
ICANN82 | Prep Week – Geopolitical Updates
Wednesday, February 26, 2025 – 08:30 to 09:30 PST

ALEXEY TREPYKHALIN

Hello and welcome to the ICANN82 prep session on geopolitical, legislative, and regulatory developments. My name is Alexey Trepykhalin and I am a remote dissipation manager for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions or comments will only be taken if submitted within the Q&A pod or submitted from a live microphone in Seattle. Interpretation for this session will include English, Spanish, and French languages. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak.

Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak, if speaking a language other than English, and speak at a reasonable pace. All are welcome to use the chat. I will now hand the floor over to Veni Markovski, interim head of government and IGO engagement, to introduce the session.

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, Alexey. Welcome, everyone, to this session. Before we start, I would like to thank my colleagues from the GE team, as well as other members of other ICANN functions who have spent a countless number of hours preparing this session. As the cliché says, I don't have enough words to thank you and to praise your work, but in this case, the cliché is true. With that, I'll pass the microphone to Elizabeth, who will take it from here and navigate through the slides.

ELIZABETH OLUOCH

Next slide, please. Thank you so much, Veni. Hello, everyone. It's good to be here. Today, we have several GE colleagues, as well as Jamie Hedlund, to share several updates. A quick overview of the agenda, we will begin with legislative and regulatory updates, which will consist of North America and European regional updates, followed by updates in intergovernmental organizations, then WSIS+20 updates, and then we'll open up for questions and answers, and we'll take questions at the end, and please continue to pose them as well in the chat. Next slide, and over to you, Jamie.

JAMIE HEDLUND

Thanks, Elizabeth. I think one more slide, please. So, hello and welcome, all. My name is Jamie Hedlund, and I head up ICANN's Contractual Compliance function. I also lead our engagement with the U.S. government. Today, I'm going to provide an overview of

one new legislative item and two quick updates on ongoing regulatory matters presented at earlier geopolitical sessions.

So first, in the U.S. Congress, Representative Zoe Lofgren, a senior Democrat on the House Judiciary Committee, introduced the Foreign Anti-Digital Piracy Act, or FADPA, in January. It would create a process under which an owner of copyrighted material could petition a federal judge for an order requiring ISPs and DNS service providers to block access to a foreign, non-U.S. website. The bill would allow a copyright owner to petition a federal court for an order requiring service providers, so, again, ISPs and DNS providers, to block access to a foreign website or online service if the petitioner can show that there's likely infringement on petitioner's copyrights that would cause irreparable harm. Expedited orders would be available to block access to infringing live streaming events.

Court orders would require ISPs, those with more than 100,000 subscribers, and public DNS resolution services, those with more than \$100 million in annual revenues, to take reasonable and technically feasible measures to prevent users from accessing the foreign website or online services identified in the order. On the technical aspects of the bill, it does not specify the measures that the ISPs or DNS providers would have to take to obey an order to block access to the foreign website or online service. Rather, they'd be required to take, quote, reasonable and technically feasible

measures to prevent users of the service from accessing the foreign website or online service.

In addition to Representative Lofgren, the House Chair of the Judiciary Intellectual Property Subcommittee, Darrell Issa, is likely to offer a different version of the bill later this year. In the Senate, the Chair of the Judiciary IP Subcommittee, Tom Tillis, and Ranking Member Senator Chris Coons, offered a site-blocking bill similar to Lofgren's back in 2022, and they may also reintroduce something later, similar later this year.

We're obviously continuing to monitor all of these, and we'll review these measures and once they're looks like they're moving forward and provide technical input limited to whether they create potential harms to the security, stability, and resilience of the DNS. Others have concerns about, procedural concerns, constitutional concerns, freedom of speech concerns. Those are outside of our remit, so to the extent that we would provide input, it would be from the perspective of potential harms to the domain name system.

So now two quick updates. First, on the Cyber Incident Reporting for Critical Infrastructure Act, or CIRSIA. Among other things, we've discussed this previously, we require the U.S. Cybersecurity Infrastructure Security Agency, which is part of the Department of Homeland Security, to develop regulations requiring owners and operators of critical infrastructure to report cybersecurity incidents and ransomware attacks within 72 hours. This was passed back in

2022. Last year, CISA, the agency, launched a rulemaking proceeding to try to identify who's subject to the reporting requirements, types of incidents must be reported, required contents and format of an incident report, and under the legislation, final rules have to be adopted within 18 months of the launch of the rulemaking or by October 2025.

ICANN supported and received an exception from these domestic requirements that would have resulted in the regulation and the re-regulation in the form of U.S. government-imposed reporting obligations of IANA services and the operation of the ICANN-managed route service or the service of the L route.

In the rulemaking, CISA proposed that this exception should apply to ICANN, IANA, ARIN, route server operators, and their performance or route server functions, and also asked whether the exception should extend to registries and registrars. We submitted comments, there's a link there, and we focused on raising awareness of ICANN's multi-stakeholder approach to internet governance and the U.S. government's traditional support of the multi-stakeholder model. We also supported the CISA proposal to extend the exception to ARIN and route server operators.

We did not take a position on whether the exception should apply to registries and registrars. We have said and continue to believe that we would be happy to facilitate the development of a cyber incident reporting mechanism within ICANN, and if successful, we would go back to CISA in support of extending the exception.

Obviously, in January, there was a change in administration and Congress, so it's unclear whether the new administration will take another approach to cyber incident reporting and revise the proposed regulation. We're continuing to monitor that.

And then finally, last year, the Federal Communications Commission launched a rulemaking on internet routing security reporting. Concerned about security vulnerabilities in internet routing, specifically the Border Gateway Protocol, FCC proposed to require ISPs to report on their implementation of RPKI, or Resource Public Key Infrastructure, a more secure method of routing.

The reporting requirements created de facto obligations to implement RPKI. We filed joint comments along with ISOC and IAB opposing the FCC's attempt to regulate routing on multiple grounds. We thought it was inconsistent with the U.S. government's traditional support for the multi-stakeholder model, mandating RPKI is not appropriate for all networks, and prescribing a specific routing technology or standards by regulatory fiat, in our view, would chill innovation and cement in place solutions that will become obsolete before the FCC can update them.

Again, the rulemaking came out under the last administration. No final rule has been issued. There's speculation that this regulatory approach will not continue under the new FCC chair, but we don't know that for sure. Sort of interestingly, towards the end of the Biden administration, the White House issued a roadmap to

enhancing internet security that took a more collaborative multi-stakeholder approach and focused on securing U.S. government networks. There's a link to the roadmap in the deck. It did not propose top-down private sector recommendations, regulations, and recognize that diverse networks have different secure needs.

So, that's it for legislative and regulatory developments in D.C., and I'll now turn it over to the next presenter. Thank you.

DIMITRIS ZACHARIAS

Thank you. Thank you very much, Jamie. Hi, this is Dimitris Zacharias. Hi, everyone. I'm from the GE team in Brussels, and I will be covering the Europe region and, more specifically, some updates coming out of the EU. Let's start a little bit with two consultations that the European Commission ran towards the end of last year.

The first one, which was a targeted consultation on internet governance, which received a deadline towards the end of December and was extended to January 14th, now obviously closed. This was part of the European Commission's preparations for the 2025 UN Summit, the WSIS+20 review process. The stated aim of the European Commission is to reaffirm its commitment to the multi-stakeholder approach and the multi-stakeholder model of internet governance, which it posits is currently under pressure due to geopolitical tensions and calls for more state-controlled internet governance.

Concurrently, the European Commission ran a consultation to develop guiding principles for the governance of virtual worlds and Web 4.0. In its communication in Web 4 and virtual worlds, the Commission acknowledged the need to engage internationally with the multi-stakeholder community on a broad scope of issues of technical and content nature. It also emphasized that this technological shift may involve new forms of governance, which require a reflection of the mandates of the current internet governance institutions and about whether other institutions should be involved.

The results collected through the consultation will eventually feed into the development of guiding principles for the governance of virtual worlds in Web 4.0, and they will be discussed at the global multi-stakeholder high-level conference on governance for Web 4.0 and virtual worlds. Thank you so much, Maeva, for sharing the link, you can find it in the Q&A pod, which is hosted by the European Commission and the Polish Presidency of the Council on March 31st and April 1st, 2025.

The global multi-stakeholder high-level conference aims at triggering a global discussion on the principles for the global governance of Web 4.0 and virtual worlds, and it will feed into the WSIS+20 review process. Kurtis Lindqvist, the CEO of ICANN, will also participate at the high-level panel organized on the first day of

the global conference. Next slide, please. Perfect, thank you very much.

The reason why the targeted consultation on internet governance was initially ran by the European Commission was because the Commission had originally planned to propose a non-legislative communication on the EU strategy on internet governance in response to a council, so the member state constellation of the EU institutions, which had requested a strategy on multi-stakeholder internet governance, aimed at securing a common EU position in international fora in preparation for the milestones within 2025. The Commission, as described before, ran the consultation to gather the feedback with the aim to review the architecture for internet governance.

Now, in our discussions with the European Commission, we have been informed that the European Commission is now opting for a wider scope communication on digital diplomacy, which will include a dedicated section on internet governance and will comprise several other key areas in digital policy and its external aspects, which will be contributed by the relevant commissioners and the directorates of the Commission, including the European External Action Service. While the communication is not already included in the Commission work program for 2025, which the Commission publishes at the start of each year, the proposal is expected to be published in the second quarter of 2025.

In terms of the Council of the European Union, which comprises of representatives of member states, ICANN organized a workshop together with the Polish Presidency of the Council in mid-January, on the 15th of January. ICANN delivered the interactive workshop with the support of OCTO and the government engagement team, covering topics emphasizing how the internet works, the internet's unique identifiers, the DNS, how the internet is governed, and the geopolitical implications of policy interventions that may impact internet governance and the multi-stakeholder model.

The workshop was aimed at enabling a deeper understanding of the technical functioning of the internet and provides EU member state representatives who attended with an opportunity to dive deeper into topics related to internet governance, the architecture of the internet, and the stakeholders involved. The workshop was very well attended by approximately 50 representatives of member states, EU institutions, as well as attachés responsible for telecommunications, cyber, and internet policy.

While the workshop was timely planned, in expectation that the current presidency of the council will be emphasizing internet governance in its council conclusions, as discussed before, the council timelines have shifted and now we expect the upcoming presidency of the council, which is held by Denmark, to emphasize internet governance in its conclusions that will again be all-encompassing, centered on digital diplomacy. Next slide, please.

Now in terms of some legislative and regulatory developments within the EU and the Europe region, the European Commission and member states are taking more of an implementation-first stance in the new legislative mandate, which has just started, and we know that there is more of a focus on making sure that the sleuth of digital regulations that were proposed in the previous mandate are going ahead with the implementation.

In terms of relevance to the community and the stakeholders involved in the internet governance ecosystem, we continue monitoring the implementation of the NIS2 directive. And some updates on that, the transposition deadline of NIS2 was set for the 17th of October last year. At that time, only four out of the 27 member states had notified either a full or a partial transposition of the directive into national law. That means taking the regulation and making sure that it's morphed into national law to comply with EU regulation.

The European Commission also, by the deadline of October 17th, adopted an implementing regulation specifying risk management measures and the cases in which an incident is considered significant. ICANN contributed to the Commission's consultation on the implementing regulation and also informed the community of the opportunity to participate in the consultation ran by the European Commission.

On November 28th, the Commission adopted a package of infringement decisions due to the absence of communication by member states of measures taken to transpose EU directives into national law. The package included the NIS2 directive but also other pieces of legislation directives as well at the EU level that progress in transposition had not been evident in member states. The process of infringement is at a very early stage whereby the Commission sends letters of formal notice to the member states concerned and the member states have to take actions to transpose those directives and respond within a reasonable time frame of two months to the European Commission on the progress.

Since the adoption of the infringement decisions, three more member states have notified the Commission of the transposition of the NIS2 directive into national law and currently the member states that have transposed either in full or partially the NIS2 directive are Belgium, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Croatia, Romania, Slovakia, Greece and Estonia. Several member states are also in the final stages of the legislative process to transpose the directive including for example France, Denmark and Estonia.

In terms of the relevant articles for the community and the DNS space, article 28 which is the article in the database of domain name registration data, the NIS cooperation group has a work stream for article 28. That work stream issued non-binding guidance for member states to consider as they transpose the directive focusing mostly on verification and access to registration

data and also establishing a methodology combining a risk-based approach with operational verification of data. It made some recommendations, however several member states had already progressed with the implementation.

Now, one of the important things that we're monitoring and is important for our space are the deviations in the status of implementation of that article. As I said before there is only a handful or maybe two almost handfuls of member states that have transposed that article into national law and some deviations are already evident. For example, Belgium has opted for a prescriptive definition of legitimate access seekers while other member states such as Italy and Lithuania have opted for a more flexible approach choosing to define legitimate access seekers through secondary legislation or on the basis of valid and reason requests.

Another point of deviation that we have noticed is in terms of the time box of response to requests for domain name registration data where some member states are requiring TLD name registries and entities providing domain name registration services to respond to requests within 72 hours while other member states have clarified that for example in urgent requests those entities should respond within 24 hours. We continue monitoring the implementation of the NIS2 directive and we would be happy to provide you with a more detailed analysis during the plenary in Seattle.

In terms of expected regulatory initiatives in 2025, the communication from the commission on digital diplomacy, which will be non-legislative is of course on our map, and we have also seen that the European commission a couple of days ago published a proposal for a council recommendation for an EU blueprint on cybersecurity crisis management. This is a process that is not the ordinary legislative procedure in the EU, but it's more a ping-pong between the commission and the council to form a secondary piece of legislation which is called a recommendation.

Why is that relevant in today's discussion? Because the draft proposal mentions the DNS and specifically encourages member states of the EU to foster the development and use of a public and secure European DNS resolver service as a key measure to ensure preparedness and resilience. It also encourages member states, relevant union entities and private entities to enhance their DNS resolution diversification strategy including the use of at least one union-based DNS infrastructure such as DNS4EU to ensure reliable DNS resolution during major crises. This is something that is in the very early stages. It was only published two days ago and we will take time to study it and examine it internally more so that we can have a more fruitful discussion during Seattle.

Last couple of things from the Europe region. We are also aware that the European commission is carrying out a fitness check of the regulations in the digital space with a target date within the fourth quarter of 2025, and also that there is an impending review to the

Cybersecurity Act. There was a study for it in the end of 2024 and a target date within 2025.

The Cybersecurity Act does not impact internet governance and the ecosystem of internet governance directly. However, there is a specific mention within its recitals, so the non-operative part of the text, in terms of supporting the security of the public core of the open internet and the stability of its functioning, including but not limited to key protocols, in particular DNS, BGP and IPv6, the operation of the domain name system, including the operation of all top-level domains and the operation of the root zone.

There is still not much information with regards to the review of the Cybersecurity Act, but this is something that we expect we will be reviewing within the year. Thank you very much and I would pass now on the floor to Elizabeth for the IGO updates. Thank you.

ELIZABETH OLUOCH

Thanks so much, Dimitris. I just want to acknowledge that we see your hands up and we are going to get to questions at the end, if you can bear with us. Next slide, please.

I have just a few ITU-related updates. Earlier this month, the ITU held its first cycle of Council Working Group meetings in Geneva. ICANN participates in the Council Working Groups that touch on internet governance. There are several, but I will only touch on two of them today. My colleague, Pitinan Kooarmornpatana, with the

IDNs Program, and I were in Geneva. We attended the Council Working Group WSIS and SDGs. This Council Working Group discusses the ITU's WSIS and SDGs-related activities and receives various update reports, including from several UN agencies, such as UNESCO, UNDESA, and CSD.

One of the main topics at this meeting was the call for inputs. You may recall last October, the Council Working Group had initiated an open stakeholder call for inputs on the ITU's contributions in the implementation of the WSIS outcomes. The call initially ran through 31st of January, but it was extended to 14th of March. We published the call on our website, and ICANN made a submission, which we shared with the WSIS+20 Network. The Council Working Group received two contributions on the call for inputs, which were introduced during the meeting.

The first was a multi-country contribution from Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, and UAE, which highlighted the important contributions of WSIS over the last two decades. The contribution also noted that the continuation of the WSIS process beyond 2025 is essential. The second was a multi-country and sector member contribution, which included countries such as Armenia, Azerbaijan, and the Russian Federation, which noted the challenges in the WSIS implementation, in particular the lack of international legal frameworks for internet governance. Additionally, the contribution noted a need for the evolution of the multi-

stakeholder model and to implement initiatives to strengthen the multi-stakeholder model.

The European Commission also delivered a statement noting the efficacy of the WSIS process as a global framework for digital collaboration and the importance of maintaining a multi-stakeholder approach to internet governance. In their statement, they also noted its support for renewing and strengthening the IGF mandate, ensuring it has sustainable funding in the UN budget. These contributions were noted in the draft Council Working Group report, but also included was a reference to the 78 inputs that had been received through February 10th, something that ICANN had encouraged, including making them public. The ITU has published some of the inputs received by those that gave consent.

We also participated in the Council Working Group Internet Open Physical Consultation, which is open to all stakeholders. The topic was on the role of public policy in promoting multilingualization of the internet. ICANN submitted a contribution. In addition to the consultation, ICANN was invited to participate in a panel discussion on the topic. Pitinan, a representative from UNESCO and from the Permanent Mission of India, were speakers. The panel was opened by the ITU director from the standardization sector, Seizo Onoe, and moderated by Nigel Hickson, vice chair of the Council Working Group Internet from CEPT. The conversation was highly engaging and insightful.

Panelists received several questions from member states, including ICANN's work with Aboriginal indigenous communities and languages in Africa. The Council Working Group enjoyed the discussion and appreciated the insights. This was highly positive for ICANN. ICANN was recognized and referenced as an expert in IDNs. There was good visibility for Universal Acceptance Day, with all panelists highlighting past UA days and UA 2025 and the close partnership with UNESCO. Additionally, there was recognition that the IDNs is an ITF standard. There were 13 submissions to this consultation, some of which were very good. A good outcome for ICANN was the new collaboration opportunities that emerged for ICANN and raising greater awareness of the availability of IDNs as well as the challenges of UA.

Now the ITU World Telecommunication Development Conference is the major conference taking place in the ITU this year. I won't go into much detail. We are sector members of the development sector and we plan to participate in the conference that will be held in Baku, Azerbaijan at the end of November. WTTC regional preparations have kicked off and we plan to engage in the regional telecom groups preparations in APAC and the Americas region where we have membership. We'll share more on our objectives at a later date. And I'll pass it over now to Becky. Thank you.

BECKY MCGILLEY

Next slide, please. Thanks, Liz, and good day everyone. Thank you for this opportunity to brief you on updates related to WSIS+20.

So today I'm going to recap key points of some of the achievements in 2024 and what to look forward to this year in 2025 as well as sharing resources and a call for action to interested community members. So here I'll be providing a brief recap of WSIS in this slide and the next. So most of you know that WSIS stands for the World Summit on the Information Society, an initiative by the ITU which happened in two phases in 2003 in Geneva and 2005 in Tunisia. Every 10 years WSIS has an upgrade. The WSIS+10 review took place in 2015 and this year of course is WSIS+20 which will be held in the third quarter.

While WSIS+20 will be discussing a number of issues which you will see in a minute, we are focusing only on the items that have the potential to touch on or impact ICANN's mission. So more precisely these issues include the multi-stakeholder model of internet governance, the extension of the internet governance forum, the IGF, and the role of the technical community in the functioning of the internet. Next slide please.

So I'll stop here briefly to remind us all that WSIS covers a lot beyond internet governance. The internet and internet governance are just a fraction of WSIS, which has 11 action lines. And because of the wide coverage of WSIS its impacts are even more important. It recognized the multi-stakeholder model is the most appropriate approach for internet governance. It also recognized the roles of all stakeholders, not just the technical

community including the private sector, governments, and international organizations.

For example, UN member states agreed in the Tunis agenda that quote, the private sector has had and should continue to have an important role in the development of the internet both in the technical and economic fields. So this is where the role of ICANN and the private sector are recognized and legitimized in internet governance. Also important is that WSIS considers issues such as multilingualism of the internet important and to ensure inclusivity on the internet.

But this multi-stakeholder model which is important to ICANN and the broader internet community has been under threat by certain governments. There have been calls by some UN member states to replace the multi-stakeholder model of internet governance with a multilateral model. And these member states claim that the multi-stakeholder model has not been effective despite the evidence that demonstrates otherwise. So if such calls are entertained this could lead possibly to a fragmented internet at the technical level and one where bottom-up processes are replaced by top-down approach that could likely prioritize political interests over technical realities. Next slide please.

So as such ICANN will continue to advocate to preserve the multi-stakeholder model of internet governance where the technical community is recognized as a unique stakeholder separate from

civil society. We will continue to support the continuation of the IGF as the primary multi-stakeholder platform to discuss internet policy related and wider digital issues. Last year, we established the WSIS+20 outreach network. This network has transformed itself into a fantastic resource and source of information and knowledge sharing. We have 560 subscribers from 87 countries. Sorry, next slide please.

We've also established an SO/AC WSIS+20 community discussion group where each supporting organization and advisory committee has two representatives and the conversations within these groups have been informative and constructive. And in 2025 we're going to continue to leverage these two important groups to further our objectives for WSIS+20. Sorry back one more yeah.

This slide shows a little bit of our work in 2024. I'm not going to teach all the new abbreviations, but we did have the first high-level government meeting since 2018 and very successful cooperation with the ITU among many of the achievements. And of course this list is not exhaustive. We organize events and look forward to opportunities to raise awareness of this topic and to highlight the community's work. Next slide please.

So we do encourage you to keep yourselves informed. There are a lot of good resources out there, so please do check out our network page. And beyond there are some great if not better resources from others in the technical community. ISOC, DigiWatch, and TCCM

have some fantastic WSIS pages with sharing similar messaging and background context. So we definitely encourage you to check it out and reach out to us if you have questions. And next slide please.

I'll talk about what we can look forward to for the rest of this year. So here is a brief overview of WSIS+20 milestones that ICANN is participating in. Another non-exhaustive list because each of these events will have side events, and regional events, ICANN hosted events. We also have as mentioned the SO/AC small discussion group which meets often in a lot of community events that are key in spreading the message of our objectives for WSIS.

One of the milestones in our work with UN agencies is our collaboration with the ITU in its Demystifying the Internet series. So we conduct briefings for diplomats in Geneva and New York and one just took place on February 17th. We had 120 member states participate across all the regions. Kurtis came and addressed the diplomats in Geneva and our GDS executive and MAG representative, Theresa Swinehart, spoke to the diplomats in New York. And of course we do have a follow-on session to this session that is going to be more interactive, geopolitical plenary at ICANN82 in a few weeks. Next slide, please.

So our summer will be packed starting with ICANN83. It's going to be back to back for us on a series of significant events. We have the IGF25 in Norway and the WSIS high level event in Geneva in July.

ICANN will have a delegation headed by the CEO with several Board members participating in both the IGF and the high level event. And both of these events are significant milestones in the WSIS review, and are a very important priority for us. So we plan to deliver our key messages on WSIS+20, raise ICANN's visibility, our role in keeping the internet unified, secure, and interoperable. ICANN's successful multi-stakeholder model and our activities to promote and support digital inclusivity. And importantly ICANN's contributions and achievements of the WSIS outcomes and SDGs.

We also plan to keep our leaders busy with bilateral meetings with governments, IGO officials, and other stakeholders. And we will be speaking during panels and sessions. These are the kinds of participation where we have direct contact with governments that could have the biggest impact since WSIS is a government-led process. So that is why it's critical for us to keep our finger on the pulse in these intergovernmental events because the WSIS review process is a government-led process. And although we support one that is transparent and open, we are not allowed in the room. So our only way of making sure objectives are met is if there are enough diplomats in the room who know what we do and how the internet functions, and to keep this in mind during negotiations. Next slide, please.

Okay, so lastly we wanted to provide a quick update on ICANN's preparations for the IGF25 and how we're engaging with the broader internet community to ensure productive and impactful

forum. So first ICANN has a representative on the IGF MAG, Theresa Swinehart. She's participating in the working group on IGF strengthening and strategy. We will be submitting two workshop proposals this year as well as an open forum. We're going to focus on a technical topic and the other will address digital inclusivity. And we're collaborating with other organizations such as the ITU, ISOC, IRRs, RIRs. And so we're designing these workshops to complement other sessions led by the technical community. We also look forward to hosting a collaborative open forum bringing together stakeholders from ICANN and the broader technical and internet community.

And beyond our own sessions we are aiming to position ICANN staff and Board members in multiple panels and workshops. And finally we are focused on ensuring clear and effective messaging around our objectives. The IGF2025 is not just an opportunity to engage with the community. It's also a key stepping stone towards the WSIS high-level event in the next month, and we will use the IGF discussions to build momentum and align our efforts with the broader WSIS+20 goals.

Thank you. I will now pass to my colleague, Alexey Trepikhlin, for more WSIS+20 updates from the UN New York.

ALEXEY TREPYKHALIN

Thank you, Becky. Since our last meeting there were also some developments on the WSIS+20 process in New York at the UN. The president of the General Assembly appointed two co-facilitators of

the intergovernmental consultations to finalize the modalities of the overall WSIS+20 review. The co-facilitators, one from Kenya and one from Lithuania, are to chair the negotiations on modalities, and it remains to be seen if they will preside over the actual negotiations themselves.

The member states produced the draft of these modalities on February 6th. This draft will be further negotiated at the UN High Q between the member states only in three additional sessions in February and March. The final modalities document is expected to be published in March with the actual WSIS+20 negotiations happening in the fall of 2025. And the high-level meeting that would adopt the final outcome documents is tentatively projected to take place in mid-December of 2025.

The zero draft has been published on UNDESA website. What does the current zero text mean for the multi-stakeholder participation? In our assessment it's not that different from 2015 WSIS+10 modalities or stakeholder participation. The current zero draft modalities specify that during the preparatory process for the high-level meeting, the President of the General Assembly will organize informal interactive consultations with all relevant stakeholders of the World Summit on the Information Society in order to collect their inputs or the intergovernmental negotiation process.

To sum up, the negotiations on modalities are ongoing behind closed doors as we speak, and it is planned that the final draft will

be submitted to the President of the General Assembly. The draft resolution would be issued and considered at the plenary session in the third and fourth weeks of March, 2025. And with this I pass the floor over back to Veni.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thank you. Let's see if we can move to the next slide. Yeah, so often people are asking us how they can get involved. As it was already explained by my colleagues, these negotiations are going to take place only among member states with some limited consultation with other stakeholders as it was in 2015. So the best way to do this is to engage with the national governments.

People can reach out to the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, or through their GAC members, to the foreign ministries and share factual information about the success of the multi-stakeholder model, explain how the internet works, what are the stakeholders doing. This is all actually explained in the WSIS agenda and in the WSIS+10 outcome document. And with regards to internet governance, there is also the text of the Global Digital Compact, which was accepted last year at the UN General Assembly, which has even more improved language about internet governance than the WSIS+10 outcome document.

Stay informed about the latest developments and participate in global discussions. This also can be done through joining our WSIS+20 outreach network, the mailing list. There are links in the

chat that can lead you to that, or you can go to the government engagement web page of the ICANN website. And spread the word. Help people understand the importance of internet governance and ask them also to engage. We have seen that being a successful strategy in 2015 at the WSIS+10 negotiations. There are governments around the world which are willing to include representatives of different stakeholders in their delegations or to consult with them. We've seen actually public consultations around WSIS+10. We hope that we will see something like that around WSIS+20.

And if you have any questions, government engagement team is at your disposal. Just reach out to us and talk to us, be that in Seattle or in Prague or in between. And if you hear something about different proposals coming from different countries, feel free to share them as well on the WSIS+20 outreach network mailing list or with us so that we can look at them and make an assessment and see what could be their impact within the negotiations.

We are constantly talking to governments. We had a delegation at the IGF in Riyadh in December headed by our president and CEO, Kurtis Lindqvist. And we had a number of meetings there and we continue our bilateral meetings through the year and participation at different conferences where member states are represented by either the telecom ministries or foreign ministries and we will continue talking to them. And we urge you guys to do the same.

With that, I'll end. I think we have a few minutes for questions now. And to remind you, there will be a whole session in Seattle, I believe on March 13, which was intended to be only for questions that people might have based on the information that we shared today. Thank you. And thanks again to everyone who spoke.

ELIZABETH OLUOCH

Thank you so much, Vani. And thank you, everyone, for your updates. We can now move to Q&A. And I believe there were a number of questions posed in the Q&A pod and Jamie has gone to them. And we also have some hands up. Anne will take your question. And Michael, I know you had your hand up earlier. We can take your question now, if you prefer. But Anne, since your hand is up, please go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Thanks very much. I'm going to defer my question and just go directly to commenting on how much we all appreciate ICANN's increased proactive involvement in providing input to the governments with respect to the various issues that are in play here in this very important year. So thanks so much. And the only other process comment I have is that these prep sessions are extremely important. And so we need to plan for having enough time for Q&A that is live, and would appreciate that going forward. And I defer to others' questions. Thank you.

ELIZABETH OLUOCH

Thank you so much, Anne. And thank you so much for your feedback. And we have duly noted your suggestion for the next prep session. I think there's always an opportunity for flexibility.

And we will have at the geopolitical plenary on March 13th. We want to have your questions coming and we want to have interaction with all of you. So keep this session in mind.

Do we have other questions as well at this point? If there are none, time is always a precious commodity. So we can allocate eight minutes back to you. We wish you all good ICANN82 and look forward to seeing you in some of the sessions and at the geopolitical plenary. Thank you all and good day.

JAMIE HEDLUND

Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]