
ICANN84 | AGM – ccNSO: Internet Governance Liaison Committee Session
Saturday, October 25, 2025 – 13:15 to 14:30 IST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Hello and welcome to the ccNSO Internet Governance Liaison Committee. My name is Claudia Ruiz and I, along with Joke Braeken, are the participation managers for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participation Code of Conduct, the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute their Zoom microphone. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphones disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. Thank you, and with that, I will now hand the floor over to Annaliese Williams, Chair of the IGLC. 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.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you, everyone. Thanks for joining us. This is a meeting of the Internet Governance Liaison Committee, a ccNSO committee of members who are interested in internet governance issues, including processes that take place outside of ICANN. So, for those who've been here, joined our sessions in the past, normally at the last meeting of the year, this committee would be looking at the heat mapping exercise that we do annually to track the internet governance issues that are happening nationally and regionally and help us inform our forward work plan. But the committee decided earlier this year that with our focus on the WSIS+20 review, that we would hold off discussion of our further work plan until after the end of this year when we know the results of the WSIS review.

So, we do have on today's agenda, we have so we'll be having a look at the WSIS+20 review and the current state of play and what the next steps are. But there's also quite a few-- Come in and have a seat. Thanks, Veni. You certainly are in the right space. Not at all. So, we're just getting started. So, we'll be having a bit of a look of some of the other ICANN processes that this committee members of this committee might be following or might be interested in following and considering as part of our issues and analysis and assessment.

So, we are joined today by ICANN's government engagement team who will be giving us a bit of an overview of what's on from ICANN's perspective and the government engagement team's perspective.

But I think we also have some other external speakers joining us remotely.

Do we have Vint Cerf on the line? Not yet. But we are expecting Vint as well today. So, we may need to be a little bit flexible in who is speaking and when. But it will be a fairly informal sharing of ideas and sharing of information just to sort of help us take stock of where we are and where this committee might like to direct its attention in the future.

We are also joined today by I think we might go to Ambassador Karklins first. We are joined by Janis Karklins who has recently joined ICANN. So, we might just invite you to say a few words, introduce yourself.

JANIS KARKLINS

Yeah, thank you. Thank you very much. So, Janis Karklins, Head of Government Engagement. It's my fifth day in the office. Please bear with me. Though it is for me it's a return to the crime scene. I've been involved in ICANN in early 2000s. I was at one point chairing the Government Advisory Committee. It was 2007, 2010. And afterwards, I was also facilitating conversation of the second phase of the EPDP on data registration. That was back in 1921.

So, I am 33 years. I was in the Latvian Diplomatic Service, mostly focused on multilateral diplomacy. Have been Latvian Permanent Representative to UN in Geneva on two tours, 2000, 2007, and 2015, 2020. During the first tour, I was lucky and honored to be chair of

the Preparatory Committee of the World Summit on Information Society, so-called Tunis phase where internet governance issues were discussed. And that probably determined in certain sense my further diplomatic career and focus on technology diplomacy.

So, my last posting in Latvian Foreign Ministry was ambassador in charge of cyber security and climate diplomacy, since ICANN recruited me. So, as you may understand, WSIS is my, I would say, baby, if I may say. But, since from ICANN org side, Veni was or is following WSIS events running up to the review conference in mid-December. Maybe that would be time now for Veni to tell us where we are and what is on the table and what is not.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thanks, Janis. So, thank you guys for inviting us. I'm sorry we are late, but our calendar invite is actually an hour later. It was at 2:15. So, not sure what, maybe the time zone screwed up. But I'll be very brief because most of you probably have seen the WSIS+20 draft document, which was published late August. We distributed it through the ICANN WSIS mailing list. And there were also comments sent by a number of stakeholders, member states, technical community, ICANN include it, civil society, academia. This is all published on the UN-DESA WSIS+20 website. If you haven't seen those, please take a look.

There are, I think 18 member states have sent comments. I would urge you to look at the G77, which are probably the biggest comments, the US, the European Union, but also Russia, Iran, you

know, a couple of other countries. But if you don't have time, obviously, between today and tomorrow is too little time. On Monday, our usual geopolitical session is actually dedicated to the WSIS+20. We'll have the co-facilitator from Kenya, Ambassador Lokaale, and representatives from the Albanian co-facilitator. She couldn't make it because she had a competing event that she needs to attend.

And we'll have UN-DESA representatives here. So that session, which is an hour and 15 minutes immediately after the opening in the plenary hall, is the place where you can tell the co-facilitators what are your observations from the zero draft, but maybe also what are the observations from the contributions submitted by other stakeholders. That's a unique opportunity. They've never done it during the WSIS+10 negotiations. They never came to ICANN back then. I mean, ICANN was going through the IANA transition. So that's a very different phase.

You may see in the G77, I believe, you may see that there are proposals talking about unique identifiers and DNS abuse. So that may be near and dear to your hearts. You may see also that there are member states who have scratched the text about the warning against fragmented internet architecture or internationalized domain names.

Again, you can see that. However, just again, based on what's happening there to give you a friendly warning is that you cannot really ask the co-facilitators what they think about member states'

contributions or other stakeholders, because that's not their role. And they will probably, if you ask a question, what you think about country X, they'll say, well, you should ask country X. So just again, don't waste time to try to engage them in such a conversation. But do tell them what you think about some of those contributions, because they have to hear the voice of our community.

So last week, Wednesday, there was a webcast. It's on the UN Web TV, public statements by member states about the zero draft. And then Thursday, Friday, Monday, and Tuesday, there were supposed to be four days of intergovernmental negotiations behind closed doors. The good news is at least three countries have allowed experts on their delegations. So Australia, Canada, and Bulgaria had people from the community, actually people who you know. And the negotiations went on Thursday and Friday, member states were presenting their proposals, which you see online. So it wasn't anything different. But then on Monday morning, there was a short session and then with some questions, guiding questions by the co-facilitators.

And then several member states and regional groups came back to them in the break, in the coffee break, and asked them to postpone the meeting. So this is where we are now. There was no negotiations on Monday and Tuesday this week. And that's something probably the co-facilitators can explain on Monday, what's next. What we heard from them was that they are planning

to have next, the following week, sorry, we are still here, but the following week to open another round of informal negotiations.

And then there is an, in their calendar, November 20th, 21st is another round of informal consultations. And between that, between ICANN84 and November 20th, they're planning to publish revision one of the zero draft. And then they will have a few days again, we have to be very fast in reacting and sending comments because the revision one will be based on the contributions that were received in between. And then I guess, we will ask them on Monday actually, but my guess is that they will publish a revision to sometime beginning of December. And that should be probably again, based on the WSIS+10 negotiations. It could be discussed in the last days before the high level meeting on December 16, 17.

Now, if any of you want to go to the high level meeting on December 16, 17 in New York, there is a process. It's on the webpage of WSIS+20. There are links, how people can participate in person. I'm hopeful that some of your members might decide to go or might be able to go because it's one thing to decide, it's a different whether you have the funding. We are planning to go, we'll see how it develops. Obviously it depends also, at the end of the day, whether there will be an agreement, because if there is no agreement, that would be a very difficult high level session in December. In WSIS+10, we were negotiating all the way like until Saturday early morning and the meeting started on Monday and I think you were there actually.

So that's in a nutshell. All the documents are published. Co-facilitators are here on Monday. I know some of you will meet them in bilateral. We don't keep their calendar, but we have allocated a room for them, which is on that level. It's boardroom 2, which is basically at the end of that, of the main hallway immediately next to the elevators before you start walking in the hallway. And it can fit, I believe now 12 people.

So those of you who meet with them, feel free to talk to them. They're very open, both Kenya and Albania are open. UNDESA as the secretariat are very good in publishing everything. Those of you who have followed the Global Digital Compact will see what a big difference in the approaches. Talk to them as much as you want and tell them whatever you want, because we are obviously talking to them, but these are different perspectives and it's good for them to hear national ccTLDs, but also any other stakeholders when you meet with other stakeholders, please talk to them to make sure that they also approach the co-facilitators and either have meetings with them or be able to talk in the hallways.

Any questions, any comments, if you want to add something?

JANIS KARKLINS

Maybe one more thing is when after the meeting with co-facilitators where you probably would want to explain them issues that you think are not properly reflected in the Zero Draft or in comments, explaining them the dangers and things, please also talk to your national representatives at home and explain them and

ask them to be actively engaged, involved in the process, because ultimately, of course, there will be about 20 delegations negotiating the final text. We will see modalities. Probably they will tell us whether facilitators will hold the pen all the time or they will put the text on the screen and negotiate in the room. We don't know, but we will hear that from them.

Nevertheless, if you feel that there is an issue that you have identified, please talk to your national governments and representatives who will be in the room and negotiating the text, because they are the ones who will be able then to influence, at least to try to influence the outcome.

DAVID MCAULEY

Thank you. Thank you both for those comments. My name is David McCauley with Verisign, a member of the IGLC. Two-part question, Veni. You mentioned that the Monday-Tuesday session was postponed. When the countries came back and requested a postponement, did they state a reason, are you aware of?

VENI MARKOVSKI

It was a formal reason, which is they needed more time to look into the questions and the comments, because some of them were received the day before, so that was the official reason.

DAVID MCAULEY

And then I have another part to the question, but before, I just want to thank you for the information that's been coming out. I think

under the links to the country presentation, member state presentations, I think was under an email from Alexei, but it's all appreciated. So the other part of the question is you mentioned the potential for no agreement by December. So my question is, as issues are negotiated, if there is a subset of issues that are agreed and another subset that are reserved as not agreed, would there be an agreement on those things that have been agreed? Is that a potential outcome with other things being left for the future? Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS

The good thing is that in the UN, there are only two outcomes of the meetings, whether they are successful or they are very successful. Failure is never acknowledged, so that means that there will be some kind of agreement. What that will be, today it's hard to say. Hopefully, it will be a very successful agreement, consensus, where everyone will sign up. I think that at the end, all the conversations will boil down to three, four topics of importance. All others will say, okay, these are more or less agreed, but then negotiations will be around three, four topics.

What they might be, probably one will be IGF and the shape, but this is my personal guess. Another might be around enhanced cooperation. Then the third might be something about capacity building, because that is very much on the minds of G77 and so on. When it comes to enhanced cooperation, then, of course, that will be about the role of governments in the internet governance

negotiations and decision-making process. Maybe it's something else, but I would guess that these are three topics that may be in the endgame.

VENI MARKOVSKI

I just remembered something, David, to add to Janis's words. Not only talk to your national governments, but also talk to the GAC members who are here from those countries, because they will hear you, you speak the same language, you know each other, so they can also talk to the foreign ministry. That's one key. The second thing is, also, if you hear anything or if you have any concerns, do let us know, GE, because we are staying in constant touch.

We have people in New York, we are following this closely, but also we could talk to them directly and we can convey your messages in case you don't have. I remember the letter from the ccNSO about the relations between ccTLDs and governments are not extremely good in all jurisdictions, but we may be able to actually talk to the member states in New York or in the capital, so that might be helpful. But we need to know what are the issues that you have located.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you. Any other questions? Was there a hand? No. Thank you very much for that, and apologies for the mix-up. Thank you for making the time to join us anyway. We do have another session

as part of the ccNSO members meeting on Tuesday that you are both very welcome to attend. We have the Kenyan ambassador will be joining us as part of that session, and we have some sort of ccNSO members as well speaking.

VENI MARKOVSKI

May I ask you to send us a calendar invite, just in case, because it may coincide with something else, but if it doesn't, let me know.

JANIS KARKLINS

One of us will be here.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you, and thanks, Veni. So, there has been a little mix-up with scheduling, so we will be flexible and move on. I did want to just sort of, before we move off the WSIS+20 conversation, I did want to sort of invite any reflections from any members who have been following it closely or participating, and also an invitation to any of our members.

I do see some of our members sitting in the back seats. You are very welcome to come and join us at the table. But, yeah, any reflections or anything that any members wanted to share on the WSIS+20 process so far? I see that there were some written submissions from members of this committee. I'm not sure whether anybody wants to share more broadly or share their

thoughts on the WSIS+20. No? Did you want to say? Yeah, go ahead. Thank you.

JODI ANDERSON

Just to point out, because Anneliese has invited us to do so, that the TCCM, which has, I think, a number of members here, we did put in a written input to the zero draft, and if you're interested in having a look at that, you can find it on the TCCM website, which is tccm.global, and you can go and click on our work and click on that. It's in a sort of a matrix, focuses obviously on the internet governance provisions of the zero draft.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Jodie. That was Jodie from InternetNZ speaking. We also have in the room with us today, we have Amrita, who is a member of the multi-stakeholder sounding board, that's advising the co-facilitators on the WSIS process. Amrita, I just wondered if you wanted to share any observations or any thoughts with us?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Thank you, Annaliese, for this. Amrita, for the record. The sounding board at this point of time, during the stakeholder discussions as well as, you know-- while we were not in the room and the governments were discussing, we had one of our members who went in as a delegate of a country as an observer to see what was being discussed.

So we took notes about, from all the sessions which we were, where stakeholders were speaking and what our next work would be is trying to look at the tricky issues and perhaps suggesting text which could be a suggested text for the tricky issues, depending upon what the community has been saying. So that's what we plan to work.

We have a meeting of the IMSB here. It was a closed working meeting, but many from the from the community have asked for an open meeting, but I think what we last hear is the room is very small, so they are trying to open it online. We don't know what would happen to that, but we are trying to work on this. And please feel free to share with us your comments or suggestions on text, because I think now when the negotiations have started, I would say, to some extent, suggested text would be very welcome, rather than say what, what are the texts you really want to see, what you would want modification. There are only two things that can be suggested, based upon the comments which have come in also. What is visible? We don't know what is invisible and is going to come up, but that's what we are.

We met a couple of community members who came and spoke to us online, of course, on what they feel needs to be there in the text, what should not be there, etc. And we are also supposed to set up a rotating office where people can come and speak. We are still working on those and that would be informed in some days. But yeah, in case this group wants to share anything, please feel free. Of course, we have members who are in the TCCM also there, but

feel free to share the language text, I would say, at this point. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Amrita. And so I believe we are expecting a sort of first revised draft document. Any indication about what might be in that or the shape of that? Sort of had a look at the contributions from the written submissions. There's only a handful of member states, maybe 15 or so that put some in, but there were other stakeholder contributions to that. Just do you have any insight into how it's shaping up?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Unfortunately, we are not privy to the dark box, I would say. Even when the zero draft came out, we were, we saw it at the same time when you all saw it. You know, the whole entire universe saw it. So that's how it is. We wanted, a few of the IMSB members wanted to be at the calls when the governments were negotiating, just as observers, so that at least we know what's happening and we can, but unfortunately, that's not happened. Let's see how it goes. But I don't think we'll see the draft before time. We would be trying to raise the tricky issues and give some suggested text. So that's where we would be working on the tricky issues part. You know, enhanced cooperation. The ones which were said are tricky issues any day.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you. Any other questions for Amrita? Thank you. And of course, you are also welcome to join our Tuesday session. I think it's at 1:15. If you are available and wanted to come and listen to that session, you would be very welcome as well.

So I also wanted to make a bit of space for us to discuss some of the other things that are happening related to internet governance around ICANN. There's quite a bit happening sort of currently or very recently. We've got the review of reviews work that has kicked off and there'll be a plenary session on that on Monday. So just wanted to make sure everybody is aware of that. The review of reviews is really just about making sure that ICANN's review processes are fit for purpose and enhance ICANN's accountability and transparency, etc.

There is a long history of discussions on ICANN reviews. I think there's a general consensus that the review processes need to be streamlined. So a cross-community group has been established with two representatives from each SO/AC on that. For the ccNSO, the representatives are Chris Disspain and myself. So there will also be a ccNSO session on that on Tuesday at 3pm, I think. So just to make sure that you are all aware of that and come along and participate and share your views with us.

But there are also some other things that have been happening. And I'm not sure whether there's the ICP-2 review and the root server governance review that has been happening. And I know we do have some members that have been following that closely or

even participating in those things. I just wondered whether anybody wanted to sort of share anything on those or update us on the status of those discussions. Peter, did you want to share anything? And don't feel like you have to. This is just, it's work that I think is interesting to members of this committee and we haven't really sort of had any discussion amongst ourselves of what's happening and why.

PETER KOCH

Sure, by making the light red, I raised my hand. Thanks, Annaliese. Yeah, anybody else who is involved or has been following is invited to chime in. Yes, this is two things at the same time, and I have parallelized them to or put them in parallel to what we did with the policy gap analysis work and maybe more importantly in the ccNSO's history, the framework on the framework of interpretation.

I am one of two appointees of the ccNSO to the RSSGWG, which is the Root Server System Governance Working Group. There's also the RSSAC, which is the RSSAC, the Root Server System Advisory Committee, and that is a committee that has been in existing, I guess, since the beginning of ICANN. And this governance working group has been conducted by the Board a couple of years ago, has undergone a restart because some issues. And they shouldn't be confused but they work on the same, generally on the same topic, the Root Server System.

The advisory committee advises the Board. And we'll have details on that in another session and I believe Joke or Bart can help me, that's on Wednesday, the session between the ccNSO and RSSAC? Yeah, on Wednesday.

So to put that in context, RSSAC is more dealing with a technical side and strategical technical side, but this Root Server System Governance Working Group was tasked with, actually with a meta task, to come up with a proposal for a governance structure for the root server system, which mostly includes the root servers but anything around it. There is a root zone maintenance function, there's also, of course, IANA involved in working with things, but this is about the governance of the root servers, the publishing side for the root zone, so to speak.

There are a couple of, more or less, potential questions. The current number and the composition of the root server operators is rather stable and has been so over, I believe, more than two decades when the later additions came in, like when WIDE in Japan and the RIPE NCC, for example, in Europe started running root servers. But there are some questions similar to what the delegation and re-delegation working group, I guess was the name in the ccNSO was faced with, which is what would happen if a root server operator would seize operations for whatever reason? Why is it, not why is it, but would it make sense for other reasons to change the number of root server operators? And, of course,

getting out of business, it could be an emergency takeover or things like that.

The governance working group is not supposed to deal with these questions, but to set up a structure, and we delivered a preliminary report, I believe in September, with a very long public comment period. There were a couple of comments received, including a comment made by the council on behalf of the ccNSO. The group is currently digesting the comments and looking into those and considering whether or how to amend the report. And, yeah, after that we'll publish the final report and deliver it to the Board of directors of ICANN. And then, as with ccNSO policy, the board of directors will have to have their own considerations and deliberations and design and decide about next step.

Not going into too much detail, because we'll probably have time for that on Wednesday, the current suggestion is, the proposal is, to have a committee that is composed of root server operators, that's 12, and equaled in numbers by six coming from the ccTLDs and six coming from the gTLDs, so that there is a, I think, yeah, balance of power is probably a bit strong of a stance on that, but the numbers should be equal and so on and so forth. And there should be a bootstrapping phase where these functions, we call it functions, that deal with these particular questions will be brought into place and will shape their own fate in ways of how they work, their self-governance, so that's the bootstrapping thing.

Yeah, and let's see what questions there are and what the community thinks about that, and how that goes forward. The important questions are, of course, these succession and so on and so forth. And if there are any questions or additions or remarks for that, otherwise I can jump in on the next one, but I'm not directly involved in those and I prefer somebody else to do that with more insight.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Any questions for Peter? Doesn't look like it, Peter. Did you want to just briefly, and you don't have to, I just sort of feel like as we are preparing to do our heat mapping exercise that having the broader context of what's happening within ICANN you know, it's just further helps shape our thinking of how things fit together.

PETER KOCH

Yeah, happy to inject, but just don't want to occupy too much airtime. There are even more parallels. You know that there is five RIRs in the world in the different, meanwhile, ICANN regions, and there is a document called ICP-2. Now, ccTLDs and the ccNSO in particular have an interesting relation to that ICP document stream, but for the RIRs it has been the founding document or the foundational document ever since, and it also hasn't been touched since its invention.

And you might have followed the or heard about developments in on the African continent, which eventually have come to a more

positive situation in recent weeks, but questions came up again about what happens if one of those registries in regional internet registries wouldn't either cease operation because they don't want to pursue it or there are other issues. And how would the interaction work, what if there would be proposals in a particular, in some region to open up a new RIR? And mind you all these discussions back then in the early 2000s were inspired by the ITU wanting to say help with the assignment of especially IPv6 addresses. Long story short, again it is about recognition and de-recognition.

Same thing, the public comment period for that is I believe open until 7 November, that is the end of the week after next week. It also has undergone a first draft shared with the community. The drafting of the document is done by the ASO Council, which is three people from all the regions, brackets, there are now people from Africa joining. They couldn't before because the AFRINIC wasn't able to appoint people. That has changed luckily, so the region that is very much affected by a triggering event for this policy proposal is now actively able to sit at the table and help shape the whole situation.

Again, there are some interesting questions, parallels to what the ccTLDs did with the delegation, re-delegation working group. RIRs are very independent from ICANN in that they have their own communities that do policy development. There are some global policies at the ASO level which rarely occur, but other than that they usually shape their own fate in the region, that should be

familiar to most of us in a way. And the way forward with probably more oversight, and you also have probably seen these strong interventions made by ICANN, the organization, the CEO in particular towards Mauritian government, so that is probably also interesting to look into from the ccNSO perspective.

And maybe one final word, and word means sentence, given that there's lots of geopolitics involved of course in this, it would be nice if we could do all of this with just technical reasons and technical reasoning, but then there comes reality. Given that this is internet governance in action, the success and the outcome are probably important, crucial, whatever, or at least informative, when it comes to judging the current internet governance models, aka WSIS+20. That's all converging in a very interesting way, and I mean that in a British interpretation, that this converges around November, December.

I hope I didn't confuse people, talk to me in the hallway. There are lots of other people, the ASO people, lots of them are here if you want direct insight into what happens with ICP-2. I'm just watching it from a side, so they can have much more insight and detail to share. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks very much for that, Peter, and thanks for jumping in, sorry to put you on the spot like that. I just think, as a committee, we've given a lot of consideration to the WSIS+20 process. Member states will be meeting to decide whatever they decide this year. And I

think it is really important, as the multi-stakeholder system continues to evolve and adapt, that we are working to strengthen these processes ourselves as the multi-stakeholder community, rather than waiting for external forces to make things happen.

So, I just thought it was interesting to have a moment to reflect on that, and think about how those discussions might fit in. I'm sure that some of our members are following these issues and having positions on them internally, and we just want to make a bit of a space to acknowledge that these are happening, and as we think about our work program, thinking about things that are happening in ICANN, as well as things that are happening outside of ICANN.

Any other questions for Peter? I am not seeing any. So, yes, I understand that Vint Cerf has now joined the call. So, Vint, apologies for the confusion with the invitation to this meeting, and thank you for your flexibility in joining us at this stage. Just to bring you up to speed of where we are and what we have discussed, we've had an update from the ICANN government engagement team on the WSIS+20 review process. And we've had some discussion about some of the ICANN processes that are taking place, including the review of reviews and the review of the root server governance consultation that's open.

And we've also heard from Amrita, who is one of the representatives on the WSIS multi-stakeholder sounding board. But I will hand over the floor to you now to share your perspectives

from the IGF leadership panel on any of those issues or anything else that you would like to discuss with our members. Thank you.

VINT CERF

Well, thank you all very much for your patience. I think somehow I thought that this meeting started later, and so I thought I was arriving early, and I've obviously arrived late, so I apologize for that. My purpose today actually is to pick your pockets. I'm here representing the leadership panel, and among the responsibilities that we have is to try to support the IGF secretariat. As some of you might know, this is not a free operation. There is cost associated with running the secretariat, and for the most part, the funding for this is voluntary.

I have a slide deck, but I think I'm not going to bother you with it. If the staff will make it available to you, you'll see a report for the year 2025, and you'll see that the approximate funding available to the secretariat was on the order of 2.4 million or so. It turns out that to run this ship, they need at least 3 million a year, and they don't get a very reliable 3 million at all. In fact, they'd never gotten \$3 million. So it varies from year to year. There is a component of their funding that comes from the host hosting company or hosting country, but the bulk of their income is from voluntary contributions of various sources.

Just for the sake of discussion, I've tried to put in through Google about a half a million this past year, but I am approaching you with the thought that the ccTLDs might also contribute. Interestingly

enough, the ccTLDs are a very critical part of the entire internet operation. I don't need to tell you that. And in fact, we just saw recently how critical DNS is, as you probably saw one of Amazon's problems with DNS resolution. It was a dynamic system that has nothing to do with funding the IGF Secretariat, but it does put in place how critical the domain name system is to literally everything we do. And that means you're very critical as well.

So what I'd like to suggest is something that Lisa Foer, who now runs Jayant, whom I'm sure many of you know, had suggested and successfully completed several years ago, a contribution from the ccTLD operators. It was a multi-year, three-year contribution. The three-year commitment was very helpful. And the reason for that is that the IGF Secretariat can do nothing unless it actually has funds in its account. They're not allowed to spend money they don't have or that they anticipate.

So I have been attempting with my leadership panel hat on to encourage some contributions from the many parties that benefit from IGF Secretariat work. The reason I want to tie this together with the ccTLD operation and to you is that the Secretariat also supports the national and regional IGF activities. And some of you probably are aware that that is not something that was organized around the World Summit on the Information Society. The international IGF certainly was born from that. But what happened is that the national and regional IGFs simply sprung up voluntarily out of interest and concern for the governance of the internet.

So the NRIs are important to you as well, I believe, and the reason for that is that they're closest to ccTLD operation, and they are persistently observing how well the internet is running. And they're raising issues of importance to internet governance as seen from their national and regional perspectives. And so I believe that the NRIs are as important, if not more important, than the annual IGF since they have local focus on how well or how poorly internet is serving the populations that they represent.

So my proposition is pretty simple. If the ccTLDs would consider modest contributions over a course of several years, and here I'm thinking \$10,000 per ccTLD, when the numbers add up to the numbers of ccTLDs that there are, they become substantial, as I'm sure every one of you can calculate. So I'm here just to pitch the idea that the ccTLD operators might make modest contributions on a regular basis to the support of the IGF Secretariat on the presumption that WSIS continues and the IGF continues. Even if it doesn't continue for some reason, then I think we should seriously consider the possibility of supporting NRIs by creating our own Secretariat and persisting in focusing on internet governance, even in the absence of a WSIS and IGF basis.

That's still to be seen. I will be in New York in December. I will be there during the high-level meetings. I hope to have a moment or two to address the assembled member states and to persuade them that IGF is something that needs to continue. But I'm just suggesting that you might also contribute to the success of the IGF by making a commitment of a modest amount over the course of

the next several years. I will do my best to support the operation as well from Google, and of course I understand we have capacity that most of the ccTLDs do not. But I want to do our part as well.

So that's my little pitch. I do want to thank you, A, for listening, and second, for what you're doing. I think that while the internet is abused, and we see this in the headlines everywhere, there is also a phenomenal value in keeping the system going and in maintaining the connectivity that it represents. The fragmentation of the system deteriorates its utility in very dramatic ways. And so thanks to you, we are keeping the system together. But this is not a trivial exercise. It's something that takes real energy. And I appreciate very much your roles in making that happen.

So thank you very much for letting me bend your ear on this topic. And if you are so inclined, there is in the chat an indication of how to send a note to the Internet Governance Forum operators to make your funding available. So thank you very much, and I hope that the rest of the ICANN meeting goes well for you. It's another vital milestone in the annual trek to keep the internet running.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you very much for that, Vint. And yes, many ccTLDs are very closely engaged in internet governance discussions in their own countries and are active participants and supporters of their national IGFs. So we do have space on the ccNSO members meeting on Tuesday as well, where you can present your slides. There will be a larger audience of ccTLD members at that meeting

as well. But thank you very much for making the time to join us. And again, my apologies for the confusion with the scheduling. And thank you for your flexibility. Vint, if you were speaking to us, you're on mute.

VINT CERF

That means somebody must have automatically muted me. Sorry about that. What I had said was that if it's permitted, I'm happy to hang around for a bit longer. I understand your meeting continues for a while. But I don't want to invade the meeting inappropriately. So I'll just ask whether I can stay or not.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

You are very welcome to stay. And you probably can't see in the room, but we have quite a few members of the committee who are from ccTLDs. But we also have some observers as well. And so you're very welcome to stay for the rest of the meeting.

VINT CERF

Thank you. I'll hang around and perhaps even intervene if permitted.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you. Before we get to the heat mapping exercise, I did want to just ask whether anybody had any updates, sort of national and regional updates that they wanted to share. I see Declan in the room. You've recently had your first very successful, I hear,

National Internet Governance Forum. Just wanted to invite you to tell us how it went and any highlights that you wanted to share. And congratulations on having one. It's great.

DECLAN MCDERMOTT

Thank you. I was hiding from the back because I was hoping that you wouldn't see me. But yeah, we recently had our inaugural national IGF for Ireland in May. That went very well. It was largely, I think, due to kind of close collaboration we had with our department for communications. They were really supportive of it. They have a whole policy kind of group dedicated to internet governance. So we work with them quite closely. And they were able to kind of bring the idea to a lot of other senior officials in the government.

And we also have quite a large concentration of tech companies as well in Ireland. So we also approach them as well as also a lot of the academics that are kind of based around. And I think that the recurring theme that we had is that we didn't really have to force or kind of argue very hard for people to take part. We just had to explain what it was and everyone immediately saw the benefit of it. So it was a good day.

I think, the main issue that people had was that we tried to cram in too many things into like one day. I think we ended up having something like six panels. But I think that's kind of a good problem to have because it showed that a lot of people wanted to talk about a lot of things. All of the panels were completely full of speakers.

So we will have to just be a little more selective moving forward. But we're already starting to plan for next year's IGF. It was a good day and we're very happy with how it went.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you and congratulations.

RUSSELL DEKA HARADA

Hello, my name is Russell Deka Harada. I'm a ccTLD manager of .bg and also ICANN84 fellow. And I want to share my experience about Pacific IGF. We had Pacific IGF at Samoa National University, National University of Samoa, NUS in July. And some Pacific, let's say, not 14 all Pacific Islanders, but most Pacific Island countries joined this Pacific IGF.

So we have three different sessions. One is APIA forum. Mainly we are focusing this submarine cable infrastructure side. And day two is this Pacific IGF. Mainly discussing cyber security, cyber cheating, treating. As I repeated again, it's a capacity building because most university academics attended this Pacific IGF. And the third day is a Pacific ccTLD managers meeting led by Aouda, our friend from Australia, hosted this event. And we are sharing our issue. And also Aouda proposed us to make a backup, backup our registry system within their server system.

So we are continuous to have this regional IGF. Because as I said, Asia and the Pacific, Asia is too big and too noise. But Pacific is too small and too shy. But I'm the right person, Asia and the Pacific.

And also I think I will become this ccNSO session on Tuesday, session chair. But I can't say too much as a session chair. So it's good to share our experience on this session.

And also we have a very hot topic. Maybe two years' time, October 2027, one of our province, Bougainville, Bougainville province already make a decision to get independent. So they did the referendum almost four or five years back. And nearly 97% people agreed to get independent status from PNG. That means I think we have to consider to apply new ccTLD, not gTLD. But of course I know it takes very long time. And ICANN alone, I think more than 10 years, you don't have any experience to create new ccTLD after South Sudan, maybe .ss. And the Asia-Pacific, maybe last one is East Timor.

So it takes very long time. But on behalf of this Bougainville government, I have to raise this concern to this ICANN84 AGM. And I know it's very sensitive and very difficult, including this capacity building for this new ccTLDs. So I need your support and I need your output. I need your assistance. And also I have to feedback to you. Many small Pacific ccTLDs is still high, but I have to encourage, like our neighbor's country, Solomon Island, I encourage him. He's also ICANN fellow and he need to show the presence to the ccNSO association. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks for sharing that, Russell. Olga, I see your hand up. Go ahead, please.

OLGA CAVALLI

Thank you, Annaliese. This is Olga Cavalli, for the record. I'm an NomCom appointee to the ccNSO. And I would like to share some, this is kind of the NRI's moment in the session. So two activities in Argentina, the regional IGF, the Latin American and Caribbean IGF will be organized in Cordoba, which is a city in the center of Argentina. And the first week of November, four and five, five and six of November, sorry. And the Argentina IGF will be reorganized after some years that we didn't organize it. And it will happen the 1st of December. So very happy at the national level that we are again having the national IGF. And thank you for having me.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Olga. And congratulations on reviving your national IGF. Vint, I understand you wanted to speak to resilience. Go ahead, please.

VINT CERF

Yes, thank you very much. This topic is becoming quite hot, as you might imagine. The resilience of the internet has become central, I think, to its successful operation. There are so many different ways in which the system can be perturbed. Sometimes it's very deliberate. People turn off the underlying capacity to

communicate. Sorry? There appears to be an intervening microphone, but I don't know where it's coming from.

Anyway, the point about resilience is that we need to be more focused than ever on making sure the system stays up and running. There was a reference, Russell, I think, made a comment about looking for help with the ccTLD operation. Let me categorically say that I have staff here at Google who would like very much to be helpful to ccTLDs that need it. So please contact me at vint@google.com if you're looking for assistance with regard to the resilience of DNS operation.

But more generally, the entire system needs to be examined from the standpoint of resilience. The Marconi Society is holding a conference in November, the 9th through the 11th. Or no, I'm sorry. I may be lying to you here. I think it's probably the 11th, 12th, and 13th. Apologies while I have a senior moment. Yes, it actually starts 13 and 14 of November. But the point is it's focused very heavily on the resilience of the internet at all layers. And considering that you're looking at internet governance, that's a very high layer in the internet architecture, but it too is subject to fragmentation. Policies can collide and create an internet that doesn't serve as well.

So I hope all of you will keep in mind that making this system run reliably is increasingly important for literally everyone. So to the extent that you're working in that, thank you. To the extent that

you need any stimulation to do that, please get busy. We need a network that works.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you, Vint. And this committee is shortly about to commence our periodic review of what the priority issues are. And for anyone in the room who's not a member, resilience was identified as one of our priority issues the last time we did the heat mapping exercise. So we just have a few moments left. Joke, if it's okay with you, I might ask you to share. We are going to do our heat mapping exercise or our consideration of the priority issues. We're going to do that remotely this time. Joke, I might invite you to just speak on that for a moment if it's okay.

JOKE BRAEKEN

Absolutely. Thank you, Anneliese. Joke here. So IGLC for the past couple of years has done an exercise which we refer to as the heat mapping exercise. And this was really a brainstorming from an IGLC perspective, but not only. Also other stakeholders are happy to contribute to these discussions.

So what we did is look at the hot topics from an internet governance perspective from a regional perspective. So what are the trending topics when it comes to internet governance in the different regions? Are there commonalities? Are there changes throughout the years? What was a priority once is no longer a priority? Are there new topics coming? So this kind of exercise is

what IGLC is doing. And the input into this brainstorming exercise is useful for IGLC when determining the next steps in its work plan.

So in terms of the methodology for doing this brainstorming, we will have a series of meetings post ICANN84, the IGLC that is. And we'll share the results of those brainstorming exercises also with the ccNSO members mailing lists. The brainstorming will happen during those meetings, but perhaps it is useful to also share some resources for written input so that we have as much input as possible that feeds into the exercise. I don't know if this was helpful, Annaliese?

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you, Joke, that was very helpful. So are there any questions on the heat mapping exercise? We are running out of time, but there are a couple of issues on the program on the agenda that we sort of didn't cover, but I think that will come up in our future discussions and particularly as part of our heat mapping exercise. So beyond the WSIS at the end of this year, there are other sort of multilateral processes that members of this committee do follow. And of course this year we have the World Telecommunication Development Conference that's taking place in November. I'm not sure whether anyone in the room is following that, but we will take those up at a later discussion as well. Vint, I see your hand. Please go ahead.

VINT CERF

I just wanted to know whether the heat mapping result will be made public, because that would be of tremendous utility to all of us.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

I think the previous ones are on our website, but this one will also be made public as well. So we can let you know when it's all complete and when it's published. But the previous versions are on the ccNSO on the IGLC part of the website.

VINT CERF

Thank you. I'll look forward to that.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Is there any other item of business that anybody wanted to raise before we close out this meeting? I don't see any hands. I don't see any online. So our next meeting will be on the 12th of November at 11:00 UTC. So members, we will see you then. And if you're a ccTLD and you're not yet a member of the committee and you're interested in becoming a member of the committee, please feel free to speak to either Joke or myself and we will point you in the direction of next steps.

Thank you, everybody, for joining us. Thank you, Vint, for joining us. And thank you all for your forbearance as we wandered around the agenda today. Thank you all for participating. Meeting is closed.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]