forward once we get past this WSIS bit? Thanks.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thanks, Chris. And I heard Jorge's more of an appeal, not as there is nothing else that you can do but just cry. And I think he makes a point which is important and you make a point which is important, which is we are engaged in conversation with the governments and the intergovernmental organizations. We talk to them regularly. We are not waiting for something to happen in order to start talking to them.

WSIS is a CEO goal, so it's obviously very high on our agenda. But this is not the only thing that we do. And the briefing that Elena did and is doing, and we are all doing continuously like Dimitris a couple of weeks ago during the Prep Week session. We are parallel

to that. We are engaged with following the legislation, regulatory developments around the world, which might touch on ICANN's mission, as you know. And we do talk a lot with the community and all the different stakeholders and groups that are formed.

It's great that we have actually this diversity. It's much better to go there to the UN or to the governments from different perspectives, like the TCCM, ICANN, the discussion group, even the WSIS outreach network that we use, the mailing list with about 600 people now on it from about 90 countries is a very good opportunity for us to ask people to engage. So, when we do that, we are fulfilling our mission. We are following our goal. We are not forgetting what we else-- I mean, we are not abandoning our daily work. At the end of the day, if ICANN does what it has to do, there are less arguments against the multi-stakeholder model in this environment. So, that's what we are trying to do. And I think we are doing it well.

I think, unfortunately the rules of procedure of the General Assembly are not going to change for this particular topic because they can't change them just for that. But I believe that the co-facilitators will do everything they can to open it as much as they can. And if they do a better job than the GDC, which is not a very high bar anyway, we will be able to provide information and this information will not be lost in cyberspace. This information will reach the member states, and we are hopeful that they will understand the benefits of the internet that we all have been

participating in the development of and will not put some text that might jeopardize it. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Just one very quick response. I completely agree with what you've said, and I just want to just make one tiny distinction, which is there's a lot of benefit in individually talking to diplomats, governments, etc. so that when they get in the room, they've got your perspective. And I completely understand that the General Assembly thing is what it is, and that's not going anywhere. All I would say is I'm pleased that you believe that the co-facilitators will open up the process. But I think that we should be, and by we I include TCCM and us and ICANN should not just be believing and hopeful, but actually out there scratching at the door saying you must because if you don't, you will not have legitimacy that you need.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thank you. Sorry, maybe I wasn't clear enough, but we are actually engaged in conversation with them and with other governments because they don't work in isolation. They are not going to pass something that member states will not be approving of and they will not jeopardize the outcome of negotiations. So, that's why I said we believe that-- Since, they're not yet appointed, it's a little bit-- We can't really talk to them with the assumption that they will be appointed. We did engage in conversation during the

modalities. So, thank you for that. And I hope everyone else is doing it too.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Veni.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Next, I think. Yeah, nobody on. Yeah, please.

MICHELE NEYLON

Thanks. Good morning. Michele Neylon from Black Knight. Just for Elena, you mentioned in passing about the continued interest in this geographic indicator's issue within the EU. And I suspect that quite a few people in the room don't fully understand what that is, what the implications of it are, and how it will look in practical terms. So, if you could possibly, using simple, tangible terms, explain to the rest of us what exactly that means and what that's going to look like, because I suspect that some people might be a little bit upset when they realize what they're talking about. Thank you.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Thank you, Michele. How much time do I have?

VENI MARKOVSKI

We have 12 minutes until the end of the session.

MICHELE NEYLON

If you let her speak, she might get there faster.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Right. So how do I put it? Geographical indications protections. This is about fetuses, to use an example from my country, like agricultural products. I'm not an expert in intellectual property by no means, so I will try my best here. Trademarks are, to my understanding, protected the same way across the world. So, countries across the world have the same understanding and they protect it the same way. That enabled ICANN to put in place a dispute resolution mechanism, right? We did put in place a mechanism because there was, at the unilateral level, the agreement on what and how to protect.

When it comes to geographical indications, and just imagine now for the sake of the argument, I'm not saying that the EU is going to do that, but for the sake of argument that a region or two regions in this world say no matter what you do in domain names, you have to protect, in every dispute resolution mechanism that exists out there, you have to protect your graphical indications.

What would that mean then? That we, the ICANN community, will have to look back to our mechanism and see how to do that. How are we going to agree on something that doesn't necessarily fall within our scope to fix? It's not us. It's the unilateral level has to tell us what is the rule, and then we can put in place the mechanisms to do so. That is the possible problem that we could

envision. And again, it is my job to worry about and be concerned. And I hope I did cover your question.

MICHELE NEYLON

Almost. I think the key thing here is to understand that because of the way these geographical indicators are set up, there is the potential that both existing domains that are already registered could be impacted based on some of the conversations that they've been having over the last couple of years. Because I don't think they understand the concept of, well, the domain names are kind of international, they exist for various different things, and that all these other bits within that. It's just the conversations and the ccTLDs are probably quite advanced. I'm not sure if the gTLD people are aware of it.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Yeah, you're right. Going to the operational level and as regards the business, because I tried to touch the multi-stakeholder discussions at the policy level. Yeah, as I said very quickly, and you're right, I did that very quickly in passing. It is unclear practically how that will be enforced and what exactly it can entail. Yeah, it can be problematic. Thank you so much.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thank you, Elena. Jordan? Becky, nothing online? Just to double check?

BECKY MCGILLEY

No, and we have nine minutes.

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks, Veni. Good morning, everyone. My name is Jordan Carter from .au. I'm also part of the Secretariat Group for the Technical Community Coalition on Multi-Stakeholderism, which has got eight organizations from five continents in the leadership group. We're over 30 member organizations now. I just want to fill up on Jorge's point about saying what we want, and the point that others have made in the WSIS negotiations.

I popped an email from a cross technical business, civil society community on the WSIS list about 20 minutes ago. I sort of mentioned it on the mic, which is calling on the COFAX and DESA and so on to take some procedural steps around publishing clear and inclusive timelines, ensuring that there's transparency and accessibility where people can see what the input is and where the people who are dealing with that input publish responses showing what they've done with that input, to facilitate inclusive and meaningful stakeholder consultations, unlike the GDC ones, to broaden and diversify the participation in the negotiations, and also to maximize inclusive participation in those final negotiations, which have generally been intergovernmental.

So, this is trying to say within the framework of the modalities that have been agreed, how can you operationalize them in that are as open, transparent, and inclusive as possible. So, if people are

interested in that letter, it's open for input until Friday, and I think it'll be open for endorsements next week.

Second point, just briefly. A few of us have been starting to put together a less than one page statement, just reaffirming the support of the ICANN community for the Internet Governance Forum. It's a key institution that does things that ICANN can't and shouldn't do. I don't quite know when we'll circulate that, but we'll again use the WSIS list, and that'll be open for individuals to sign on and express their support. Here's an initiative that Lisa Fir initially suggested, I hope she doesn't mind me mentioning that, as just a way for us to informally but importantly indicate our support for that forum as well. Thanks.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thanks, Jordan. This is actually a very good example of why this session is of interest for us, and thanks to the SO/AC leadership who suggested this. Because if it was only the presentation from our side without the opportunity to have a discussion, I admit I haven't checked the mailing list in the last 20 minutes, or I would say the last 53 minutes, but it is important to use that mailing list for sharing such information.

And it's good to see that organizations are engaging with the co-facilitators in such a way, because the more engagement there is with them, the better for us is to make sure that our voices are being heard, and that our contributions are going to be taken into account. You mentioned again the three-letter abbreviation GDC, which was again an example of how contributions by people like

Vincent or our chair Tripti Sinha, they were speaking there for like 10-15 minutes each, and nobody knows what was said, because there is no recording whatsoever.

So again, we are hopeful, we are urging, and we are talking to diplomats, not only the co-facilitators, that this would be good, and Jorge, who is here, I'm sure is also talking to the rest of the Swiss government in missions in Geneva and in New York to make sure that this is actually taken into consideration, and our contributions are going to be meaningful and not meaningless. And I see Jordan nodding for those of you who are not in the room. Thank you. Next.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Mike Palage for the record. This is a follow-up question to Jamie. Jamie, regarding your statement about ICANN being committed to cybersecurity, SAC074 has been cited or referenced in a number of recent Board actions, and Recommendation 1 to SAC074 states that ICANN Compliance department should publish data about security breaches that registrars may have reported in connection with 2013 RAA paragraph 320. If you could please provide a response to that. I want to be respectful to the other speakers in the list, so you can respond perhaps via ICANN correspondence. Thank you.

JAMIE HEDLUND

I can reply quickly here, just to let you know that implementation is underway.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thanks. We only have four more minutes, so I hope we'll be able to answer both Nigel and Chris.

NIGEL HICKSON

Yeah. Well, we'll get on with it then. Nigel Hickson. Why do I ever do anything? Nigel Hickson—I'm just not tall enough—UK government. Just two points, and I could talk about geographical indicators as well, but indications as well. We're having to implement it in the UK, which is interesting, because we're not in the European Union, as some people will know. But our collective memory is not that good sometimes.

First point, you've done an amazing job of talking to people, and in this session, in sessions earlier in the week, and in sessions at earlier ICANN meetings, you've told us that you've engaged with lots and lots of groups, lots and lots of diplomats. Can you tell us where the opposition to the multi-stakeholder approach, the continuation of the IGF, the extension of the IGF mandate is? I mean, you needn't necessarily, but do you meet opposition? It would be nice to have some substance in response to all the engagement you do.

And the second point is, we are now in December, the end of the year, WSIS has gone. What are your main strategic objectives for the following couple of years on internet governance? Thank you.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thanks, Nigel. With regards to the first question, so far, really nobody has expressed any objection to the multi-stakeholder model. We might see something when the first zero draft is published of the WSIS+20 outcome document.

Based on the experience in 2015, even when there was a push for another model, like a multilateral model of internet governance, there were enough voices in the room to argue that the multi-stakeholder model has made the internet what it is, has allowed all these innovation and new services and online economy to develop. 10 years later, the situation is even better from the point of view of how the internet developed and how the economy is using it. So, I hope there will be enough voices, but we haven't heard so far anyone talking against the model.

On the question about what are we going to do after the WSIS. Well, first of all, there is an ITU plenipot next year, so there will be a lot of conversations about that. But secondly, it really depends on the outcome of the WSIS, because there are different possibilities for the WSIS+20. It can upgrade and update and improve the language from the WSIS+ 10, or it can make it worse, or it can keep it the same. So, depending on that, we will decide how to engage. Thank you. Desiree, last question.

DESIREE MILOSEVIC

Yes. I'm Desiree Milosevic, a GNSO lead on informal group on internet governance. Thank you for putting this session. I wanted to ask specifically since the IGF, the 20th IGF, is taking place in Norway in the last week of June. It is a highly important meeting

and agenda set for the future of the internet. I also want to ask what is ICANN plan to get the community involved, or what are you doing as an organization to make this event successful since we have an important review of the WSIS+20, and the IGF is a child of the WSIS process. Thank you.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thank you, Desiree. Becky, do you want to answer, or shall I take it? Okay. Well, as usual, we are submitting a couple of proposals, workshops, and open forums. We hope that they will be accepted. We know that the timeline is really short. The deadline for submitting proposals is the end of this week, actually, on Sunday evening. I hope, actually, that the IGF secretariat, who are, hopefully, some of them are in the room and some of them are listening, will extend it at least to Monday, because it makes it a little bit difficult to submit proposals on Sunday.

We will have a delegation there. We will partner with other organizations. Some have approached us, some we have approached. We are partnering with the ITU and other stakeholders to provide as much as possible participation. And we are hopeful that it will be a really successful IGF. Given the time framework, though, and how limited we are in opportunities, because it was announced late last year and it's happening in June, we are limited in terms of being able to be more flexible as we have been in the past. So, I hope that everyone who is applying will get their workshop approved. I hope to see you there in June.

Thank you. With that, we are one minute after the hour. Thank you, everyone, for the participation. Hopefully, see you next time. Travel safe.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]