
ICANN83 | PF – ccNSO: 20 Years of WSIS Implementation and the Road Ahead
Tuesday, June 10, 2025 – 10:45 to 12:15 CEST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Hello and welcome to the ccNSO, ccTLDs, and IGF 20 Years of WSIS Implementation and the Road Ahead Session. My name is Claudia Ruiz and I, along with my colleagues, Julie and Joke, are the remote participation managers 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 submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted. Interpretation for this session will include English, Spanish, and French. 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 and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English, and speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Thank you very much. And with this, I will now hand the floor over to Marta Diaz. Thank you.

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.

MARTA MOREIRA DIAS

Thank you, Claudia. So hello, everyone, and welcome to the ccNSO Internet Governance Liaison Committee session. In terms of agenda for today, we do have a 90-minute session with a keynote speaker, followed by three ccTLDs testimonials coming from Africa, Europe, and Asia. And then in the end, we are planning to have a final slot for a panel of discussion of 20 minutes.

So please let me say that your inputs and your participation during the session are very appreciated. So without further ado, I welcome Chris Buckridge, Suzete Centeio from .cv that will join us online, Pierre Bonis from .fr, and Jo-Fan from .tw. So the theme of the session is 20 years of WSIS Implementation by ccTLDs and the Road Ahead.

So next slide, please. So before we dive in today's discussion, I want to call your attention to the WSIS guidelines that were presented during the World Summit on Information Society in Geneva in 2003 and later in Tunis in 2005. So I would like briefly to highlight the longstanding role of ccTLDs shaping the Internet and contributing in different ways, different geographies, and different moments to the implementation of the WSIS action line.

So nevertheless, it's important to underline that for many cTLDs, the WSIS action lines, the WSIS priorities are not new. They were already part of the mission of their objectives of their day-to-day work and even of their bylaws. So, ccTLDs were already playing a crucial role in internet governance well before WSIS. So it's

important to emphasize this here. So ccTLDs nowadays, they are already contributing on the ground.

They work together with their local communities, they foster digital inclusion, they're investing in infrastructure, sometimes they even run their own certs. They promote multilingualism, which is very important and they contribute day-to-day to a trusted, inclusive and secure online environment.

So we believe it's a good moment to reflect how the principles that were established during the WSIS process have been implemented over the past two decades by ccTLDs, and namely through their engagement with national and regional internet governance initiatives. The moment could be better. The UN General Assembly ALAC meeting will be held in December for the overall review of the implementation of the WSIS outcomes.

And today we do have an informal consultation with stakeholders from Eastern America, Europe, and Africa to collect their inputs for the negotiation process. So this could be seen as a good opportunity for us, for all of us to contribute meaningfully in the process. Also, the Technical Community Coalition for Multi-Stakeholderism has secured the slot to make a statement during today's consultation, so I'm sure that we will be very well represented.

So, in short, in today's session, we do have a keynote speaker that will guide us through WSIS process. We are looking back and forward, and then we do have the three ccTLDs testimonials that

somehow will try to showcase how they are contributing to the multi-stakeholder process and to the open discussions related with the internet governance. So next slide, please.

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Marta, can you please slow down a little bit for our interpreters? Thank you.

MARTA MOREIRA DIAS

I will, I'm sorry. So we want this session to be as much interactive as possible. So we would like to invite you to take part of our first Mentimeter poll. We prepared two icebreaker questions. So it's time to hear from you. Please take your phones, so go to menti.com. You have a code over there or you can use the QR code. And we do have the first question for you. So please go ahead and answer the question.

The question, I will read it out loud. "What is the most positive change you witnessed internet governance over the last two decades?" So one minute or two to participate. We already have one answer, two. So the idea is to have a guide to the discussion. So feel free, there is no right or wrong answers, just your perspective. Let's see what the room is thinking. So a few seconds left. Go ahead. Are we done? I believe so.

We see that it's interesting to see that, again, the multi-stakeholder model and collaboration are standing out and clearly on the top of mind of all of you. Well, there's a great variety of thoughts. IANA

transition, recognition of the different stakeholders, improvements of participation, an increase in collaboration, so multi-stakeholder model, the promotion of the multi-stakeholder model, and the importance of collaboration, meaningful collaboration, meaningful multi-state colder participation in different forum and discussion, so good points.

Is there anyone that wants to comment on the results or should we move to the second question, maybe? Any thoughts, any comments? Do you want to explain why did you choose that answer? Not yet. Let's move to the second question, please. So in one word, what should define the future of internet governance? One minute.

Trust, yeah. Free, collaboration, trusts, inclusivity, coordination, secure, transparency, respect, very important, respect, global stability, diversity, and again collaboration stands out as a key point. Yeah, I believe we can move on. Very interesting to see that I think that the audience is aligned with the most important, the keywords for what we want for the future of the internet. So I believe that we do have here a message of hope. Somehow, we can read the results that way or just a single wishful thinking, I don't know.

Well, anyone wants to comment on the results? No. So if not, I believe that we have here a good guide to our panel of discussion in the end of the session, and we always can come back to the results during the next panel. So we move on. I want to give the

floor to Chris Buckridge. He's our keynote speaker, and he will introduce the topic and will help us reflect on the progress made over the past 20 years. Chris, thank you so much for being here today, and the floor is yours. Thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay, thank you very much, Marta. And thank you to the ccNSO for having me here today to speak. It's on a very important topic, obviously, and I think my role is to give a bit of historical context, to give a bit of outline to why these issues are important and how they're relevant. I think we'll hear more from the other ccNSO members on that direct relevance to CCs and their operators.

I should also point out I'm an ICANN Board member, obviously, but I'm speaking here today on my own behalf. I'm also a member of the IGF Multi-Stakeholder Advisory Group, again, speaking on my own behalf. And that is somewhat important because I'm going to start a little controversially by disagreeing with one of our esteemed GAC representatives. There was a comment yesterday about the World Summit on the Information Society and whether that idea of the information society feels a little dated or not reflecting the current times and situation we live in.

I actually disagree. I think that idea of an information society was one of several really prescient and insightful elements in the original WSIS planning because while it's easy to get dazzled by the technology and the progress of the technology in the last two decades, what this is really about is it's about information. It's

about how we use information, how we store information, how we share information, how we protect information, and how access to information has the capacity to evolve our societies and our lives for better and also for worse.

So I think that idea of an information society really threads all the way through from the most basic internet connections to AI, LLMs, quantum computing. It's a very future-proof way of framing our human society's relationship to digital technologies. And as I say, I think very prescient on the part of those working so long, two decades ago now, to put this together. We also see that while there is technology that's not linked to information and data and communication, that gap is closing.

Even the technologies that we have, which are not necessarily ICTs, are being linked to the data that is created and provided in this information society, and that has important implications for how we deal with this. The other point I think important to make is that we in the ICANN community, in the registry communities, handling of information, use of information, storage of information, this is our bread and butter. So it really reinforces the way and the influence that this community can and should have in the discussions around information society.

So if I can go to the next slide, please. This is probably background that many of you have already known or have heard about several times. So hopefully the very bright colors here will help to make up for the repetition. This is a chart I put together, actually, I think a

couple of years ago, and I've made some updates. And it's messy, a bit like the WSIS process is a little messy, but it draws out a couple of important elements that I think are useful to recognize.

One is the history and how it's played out here. We heard yesterday how ICANN actually predated WSIS. And that's true, but it's actually not as true as I think was being discussed yesterday. ICANN's articles of association were filed on the 30th of September 1998. About a month later, there was the ITU plenipotentiary in Minneapolis, which produced the resolution which led to the WSIS.

So you could argue in a way that ICANN predates the WSIS by about a month. But I think that parallel of the development of WSIS, the development of the UN's engagement with these questions, and ICANN and its community and its engagement with more operational questions is a really important one. You can also see here that that history, there are many events involved, there are those black dots there are both the IGF, Internet Governance Forum events, and the WSIS Forum events that have taken place, and we've also been through reviews before.

There was a five-year review of WSIS in 2010, there was the WSIS+10 years in 2015. So those can inform a little how we view and how we prepare for the WSIS+20. Another point that's worth noting here, and we heard again yesterday, WSIS was about much more than just internet governance. And you can see here, these are the action lines, which Marta also had in the slides earlier, now in bright

colors. You can see that there is much more than internet governance here.

There is e-learning, e-science, there is e-government, e-environment, the e- prefix perhaps sounds a little dated these days. But it also, you can see the facilitators there, which are different UN agencies, specialized agencies. And that breadth of engagement across the UN was one of the real strengths of WSIS. And also, I would argue, prescient in recognizing how broad the implications of these technologies were going to be.

And so leveraging that breadth and that diversity is something really important. And it's something that some of us have argued is not really captured by more centralized approaches, something like the GDC or the new UN structures being proposed. So WSIS wasn't all about IG, it wasn't even much about IG, but internet governance was a significant novel and new element of this, and that's demonstrated, and you can see here the red circle towards the bottom between the two phases of WSIS.

There was actually a working group on internet governance convened because that idea of internet governance was at that point not really understood yet. There was a discussion of, okay, it's internet governance, but they actually had to go away and talk in the intervening 24 months about what does internet governance really mean and what can WSIS do about that? And that really led to some of the most fundamental outputs of the WSIS process. So if we can jump to the next slide, please.

So these are talking about the outputs of that working group on internet governance. One of the main ones, obviously, was a definition that we still use to these days for the most part, which is that internet governance is the development and application by governments, the private sector, and civil society in their respective roles of shared principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures, and programs that shape the evolution and use of the internet.

So they also identified relevant public policy issues, which is worth going back and reading. I won't list them all here. They discussed the different roles and responsibilities of different stakeholder groups. They identified the need for a global forum, so that's where the IGF came from, and they recommended that all stakeholders need to be engaged. So that's really the kernel and the beginning of the multi-stakeholder idea there in that report from the WGIG.

But at the same time, that capacity building for the Global South was absolutely necessary to ensure that it wasn't just rich countries, rich private sector taking part in this, that this was an inclusive process that involved all of those whose lives were going to be affected. So this is a foundational document, no question at all. But it also was of its time, and I think one of the really interesting things to look at now is what's not there. I mean, obviously, there's no references to AI, but even something like cell phones were not really considered as important or within scope of that internet governance idea.

And it was only less than 10 years later that we had smartphones emerging, we began to see that really fundamental change. So I think it was prescient and it was in many ways future-proof, but it does require us to sort of look at it with eyes now of how much has changed in the technology space itself. Can we go to the next slide, please? So when we talk about that multi-stakeholder idea, one of the things I think we can stress in various ways is its creative ambiguity.

We talked about the ICANN multi-stakeholder model, we also acknowledge that the ICANN multi-stakeholder model is just one of various models that exist, and that those models are all evolving constantly to reflect the technology, the communities, the needs of policymaking, and the relationships between different stakeholders. And that ambiguity was already there in the language from the working group, but then also into the Tunis agenda. And again, you see that repeated idea of within their stakeholders, working, participating, contributing within their respective roles and responsibilities.

And I think that idea was both necessary but has also led to this situation of constant reassessment of what are the respective roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders. So it's not a bug in the system, maybe it's a feature of the system, but it's certainly a challenge in the system that we have to be constantly mindful and ready to evolve our understanding of these issues. Now I'm here to sort of give some background, and I think it's worth looking

back at some of the previous reviews that took place of WSIS, and particularly the WSIS+10. So if we can go to the next slide, please.

So the WSIS+10 took place in 2015, it was in many ways very similar to the process that's going on now for the WSIS+20. Like this process for the WSIS+20, there was a lot of interest and consternation and uncertainty and thinking about what this could mean for the IGF, for the broader internet governance framework and approach. But it's also important to look at it in a slightly broader historical context. So 2015, this was happening in the UN, what had been happening in the years or the period around that.

In 2013, we had the revelations from Edward Snowden about how information, again, information society was being taken and abused essentially, or certainly used without consent. And that had really struck at the trust that many people had or, by default, had in these technologies. Stemming from that, in more or less direct ways, there were events like NetMundial, which took place in 2014, which really saw different stakeholders, including the technical community, coming together and trying to put some meat on the bones of this idea of how do multi-stakeholder processes work.

And so that really fed into these discussions in terms of there has been some work done, ongoing work, to meet these challenges and to make multi-stakeholder a viable idea for the long term. The other really key event, which hadn't happened yet but was in the process of happening, was the transition of IANA stewardship away

from the US government to the global multi-stakeholder community. And so where the Snowden revelations had sort of diminished trust, struck at trust, the IANA stewardship transition sort of worked in the opposite way to make people think, okay, this global multi-stakeholder idea, maybe it actually does mean something, maybe we're going to see this reflected.

The outcome of all of that, I think, was characterized at the time as victory, but victory by move along, nothing really to see here. The IGF was extended, support for the multi-stakeholder model was reinforced and maintained, and there was a renewed discussion of this enhanced cooperation, which came out of Tunis and remains potentially an issue of some consternation between different groups as to how governments actually participate. So if we move forward now to WSIS+20, and sorry, if we can go to the next slide, please.

What are we seeing in that intervening decade? These are some of the events, Cambridge Analytica, the whole discussion around use of data information again, which I think, again, diminished some trust in these technologies and the companies that are involved in deploying these technologies. We had the COVID-19 pandemic, which obviously affected society in many ways, but the movement of so much work online really highlighted the criticality of these information technologies and the Internet, and I think that will impact the discussions. I've got the Russian invasion of Ukraine here as a key element because it really, in some senses, highlighted the intersection of geopolitical issues and quite specific

geopolitical issues in this case with internet governance and the maintenance of these registries and we we've had numerous discussions about that in various form forums in ICANN.

Next one, ChatGPT and AI. So AI in the very broad sense, but ChatGPT I think is just a sort of a moment when this all became very real for society. And I think it actually happened about two weeks, they released their first public version about two weeks before an IGF in Japan, in Kyoto. And to feel the change that came into those discussions when people realized this could actually have some really significant impacts in the very near term on things like work, on things like how we engage with businesses, how we engage with government.

And that, I think, has only increased in the intervening years. And then finally, just shifting geopolitical positions and priorities, we don't know how things like discussions around the development agenda in the UN are going to play out in the WSIS discussions. So if we can go to the next slide, please. And sorry, this is my second last slide here. The other really significant thing we've seen in the last 10 years is a shift into a higher gear of government attempts to regulate or legislate around digital technologies.

And so the EU is obviously a bit of a global petri dish for this, GDPR in the privacy space, NIST and NIST2 in terms of cybersecurity, the Digital Services Act and Digital Markets Act in relation to how businesses are online, and the AI Act as one of the most recent significant efforts to sort of jump into a very current and developing

scene with some regulation. And we've seen this certainly outside the EU as well, online safety acts in the UK and Australia, data protection in India, Brazil, many others.

At the same time, and perhaps related to that, we've seen at the UN level a real new energy and new ambition, which is reflected in the Global Digital Compact, which was adopted last year as part of the Pact of the Future, but also this new Office of Digital and Emerging Technologies, which represents As I say, perhaps a different approach from the UN and how that will sit alongside WSIS and sit alongside something like the IGF is yet to be determined.

It's an ongoing negotiation, you could say. But it changes the environment and will play into these discussions. So as a last slide here, just looking at the outcomes that we might expect. If we can go to the next slide, please. I think the big question is whether we will see support continue or grow for a multi-stakeholder approach to internet governance and to digital policy processes more broadly. I think there is reason to be optimistic about that, but I think we need to keep an eye on that.

In a more practical or specific sense, there's the question of the mandate of the Internet Governance Forum. Are we going to see that made permanent? Are we going to see a 10-year mandate like we saw coming out of the WSIS+10? Might we even see something like a five-year mandate that would allow a new integration with something that comes after the Agenda 2030, which obviously concludes in five years? I think that's a discussion obviously for

governments to have, but a commitment to the permanence or to the ongoing importance of the IGF would be really positive to see.

The question about the development agenda and what, for instance, the US government's step back from the SDGs and how that will factor into WSIS is a really open question, I think, particularly because so much of WSIS is about development, it's about the commitment to making sure that digital divides are closed or that existing divides that are exacerbated by digital technologies can be addressed. So the uncertainty around such a major element of WSIS, I think, extends then to uncertainty about the whole process.

Are we going to see geopolitical conflict and tensions reflected in the negotiations? I think that's a bit of a question here. Will we have a stopgap, essentially, which says, okay, as I say, for five years, let's keep going, business as usual, and then we rethink this whole thing?

Or will there be a recognition that we need to commit to a more sustainable, responsive governance model that really is fit for purpose in a very rapidly changing technological environment and a very rapidly changing social adoption environment. So I think that's where I'll stop, and hopefully we can make some connections there to the ccTLD community. But thank you very much.

MARTA MOREIRA DIAS

Thank you so much. It was a great presentation. So you left us with a set of important outcomes and questions, and I open the floor to have your opinion and, if possible, to share a guess or a possible answer to the questions that Chris left us. So the floor is yours. Okay. Thank you. Go ahead.

BRUCE TONKIN

Hi, Bruce Tonkin. Thanks for that presentation, Chris. It was really good history going back over sort of 25 years or so which is great. The second one, a permanent mandate for IGF what do you think the criteria would be, like what would be the threshold conditions for governments thinking that a permanent mandate would be good versus a 10-year versus not at all? So it's really a question about criteria.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

And it's an interesting question because I guess I don't have a very clear answer on that. I think one of the criteria there is certainly how the UN and its member states see, as I say, the post-agenda 2030 approach. Like, are they, and to what extent, WSIS and this digital technology work needs to integrate with a much broader development agenda within the UN.

Because I think we've seen, and there have been comments over the years about the SDGs, the Millennium Development Goals before that, and WSIS have been somewhat siloed or at least happening in independent of each other. There is not a SDG for

digital, for instance. So is there a need to now as we sort of understand how deep and broad the implications of digital technology are, to integrate those more tightly in the UN?

That might mean a shorter mandate and a commitment to re-evaluate more fundamentally in five years, or it may not. I don't really have a clear sense of that but perhaps others in the room or governments may have a sense.

MARTA MOREIRA DIAS

Over there, and then we come to Nick. Ah, I'm sorry Olga, and then you.

HOSEIN BADRAN

Thank you so much, Hosein Badran. Thank you, Chris. Excellent presentation, as always. My question relates to the previous question about the criteria for renewal, but from the side of funding, how would you see the funding of the IGF continuing and given the fiscal pressures that we are aware of and the finishing funding for the UN? Would you see also the technical community playing a role in trying to bridge this gap of funding? Thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks, Hosein. I think funding for the IGF is a really sticky issue, sticky question. But I do think probably the fundamentals I would see is that diversity in that funding is really key. We don't know what the UN is going to look like five years from now, even best-

case scenario. It's not a huge pool of money, and I think part of the IGF's importance has been to have one foot in the UN and in very formal UN processes, but then another foot in the multi-stakeholder community.

And I think if funding can reflect that and can reflect that sort of diversity of stakeholders, opinions, perspectives, and prevent capture by any one sort of side, I think that's really important. Now, how we make that case to a very broad diversity of potential contributors, that's the nut we have to crack now. But I think focusing on that would actually be really useful for us to do.

MARTA MOREIRA DIAS

Thank you. Olga, please.

OLGA CAVALLI

Thank you. Thank you very much. This is Olga Cavalli here in the back, ccNSO Council, NomCom appointee. Thank you very much, Chris. It was very interesting, and this historical view of all this process. I was wondering about the last sentence on a new approach to sustainable, responsible governance. I understand the sustainable part because it has been difficult to sustain, especially the IGF secretariat and compared to other international meetings and processes.

But I was wondering if the process that has been happening in the last 20 years was not responsive enough. I mean, what do we mean by responsive governance? It should be more responsive or should

be maintaining the equal footing and the multi-stakeholder approach to all the problems and challenges that technology is bringing to us? It's just a reflection, I don't know if I have the answer or we should think about it. Thank you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Thanks, Olga. I can give a little perspective on why I included that word there. And it was really in response to a lot of the discussions going on around AI governance and around quantum technologies, quantum governance. The question I think that some are asking is, are the models that were developed in WSIS, is the model of the IGF equipped to deal with these new technologies that are coming online or coming into our society very quickly and posing different challenges.

So I think part of what we're looking at as we evolve the IGF or evolve WSIS is, yeah, can these processes and these structures that we have respond to those new challenges? If not, are there ways we can better make them respond? And so there's a session, obviously, that we're having at the IGF about emerging technologies and human rights.

And one of the questions that we're looking at there is, how can regulators or how can policymakers respond to very rapidly evolving and technology digital challenges. And I know that there's been work by the OECD on anticipatory governance. I think the

IPU, the International Parliamentarian Union, has also done some work on this.

So policymakers are looking at it, but it's something that requires, I think, the attention of the full multi-stakeholder spectrum.

MARTA MOREIRA DIAS

Thank you, Nick. I'm so sorry we are running out of time. We can come back to you in the end of the final panel, okay? Thank you so much. So we are moving to the next part of our session. And then we do have Suzette Centeio from arm.cv. Suzette will guide us through the case of Cabo Verde and the way forward. Hola, Suzette, you have the floor.

SUZETE CENTEIO PEREIRA

Thank you, Marta. Good morning, everyone. Like Marta said, my name is Suzete Centeio Pereira. I work at ARM, the Multisectorial Regulatory Agency for the Economy and among other things. It is the registry of the .cv ccTLD designated by ICANN. So, it is a great pleasure to take part in this panel and share some reflection on the implementation of the WC's action line from the perspective of the ccTLDs, with, of course, a special focus on Cabo Verde and the management of our national domain .cv.

So in this presentation I will show how a local internet governance effort aligned with the WC's objective, highlighting some key themes such as digital inclusion, linguistic and cultural diversity and international cooperation. Next slide, please. So for who don't

know, the Cabo Verde is an archipelago located in West Africa consisting of 10 volcanic islands with a total area of about 4,033 square kilometers, and our official language is Portuguese.

Next slide, please. Over the past 20 years, WCs has been a fundamental reference framework for building more inclusive people-centered information societies. So among many actors involved in this process, the ccTLD's operators play a critical role in affirming digital sovereignty and developing national internet infrastructure. So here in Cabo Verde, the .cv domain represents more than just a digital address.

So it is a strategic asset that with strangeness, our digital identity supports the creation of local content and is fully aligned with our national agenda for digital transformation and universal access. Next slide, please. One of the most important platforms for fostering the local dialogue and participation here in Cabo Verde, has been the Internet Governance Forum. So, here in Cabo Verde, we have organized several editions of the National IGF, the Youth IGF, and last year, we hosted the second Lusophone IGF, and we are actively participating in the Lusophone IGF process.

And these forums have created open multi-stakeholders and inclusive spaces for dialogue among governance, private sector, civil society, academia. So, in this forum, we normally discuss topics like digital inclusion, cybersecurity, artificial intelligence, data protection. But the multilingualism and the need to represent local language on the internet emerge as a recurring and central

theme. So these events have already impacted hundreds of participants and have helped bring global internet governance topics into the national conversation for, of course, a local participatory perspective.

Next slide, please. So the multilingualism is a priority in our digital development process. In Cabo Verde, we speak Portuguese, like I said, and Cape Verdean Criollo, and boats are fundamental components of our cultural and digital identity. In the Lusophone Forum, we produced the São Paulo letter and the Praia letter, and both are developed to emphasize, they clearly emphasize, the importance of using local language online as a means of inclusion and promoting cultural diversity.

So this concern is directly reflected in the WC's action line. I focus in C8, which focused on cultural linguistic diversity and local content, and in the C12, which promotes the presence and use of all-world language on the internet. So we have been encouraging the production of digital content in both Creole and Portuguese, especially in education, in media, in public services. And that is because the language is not just for us a cultural issue, it's also a matter of access, equity, and digital citizenship. Next slide, please. So another essential debuses principle is the knowledge and good practices, which you have embraced strongly.

Cabo Verd has benefits for long-standing cooperation with the .pt, the Portugal, and .br, Brazil domains both and at the technical level and the policy development for the .cv. So through this

partnership, we have improved the security the stability and governance of the .cv domain, and we have also gained valuable insights on registry management, on DNSSEC implementation, on our IPV6 transaction and the community engagement. So this experience sharing especially among the Lusophone countries I think is essential to us to ensure that small states like Cabo Verde can evolve sustainably and align with global standards while they addressing local realities.

Next slide, please. So our cooperation has been further strengthened through the LusNIC. LusNIC is the association of Portuguese speaking ccTLDs, where Cabo Verde is an active member. And through this network we recently took part in the DNSSEC Roadshow project. It is organized as part of Coalition for Digital Africa and is an ICANN initiative. And the goal of this coalition is to promote the DNSSEC adoption across the African continent.

So we are now in the final phase of this one-year project, which ends now in June. And we are proud to say that the .cv zone is almost signed with DNSSEC. Next slide, please. So, when I look at our ads, I have identified several key priorities for us. Strengthening the technical and institutional management of the .cv make it more secure, resilient, and accessible. Promoting the creation and distribution of digital content in Creole and Portuguese to foster online and cultural identity.

Participating more actively in the WC's initiative and in regional and international internet governance forums. Deepening cooperation networks, particularly through the LusNIC and the African Initiative. And finally, engaging more board young people and women in internet governance. Not just as a user, but as a decision maker and as technicians, as innovators. Next slide, please. So, to conclude, I would like to leave you with this message.

The Internet must reflect the diversity of its users through ccTLDs cooperation and dialogue. We can build the digital space and that is more inclusive, secure, and represented. Thank you very much for your attention.

MARTA MOREIRA DIAS

Thank you, Suzette, it was very inspiring, and thank you so much for again bringing up the multilingualism topic, it's a very timely and relevant topic and it's also connected with the one of the WSIS action lines, the one regarding non-cultural in linguistic diversity, so very important to underline here this.

So any questions, any comments from the floor to Suzette. If not, obrigado, Suzette. So I pass over Pierre Bonis from AFNIC, .fr. And the theme of the presentation will be AFNIC Internet made in France. Go ahead. Thank you. Because I had a question for you regarding that.

PIERRE BONIS

But maybe in the spirit of applying the Action Line C8 of the WSIS, I wanted to speak in French, but I don't see a lot of headphones. And people say, no, no, no. Okay. But I'm going to speak in French because there are interpreters. I will go ahead and speak French since we have interpreters. Thank you very much for giving me the floor.

I will wait until everybody has their headphones and I will speak slowly. Wonderful. Maybe before we start, I hope that you will not count these seconds against me because this is not part of the presentation. So, by means of introduction, let me say that--

UNKNOWN SPEAKER

You can use the translation tool in Zoom as well. So you need to sign into the Zoom room and then you can use your own headphones and use the translation in Zoom. So we run out of headphones, Pierre, and there is a new set of headphones arriving.

PIERRE BONIS

This is a tribute to the president of the council of the ccNSO who is always very careful to use Spanish at least several times during each session. So I am just following her example, which inspires me. So thank you very much. I will now start the presentation. The idea here is similarly to the previous speaker is to look at the mission of AFNIC as an internet registry of ccTLD, to look at the action lines of the world summit under Information Society that we want to take part in, that we want to implement.

The idea being through the different examples to reaffirm the use of the top-level internet registries, ccTLDs in particular, not just for our daily work of management and development of ccTLDs, but also with the use of our governance and our role at the national and regional level, which I think resonates with the priorities that have been those of the World Summit and the Information Society for the past 20 years. I'm not sure how to say next slide in French actually. Thank you.

So that's basically what I was wanting to say. The multi-stakeholder approach, for many of us, at least at AFNIC, it is certain, it is an approach based on or by design. The French internet registry is a multi-stakeholder registry. You have representatives of the users of registrars, of public authorities, governments, of universities. We also have international peers with the international college that I would like to congratulate. Ralph was just elected at the .ng. All of those stakeholders are within the association and within the board of directors.

So they are present at all levels of governance, which means that we have this multi-stakeholder dialogue at the different levels. But there's also a mission of AFNIC within its internal organization, which is to take part in promoting the multi-stakeholder dialogue in France. This is why we are core organizers with ISOC France of the IGF in France, but more recently during the latest increase in regulations regarding DNS and domain names, we created a liaison

committee between the state and the DNS. DNS stakeholders, as you know, are of various sizes.

They are not necessarily known by regulators, whether it is exchange points or access suppliers, internet registries, the landscape is somewhat disseminated. And so AFNIC wanted to gather them in order to present a unified discourse to regulators at the level of the European Union and at the national level. Of course, regulations are not bad, they just need to be intelligent. And of course, we give feedback to the French internet community of the discussions that we have at the international level. Whenever we have ICANN, whenever we have an IETF meeting, we go back to the local internet community to explain what was discussed.

Next slide, please. So this is what I was mentioning earlier, that is to see the governance of AFNIC and the multi-stakeholder aspect of this governance structure. Next slide. Next slide. That's how you say it In French. We also needed to mention, and actually, was mentioned previously, the question of funding for those different multi-stakeholder structures and the goal. For a ccTLD like the .fr, we have the luxury, the ability to fund ourselves the priorities that resonate with the action lines of the World Summit on the Information Society.

First, let's say that capacity building that action line, which is very important within SMSI. It is self-funded by the .fr in France as we transfer skills around DNS technologies, but we also guide the

digital transition for businesses, especially small enterprises and medium-sized enterprises. We help thousands of those enterprises. It is funding that is made possible, thanks to the revenues of the .fr. Those programs are carried out in schools, in universities, we talk about protection of the youth, protection of their personal data, and we have a foundation for AFNIC solidarity as well. Next slide, please. There you go. This gives you an idea.

Beyond the actions that are at the heart of what we do, training on DNS training, on the internet, and so forth, the digital divide actually has to do with uses as well. Uses is not necessarily what we do as an internet registry, but we have set up that foundation, which is funded by the revenues of .fr. And all over the territories, we have different projects on the use of technologies to promote inclusion, physical inclusion, digital inclusion, any sort of inclusion, inclusion of refugees as well, migrants.

So in 2024, it was 95 projects for 1,400,000 euros almost. Next slide, please. Let me try. Just give me two minutes, please. People had time to get their headsets, so. If I may. My apologies. But we knew from the get-go that this was a multilingual meeting, so I need an extra couple minutes.

So let me summarize the last slides that I have left. One way to discuss the topic, and I think that Chris was quite right on that, the implementation of the action lines of the World Summit and the Information Society are reflected in the ISO 26,000 approach and in the sustainable development goals, even though there isn't a

sustainable development goal that has a number, so to speak, but the action of ccTLD can be reflected or can use those ODDs and establish the link between the WSIS action lines and the action lines of the ODDs, which actually are reflected in ISO 26K.

Next slide, please. If people are interested, I don't have any more time, but I have a lot of data related to the different elements that might give an answer to the sustainable development goals. Just to give you an example. Next slide, please. So, sustainable development in terms of the social aspect. And then the next one is about, I think, societal data.

Yes, that's right. And then the last one, sustainable development regarding governance. We do this every year, we have reports every year, so you can have access to that data. Thank you very much for your attention. I will stop now, and I am available to answer your questions in English as well, if you prefer. Thank you so much.

MARTA MOREIRA DIAS

Thank you very much. It was excellent. We can take a single question. Sorry, Olga, we can try to come back to you later. I'm sorry.

VAHAN HOVSEPYAN

Okay. Thank you. It's me, right? Okay. Well, the question is very simple. We are talking about WSIS, but we have also the best practice guideline for ccTLD managers of ICANN. And there is a

question, do you have a definition of local internet community at your ccTLD?

PIERRE BONIS

Thank you very much. This is a very tricky question. We pretend that we have, and since we pretend that we have a very strong definition of what is local internet community since 20 years, everyone thinks that we have this definition, which is not the case. But most of the time, we will say that the local internet community are the people who feel that they are a member of the local internet community.

MARTA MOREIRA DIAS

Very good. Thank you so much, Pierre. So we have to move on. So the last ccTLD testimonial is from Jo-Fan from TWNIC .tw. Global Engagement and Governance Practices: Implementing WSIS Action Lines Through Local Stewardship. You do have the floor. Thank you.

JO-FAN YU

Thank you. Hello, everyone. I will return to English. Hope next time we'll have a privilege to speak Mandarin next time. So, hello, my name is Jo-Fan Yu. I'm the CEO of TWNIC, the registry for .tw and .taiwan, and it's my pleasure to be here today to share our reflection on how we, .tw, contribute to the implementation of the

WSIS action lines and how we see our role has evolved over the past two decades.

Next slide, please. So today we would like to share particularly how we contribute to the implementation of two action lines, that is C1 and C4. And C1, which emphasizes the importance of inclusive multi-stakeholder participations, that is to include governments and civil society and private sector and international government organizations. Another one is C4, which focuses on capacity buildings to ensure that all the people have the skill and opportunities to fully benefit from ICT development.

So as a ccTLD, we all know that we are deeply embedded in a local digital ecosystem. So that's why we believe the ccTLD are a good and also natural platform to implement WSIS and values because we are neutral, we are trusted, we are also anchored in a local legitimacy. Next slide, please. Thank you. So we would like to talk about our view on our changing role of ccTLD. So historically, ccTLD was seen as purely technical operators.

So we manage DS zones, we ensure the uptime, and we also process domain registrations. But I think today, I think we believe our role is much more than that. So actually in Taiwan, [01:07:29 – inaudible] is increasingly involved in the policy coordination and security framework and trust building initiative and even discussion about digital rights and AI governance. So now we are facilitating multi-state whole dialogue and also to build such as like

a public-private partnership and also contribute to the broader digital resilience.

And in many cases, we are also asked to help with the balance, the freedom and safety and regulation. So I think our role is not only to manage domains. So this evolution, we think, actually reflects the maturing role of ccTLDs. Do we operate a crypto infrastructure? Yes, of course. But I think we are also now operating in the space where the technical systems actually meet the social values. Next slide, please. So reflecting the evolution of our role, so [01:08:36 – inaudible] has prioritized a capacity building initiative.

So last year, we had the honor to host APriGF in Taipei. So we are really pleased to see strong engagement. So we see more than 1,000 participants joining both in person and online, and we're representing 63 countries, mainly from Asia, and also we have up to 57 sessions. And several use focus capacity building program also held in parallel ranging from one to three days. And we also see major private sector players, including Google and LINE, really actively participate and share insight with the community.

In our view, I think it is the particularly notable development at this API GIF actually is the organization of nine side events by the prominent NGOs and human rights organizations. We see groups like AccessNow, the Global Digital Inclusion Partnership, the Engagement Media, the Freedom Online Coalition, and Stanford Delivery and Democracy Lab, they also host a half-day or four-day event during or before the forum. I think this gathering attracted

many new participants, not typically involved in all the Internet governance.

So it demonstrated growing interest in how Internet governance can be integrated into broader advocacy and practice. And this diversity of participants also enriched the forum and offered a really significant value to technical community by broadening all the dialogues. So we believe this experience demonstrates the great potential of regional internet governance forums. Next slide, please. And we also...

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Apologies, Jo-Fan. While we go to the next slide, could you please speak a little bit slower for the interpreters?

JO-FAN YU

Okay, sure. Okay. Yeah, we also see that such forum can serve not only as a platform for dialogue, but actually acts as a bridge to translating global internet governance principle into regionally relevant actions and also amplifying the local voices on the global stage. Next slide, please. Okay, beyond our original efforts, we also support and sometimes lead initiatives at the national level.

So this year marks the sixth edition of our engagement forum and the 10th anniversary of TWIGF. Every year, these events bring together stakeholders. We are familiar with government, civil society, academia, private sector, and technology community. So the topic in recent years, we also include like a popular, now a lot

of people mentioned, AI governance and resilience, but we also start to talk more about the sustainability, not only the digital infrastructure, but also the whole the governance issue.

So we see these forums not only a platform for capacity building and also digital literacy, but we also see that it's a space where the diverse local stakeholders can explore, how the multi-stakeholder approaches can be meaningfully implemented in like Taiwan in our context. So back to our role, and we see that ccTLD like TW, actually, we want to play a neutral role to convene and coordinate and the labeling everything.

We do not speak on behalf of a stakeholder, but rather we want to create space for them to speak for themselves. And we think it's also central to what WSIS action online C1 is about. Next slide, please. As we all know that governments are showing increasing interest and concerns in the internet space. As we saw that all the discussion related to the WSIS+20 discussion from last year. So, I think it's to demonstrate that the multi-stakeholder approach, I mean locally, is both workable and effective.

We believe it's essential to establish the concrete example and framework so that we start to partner with government agencies. Now it's more than 10 government agencies and law enforcement, so we develop some voluntary framework to address DNS abuse and harmful content, but we still want to keep spirit of multi-stakeholder. On the private sector side, we also collaborate with ISPs and not the traditional registry, registrar industry. We

collaborate with ISP and also platform providers on various voluntary initiative.

And then also we want to actively promote, maybe some of you might be aware, the trustee notifier framework at the local, regional, and even the global levels. I think this model enables the civil society and security professionals and technical experts to work together to share information and to ensure the transparency and accountability. In addition to all this partnership, we also think is important to support a local initiative about multi-stakeholder approach.

So last year, we actively support the local initiative to see how the multi-stakeholder approach, this mechanism can be implemented in practice and ensure that they are both effective, efficient to shape digital policies. So in our view that this framework is not just reactive measures, but it represents a government model where ccTLD can act as a driver for the multi-state holder governance and also act as facilitators for the inclusive and practical solutions. Next slide, please.

And of course, we see the real challenges, funding. So we have really seen a lot of discussion of the funding and the sustainability. Especially I think now is for the regional internet governance, I think funding is a really big challenge for most of us. Another one is the fragmentation. So we see a lot of discussion across forums and also regions, but there's no single space where the older

conversations can connect meaningfully. And we also see the limited policy uptake.

Discussion from all these forums, sometimes it's not so well integrated into the local policy and regulatory framework. Stakeholder challenge. We see, still we're missing some important stakeholders, something like the indigenous people. We don't see that in our forum. And we also still see the persistent power imbalance in the digital policy discussion. We still see the government and also large industry players, they dominate the discussion.

So, for all these challenges, I think, but in our view, we don't think it's diminishing the importance of ccTLD's but other countries i think they underscore the need for ccTLD to play a more active role to contribute to the digital governance and also capacity buildings. Next slide, please. Thank you. So looking forward, the WSIS+ i think it is a not just a moment for us to reflect. We actually think it's a really good opportunity to reposition ccTLD. So we are not only the operator of digital infrastructure, but we are also the trusted local connectors between the global norms and the local community needs.

So we are also for the drivers, for the multi-stakeholder and the facilitator for the more inclusion, trust, and resilience. So WSIS+, in our view, offers a really unique and a good opportunity to reconsider our positions, to recognize our unique position at the interaction of infrastructure policy, and more importantly, local

accountabilities. I understand most of us have really done a lot of contribution to the WSIS action line.

So we believe that together we can help to build the Internet to serve all the communities everywhere. Thank you for all your attention. As usual, we look forward to the continued collaboration of you and also other stakeholders for more inclusive and trusted and locally empowered digital future. Thank you.

MARTA MOREIRA DIAS

I will try to say correctly, che che.

JO-FAN YU

Yes, good.

MARTA MOREIRA DIAS

So a very interesting and informative presentation. We still have a minute, but a minute for a question and an answer. Is anyone from the floor? If not... yes. So go ahead. I'm sorry. Can you be as fast as possible? Thank you so much.

DESIREE MILOŠEVIĆ

Hi, this is Desiree, the GNSO liaison to the ccNSO. So I really liked all the presentation and what the last speaker said really resonates well as the ccTLD is taking this leadership role. So it is something that we'll take back and discuss. So just a big thank you.

MARTA MOREIRA DIAS

Thank you so much. So thank you for all the speakers for the valuable insights and I'm sure that in the room we do have similar stories to tell. So we need to move shortly. Next slide, please. We do have a final challenge for you guys, so again we want to hear from you. Prepare your phones because we do have here a scenario, we prepared the scenario with a related question So if we can go through it, please.

Next slide. Next slide, please. Thank you so much. So the title is A Divided IGF Panel. Just imagine that you are representing your ccTLD at the national IGF. During a panel discussion on digital sovereignty, government representatives strongly advocate for tighter regulations, while civil society groups push for more open internet policies. The conversation is becoming tense and stakeholders are looking to you for a balanced perspective.

So, ccTLD is in the delicate position, I would say. The question is, how would you handle this while keeping your ccTLDs neutral with its technical role, how do you encourage dialogue? So two minutes to write your answers. Thank you. And we do have to accelerate this, so one minute. It's good? Two minutes again.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER

But you can type in your own language.

MARTA MOREIRA DIAS

Of course you can. Add Portuguese to that. We had already a provocative answer, vote the government out, appeal for shared

goals, so consensus. My ccTLD cannot be neutral. Come on. Underline importance of private public partnership. Yeah, issues that are being concerned. Balanced approach, yeah. Let the local jurisdiction handle.

Try to compromise the pros and minimize the cons to both parties. Well, I think that we have here very good input. We all want the same, of course, a safe and reliable internet. That's a good conclusion. Are we done? Thank you so much. Very, very interesting participation. If I can resume this, I believe that we all agree that we have legitimate concerns on both sides and we should reaffirm somehow our role as the ccTLD operator and we should encourage dialogue and try to bridge gaps, ask for consensus if that is possible.

And of course, in the end of the day, we all want the same thing. We want an open, secure and inclusive internet. So thank you so much for your participation. It was very, very interesting to collect your feedback on this. In fact, we had a second scenario, but I think we don't have time for that. I don't know if someone wants to comment on the results of this scenario, someone from our panelists or someone from the floor. So if not, we... Ah, go ahead. Thank you.

MOLEHE WESI

Molehe Wesi for the record. I think good scenario, but neutrality depends on the type of ccTLD manager you are. If you are from a civil society perspective for most of your members, then of course,

you're obliged to be neutral. If you are a member of the state, you are not obliged to be neutral. Thank you.

MARTA MOREIRA DIAS

Thank you for your comment. It's very important to raise that. In fact, we do have different models of governance, and we should take that in consideration, of course. Thank you so much. So I believe that we need to wrap up our session. I would like, again, to thank all the presenters for the amazing presentations, and all of you for such an active participation.

So I took here some notes just to wrap up the session. In our session, we explore a dual perspective, looking back over the past 20 years of Internet governance and looking ahead to the journey still to come. To the questions, what is the most positive change in the internet governance over the last two decades? Answers like improvement of the multi-stakeholder model and collaboration standing out.

About the future of the internet, we had message of both hope and caution. The road ahead is ours to shape through a continued collaboration and a shared commitment to a free, inclusive, open, secure, resilient and human-centric internet, grounded, of course, in the multi-cycle approach to internet governance.

So I end up daring to quote Sally Wentworth, she's the ISOC CEO, as you all know, and yesterday during the WSIS session, she told this statement, which I believe it's very good to apply here, "We are

champions of the internet of the future.” So, again, thank you so much and enjoy the rest of the session, and thank you for coming. I’m sorry, before you leave, please take a moment to write the session. Yeah, sure. I’m sorry.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

I’m just tagging this on the end here. I’m sure you’ll probably hear about this elsewhere, but for those of you interested in the IGF and WSIS, there’s a report that was published this morning by ICANN and ISOC called Footprints of 20 Years of the Internet Governance Forum. And so it looks at the impact that the IGF has had in very practical ways. So if you’re talking to your governments or any other stakeholders, it might be a really useful resource.

MARTA MOREIRA DIAS

Thank you so much. Thank you. Have a great session.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]