SINGAPORE - CTO Commonwealth GAC Members Meeting
Tuesday, February 10, 2015 – 12:00 to 14:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

RAKESH LUCHMUN: Good afternoon, everyone. Can we start? Are you ready? Can we start please? Members? Can we start please? Members? We start in one minute.

Good afternoon, everyone, we're going to start now. Can you please sit down? Hello? Thank you.

My name is Rakesh Luchmun. I'm from the Commonwealth Telecommunication Organization. I'm the Director of Finance and Administration. On my right I've got Tracy Hackshaw who is a GAC representative of Trinidad and Tobago, and on my left I've got Mark Carvell who is the GAC representative of United Kingdom.

We're here to look at the Commonwealth agenda and we segregated the agenda to all the members last week. I've just put that on the screen there and we just want to see if there's anything any member would like to add on it.

Now shall I take silence as concurrence? Shall we start? I'll just give you a brief outline what CTO is and who we are and what we've been doing. We are one of the oldest organization since 1901, been engaged in multilateral collaboration in the field of ICT and users' experience and expertise to support its members.

What we've been doing? We are a membership organization both of the government, private companies through our sector membership and

EN

civil societies. We have three divisions that we work on in the capacity and development and training, the research and consultancy and event and conferences. Our priority areas are mobile broadband, regulatory environment, skill development and entrepreneurship, youth and ICT, ICT and disability, and cyber security. We're also the coordinator for the Commonwealth coalition.

Now, just a quick look out of what we have been doing in the last couple months. We held the very first ICT Ministers in London in March where we were delegated to represent all the Commonwealth agenda. We also have developed the Commonwealth cyber governance model based on the charter of the Commonwealth. We also have the links there attached for anyone who's interested to know more about it. We also drafted the Commonwealth approach to developing the national cyber security for several countries. Again, the link is attached.

We also very much do a lot of capacity building across the Commonwealth itself and with our members. We have held several workshops, some of them which have been completed – one in Bangladesh, one in Vanuatu, Kenya, and Barbados. We have one planned in Cameroon in two weeks' time and one in Botswana.

We are helping selected countries to develop national cyber security strategies. For those who are interested, please do contact me so that we can talk about it. We're also developing a model of data protection and privacy framework.

Upcoming events for the CTO. We have the Digital Broadcasting Switchover Forum next week in Johannesburg. We have the

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Commonwealth E-Governance Forum in Kigali, Rwanda. We also have Cyber Security Forum on the 22nd and 24th of April in London. We also have the Broadband Forum in Abuja, Nigeria. This might be changed depending on the situation of the election, so we will keep you informed.

We are holding the HR for ICT in Maputo, Mozambique and we're also having our biggest forum which in September in Kenya. We're also having one workshop right now in Caribbean which is hosted by the Antigua government and Professor Tim Unwin is there right now and he sends his apology for not being here.

We're also doing [sub-regional] conference on cyber security in Yaoundé as I said in two weeks' time. And then on capacity building, we are having a workshop on understanding the big picture on the 9th to 13th in London and all members are invited to attend.

Now let's go very quickly on the agenda. Just before we do that, this is a meeting primarily to address matters of which Commonwealth GAC representative might wish to reach agreement, but more principally it produce an opportunity for us to update on work by CTO on the Commonwealth. This is your meeting. We are here to help you to have one voice and we can share that with the GAC and in other meetings. I will now let Tracy – if you can just have [inaudible].

TRACY HACKSHAW: All right. Good afternoon, everyone. These slides are very wordy. I took it from a document so I hope you can see what's happening here.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

The basic update for the CCI with the Commonwealth cyber [inaudible] initiative has been, since our last discussion, I believe you were aware of it being under the jurisdiction of another organization. Since then the Commonwealth Secretariat has taken over the management and Secretariat for it and has made significant work in progressing the initiative forward.

On this slide there's a listing of the proposals that they're taking forward including one on the virtual currencies. There's also public awareness of cybercrime, national cyber security strategies and mutual legal assistance, electronic evidence. I don't have the time to go through all of these but I certainly direct your attention. So those are the areas in which the CCI will be focusing on in the next year or two in addition to its specific engagements with the countries that you're going to see coming up here.

In Ghana, significant progress was made in the Ghana Initiative. A meeting in December from a COMSEC team was done in Ghana and senior officials, the Ministry of Communications and Justice – basically, COMSEC has been looking to work with the Ghana government and the Ministry of Communications to do several initiatives on the CCI front and is proposing to look at the ITU, IWF, ECPAT, and [NCSCEOP] in delivering initial – well some additional look at CCI.

This year funds are provided by the Foreign Commonwealth Office – is that correct team FCO, the Foreign Commonwealth Office?— take a review of the Ghana legislation on cybercrime. Professor Ian Walden, University of London's recruit [could] take this work. The first job there has been received and is now being reviewed by the CCI team.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

I'm going to go quickly through these initiatives here. Virtual currencies roundtable – this is something that has been proposed as a new initiative. As you would see here, it's been recognized by several organizations, global organizations, Interpol, Europol, the FBI and so on, as a potential facilitator of both crime and terrorism. The CCI is looking at this seriously and has proposed to host an event coming up shortly with a number of CCI members to participate, and I cannot give an update as to the location at this point. I have to verify where this event will be happening.

On the cybercrime public sector advocacy, this is another project that has been proposed by the CCI Initiative. And this public sector advocacy initiative, the proposal is to ensure that the governments in particular are aware of cybercrime and what the ramifications and issues are.

The proposal is to seek support from the Foreign Commonwealth Offices later this year, and in the long term they expect this to be permeated throughout all governments to ensure that there's significant awareness within the government sector, in particular on cybercrime.

We can go on to the next one: National Cyber Security Strategies. The Commonwealth is proposing as per the meeting of Commonwealth Law Ministers in 2014 to develop a series of strategies in the Commonwealth regions and it's going to complement the work done by the CTO in this area. So I know that the CTO just spoke on doing some of that work and I won't speak any further on that at this point in time.

Another series of work under the CCI that's being led by COMSEC is mutual legal assistance electronic evidence area. Again, the project is seeking the support of the Foreign Commonwealth Office to deliver a series of frameworks and assistance in this regard. If there's any interest by countries and something along these lines, I would encourage you to send your request in to the CCI Initiative at this point in time. Next slide.

So now I return to the brief updates on each country, very brief. Botswana. The Botswana project is underway. Again, Professor Ian Walden is now taking review of legislation on that country and that mission is imminent and due to begin shortly.

In Dominica, a Needs Assessment was conducted. I see the representative [inaudible] is actually in the room. Maybe you want to give an update on what's happened since. As you can see in this update, it's indicated that after the election in December 2014 there'll be progress as what has happened. Maybe Dominica can give an update a little bit.

[DOMINICA]:   Well, since the election actually, we have completed the Cyber Security. Needs Assessment is now before cabinet for ratification and we have also completed the Cybercrime Strategy which the OAS did in conjunction with the Commonwealth Office. So we have the strategy and the Needs Assessment before cabinet for approval and hopefully within the next quarter we should begin to establish the [C CERT]. So we'll be following up with the COMSEC and the COE (Council of Europe) for capacity building in that area. That's where we are now.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thank you, Dominica. In Trinidad and Tobago, there has been significant work with the CCI. We have done a Needs Assessment. I'm from that country, so I can give a little more background on that. There's been a child protection study undertaken which is being reviewed by the EMC as we speak. And in this particular go around there has been funding for a full legislative review. That's been approved and is about to be conducted in Trinidad and Tobago, details of which are being worked out with the Ministry of National Security in that country.

In India, a significant event was that a presentation was made at a major conference in New Delhi and subsequently our conference, the work of the CCI was praised and it's expected that the government of India and the CCI will do work shortly in this area.

Wrapping up. A major project on child online protection is being pursued by the CCI in conjunction with the U.K. government and there are several initiatives that are currently underway including what I mentioned, Trinidad and Tobago as well as working with other of the Commonwealth countries in this regard. And again, I would encourage each one, each member country to seek assistance from the CCI if this issue is perceived to be one that is important in your country and to make those needs known to us very quickly.

Another major thrust of the CCI is a regional approach that has been adopted. So in the cases of – in Africa in particular, East Africa, what the CCI is trying to do is harmonize utilizing the countries that are already in the program and replicate that initiative throughout the region where

ICANN | 52
Singapore

feasible. That way, they're able to share the knowledge and share the learning that one country or two countries would've gotten from the initiative. So in East Africa, we've already gotten something going based on work done in Uganda. In this way, the government of New Zealand and the Commonwealth Secretariat are exploring to be doing more work with the Pacific Islands in particular.

The final slide will basically tell you what happened in Uganda. The COMSEC team met with representatives of the [Ghanian] – of the [Ugandan] government and sought to implement outcomes from the Needs Assessment. Discussions focus on intentions of Ugandans to seek support from the FCO for implementation and the COMSEC provide that support to the government agency as it made that submission.

The UN [OSC] has continued to progress the recommendation to provide support to the criminal justice sector through training and resource assistance through the East African region and a data submission to the FCO has been submitted for funding to the regional training in East Africa.

In addition, Tanzania has worked with UN [OSC] to complete the Needs Assessment. I understand the Tanzanian representative is in the room. Is there any update you'd like to give to this Tanzania? Do you guys have an updates as to what has happened in Tanzania on this issue? Yes?

[TANZANIA]:   Is it now?

TRACY HACKSHAW:	Do you want to give an update?
[TANZANIA]:	Is it now? Now?
TRACY HACKSHAW:	Yes, you can. Yes you can give an update now.
[TANZANIA]:	Okay. What has happened is that only. We have already set up our set, our computer emergency response and it is operational. And we are still building our own [inaudible] for more services to be provided to the community. We have started with our government and there are some [inaudible] but we want to do on more for instant handling processes, and perhaps later on we may have a talk on what do we want again further to that. Thank you.
TRACY HACKSHAW:	Thank you very much, Tanzania. And just to wrap up, finally the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting will be held in Malta this year and is expected that the CCI progress will be presented there for the ratification and to formally concretize the agenda which I began to outline earlier with the new projects that are being listed for delivery within the Commonwealth region.
	So as I said, just to wrap up, any issue that you currently have in these areas, it is very useful to submit this request now through the CCIS. We

have contacts in the various ministries or yourselves if you are the contact. Make those requests now so that the requests that are coming in can be formally tabled as part of the overall package that will be going to the [inaudible] meeting in Malta. Thank you very much.

Do you have any questions or anything further on the CCI? I'm sorry for going so quickly. Yes?

SHIVA BISSESSAR: I'm Shiva Bissessar, Fellowship Program. A couple of questions. The document itself, is that publicly available?

TRACY HACKSHAW: I have to verify. I actually took this from a series of meetings that were held. I'm sure I can deliver a version of that and probably share it to the CTO to share amongst the GAC members.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. As a private business, how can I get involved in these types of initiatives? Or is this restricted to government only being involved?

TRACY HACKSHAW: Given that you're from Trinidad and Tobago. The CTU is one of the agencies who are helping with the Commonwealth Initiative, if I'm not mistaken. I'm seeing the representatives of CTU in the room. So perhaps if you're offering any facilities and support to that, you can liaise with the CTU because it goes through a series of – there's an Operational

Committee with all the various agencies that sit and discuss. And the CTU will be one of those agencies that you may want to liaise with. It will not be individual consultants or along those lines but there's an opportunity to share resources, share expertise even regionally and across like from Caribbean to Pacific and so on.

RAKESH LUCHMIN: Thank you, Tracy. We just go to Mark now so they can update us on the potential area of [harmonization] and the WSIS. Thank you.

MARK CARVELL: Yes, thank you, Rakesh. Good afternoon, everybody. I think we've got about 20 minutes or so, 25 minutes, for the second part of the meeting. It's only one hour, not two hours as was on the GAC agenda, you'd be glad to hear. So we can all head off for lunch at 1:00.

I just wanted for next item on the agenda with regard to ICANN issues just to have a little bit of an exchange here. I'm not intending – you'd be very glad to hear – to recount in detail any of the issues that we've been discussing here and also hearing about elsewhere during this ICANN meeting particularly with regard to IANA stewardship transition and accountability.

The first item we have here is safeguards regarding new gTLDs. We had a discussion about this in the GAC on the opening day I think on Saturday as I recall.

Generally, the gTLD's dossier for the GAC has been rather overshadowed by the IANA stewardship transition and enhancing

ICANN | 52
Singapore

accountability workloads. But it's still there in the agenda, of course. And as I say, we had the session on safeguards, and in particular the implementation of GAC advice with regard to the highly regulated sector domain name applications, those 40 applications that were aimed at to health, financial, gambling, and charity sectors primarily. It's about 40-odd domains.

As we discussed on Saturday, if you were here for the opening of the GAC meeting, there's a sentence at the GAC advice which has been consistent since the Beijing meeting that ICANN had to take particular care with these applications because they seek registrations by people who are active in highly regulated sectors. An entity claiming to be a bank wanting to register under dot-bank, well, that has to be checked out who exactly are they. Are they actually a bank, for example.

So that was the kind of challenge, really, we wanted to ensure that the people running these domains were undertaking commitments to ensure that the consumer interest is being protected by validating who these registrants were under their domains as they roll out and ensuring that that was a consistent process of consumer safety through regular monitoring and so on.

So that remains a big issue for the GAC I feel, and there's more work to be done and more messages to be conveyed. The European Commission and the U.S. are leading on drafting some text as a result of the discussions we had on Saturday. We'll have to see how the dialog with ICANN goes.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

There is also agitation in the rest of the community. We've heard proposals that these applications including those for which contracts have already been issued should be frozen until this corrective action, if you like, to ensure proper implementation of the GAC advice and the consistency amongst the public interest commitments that some, not all, have undertaken to apply in their registry business activities.

Until we see those – that's the raising of the bar, if you like, of safeguards for these particular domains. Until we get to that position of confidence, there are proposals from the ALAC and the business constituency to have these domains put on ice. And there was some discussion in the GAC as to whether we would support that or feel it was excessive that the corrective action could be undertaken and it would not need for those businesses to have to put a halt [of] roll out of their business plans.

So that's generally the situation. I'd be interested to hear from colleagues here amongst the Commonwealth community if they have any particular views on that, if they feel that the GAC is taking the right approach and if they feel looking ahead to future rounds, these particular kinds of applications targeting these highly regulated sectors – we've all got banking institutions, financial institutions, we are all as part of our digital strategies looking for online health programs to roll out and governments working in partnership with private sector.

So the future for prospects for these kinds of domains are going to increase and there will be more interest I would've thought in applications for similar kinds of top-level domains. So I'd be interested if there is anybody who wants to say something now about that, how they

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

reflect on that, whether they feel the GAC has taken the right approach and, indeed, what they would like to see in the communiqué coming from respective Commonwealth perspectives.

Does anybody have a thought about that or any suggestions as to how we might articulate a kind of Commonwealth line with regard to regulated sector gTLDs? Does anybody have any thoughts on that or want to share any experience? No? So, okay. Well, I plant that with you.

Looking ahead more generally with regard to the expansion of the domain name system, I wonder if we might, as a Commonwealth Group, collate some thoughts and experience about how to promote awareness of the next gTLD round. We were all very critical about the level of response from stakeholder communities in developing countries is very low. We're very critical of ICANN in its outreach and promotion of awareness of the gTLD first round.

I'd plant the idea perhaps that we as a Commonwealth Group might collate some thoughts about how to inform and advise and make recommendations to ICANN and their Global Stakeholder Engagement team how they might ensure that that doesn't happen again, that the level of interest among stakeholders is greater about the opportunities and for the new top-level domains in the future round, which if the prices come down and the experience of the domain names community and also brands in the first round starts to disseminate to medium-sized businesses, it just doesn't become the opportunity for big corporate business.

In the future, we may see medium-sized businesses or even individual small businesses feel that they and their global business prospects would be enhanced by having a top-level domain. Can we as a Commonwealth group perhaps see this as something we might look at and help promote awareness of gTLD rounds and the opportunities for SMEs in the future? Any thoughts on that? Do you think that's a good idea?

Yeah, please?

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: Hi, Nigel Cassimire, CTU. We're based in Trinidad and Tobago. I think it's a good idea for discussion to take plce around the Commonwealth. From my own experience, I can see that – I expect whenever a second round takes place, it would be quite different from the first one.

You talked about maybe lack of awareness in terms of the developing countries last time around and the price or the investment that was required in terms of making a submission. I think both of those messages have been sent and received from every single constituency meeting that I've attended. I think in the interim as well, ICANN has significantly enhanced its global outreach staff and infrastructure.

Like we have a rep now in the Caribbean and certainly from my [interfacing] with him, it's clear that the message has been sent. It's clear that the interests, say, of our region have been put to him and that is making representations. I think in addition to the fact that ICANN hasn't set a timetable yet for a second round, I think is also indicative of

ICANN | 52
Singapore

– I guess message is sent that, "Let's see what happens with this one, so that we can better inform what goes on with the next round."

So, all that being said, my expectation is that it's going to be quite different but it still remains a good strategy for the Commonwealth countries, especially the developing countries, to remain in contact and collaboration in terms of whenever the second round is announced in terms of making our inputs. Thanks.

TRACY HACKSHAW: I just wanted to point out that the GAC does a working group that's been set up to deal with applicant support for developing economies. As a matter of fact, there has been some discussion as to whether we should broaden that to treat with larger issues or more issues than strictly the new gTLD program.

Of course, several attempts have been made to garner some comments on the existing initiative that happened and what went wrong on applicant support in the whole DNS industry. The feedback has been not encouraging, thus far.

But what I encourage everyone to do is to contact the Secretariat who are not – sorry. For those who are not in a working group, please do contact the GAC Secretariat because there is a working group set up for that purpose. And as I indicated just a few minutes ago, that is likely to also include other issues that will be of importance to developing and underserved economies including the issue that came up earlier about the registrar issue and the insurance and the [inaudible] and so on, as well as larger capacity building issues for developing countries. So

ICANN | 52
Singapore

please do see the secretariat to add your name to the list, and once again we will probably try and indicate or try and [galvanize] some kind of support for that comment and collaboration going forward. Thank you.

MARK CARVELL: Okay. Thanks, Tracy. That's a very helpful reminder, that opportunity to provide inputs into the thinking and so on.

Just very briefly on IANA stewardship transition and enhancing accountability, we've seen the emergence of a proposal with four variants and the perception that is quite complex. As a perception, I think that might settle down into understanding. While these are fairly straightforward provisions in the proposal that allows for a multi-stakeholder engagement in the stewardship process through the MRT and some mechanism for monitoring the IANA functions operators' performance and so on.

So actually, I think the arguments that this is over engineered and overdone and too complicated and too risky, I think – my perception is that that concern may be overstated. You can't transition from a backstop provided by the U.S. government to nothing. You can't just simply hand over the whole thing to ICANN without creating some new mechanisms to replace what the U.S. government has been providing as a backstop. So that's my perception. I don't know if anybody else wants to chip in with their own thoughts about this.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

But again I have a question about the level of engagement and awareness in our respective communities throughout the Commonwealth.

If you've got any concerns about that in terms of who is driving the cross-community work and how much awareness there is within your communities of stakeholders about the importance of this and the opportunities that are coming up to react to the public comment periods, and also to engage with the GAC representatives who are, as members of a chartering organization are going to sign off on the process and potentially even sign off on the proposal ultimately.

So how is that happening within your experience within your Commonwealth country/communities? I'd be interested to hear. I mean, are there points that we should advance from our respective experience, particularly in those communities in developing countries in particular about how this process has been rolling out and the level of awareness and the opportunity to contribute to the public comment periods.

So I put that out to you if anybody wants to react to that now. Anybody wants to say anything on that? Or are we all totally overwhelmed by what's been going on here?

Tracy, go on and have a go. Thanks.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thanks, Mark. So I am aware that in the Caribbean region – and maybe Nigel will say something – that ICANN has been very vocal and has been presenting on several occasions in the region through its representative.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

However, my take on it is that the presentations have been given to a lot of ambivalent type audiences and who have not really understood or sought to understand the potential ramifications of what's happening, both on the overall transition process, and in particular the ICANN accountability issue.

Even within the GAC, I believe there's a significant difference in interest between the countries who may be most affected and most interested and those who are basically sitting around and looking at it and seeing what's happening next. So maybe an opportunity for the Commonwealth to do some kind of briefing paper, a step-by-step or what it means for the countries [inaudible] the transition and the accountability and process to ensure that at least we understand what's happening and give an opportunity to comment [very formally] to position before it's too late. That's my take on it.

RAKESH LUCHMUN: Can I also add that we can actually hold a parallel session in Kenya in September? If there's an issue, we can discuss about ICANN – the CTO forum?

MARK CARVELL: I think that's an interesting idea. I mean the timing sounds right. Yeah, anyway. First of all, African, yeah.

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: I agree with Tracy in terms of what has been happening in the Caribbean. While people are hearing about the issue, I don't think

ICANN | 52
Singapore

there's a full appreciation of what it means to them. It's still kind of something happening out there.

It's an interesting point that Tracy mentioned about the opportunity to do a paper on it and you, Mark, mentioned a fundamental issue that I've been trying to determine for sometime as regards to the stewardship transition one. You talked about a backstop presented by the U.S. government.

What are the elements of that backstop that are being given up when the U.S. government transitions its stewardship, and what is being put in place to replace it?

If we can see the U.S. government is providing point one, two, and three and in the transition, number one will be handled by this organization, two by that organization and so on, I certainly don't have a good sense of what is being given up in terms of taking the U.S. government out of the picture. And it's not so easy to find.

In fact, I, at one point, spent a little time – not a lot of time – going into some of the documentation like the contract with ICANN and so on. It would have required more time than I could have put in at the time, but I think that would be some useful information for us to understand what is it that the U.S. government had been providing that is being taken away and such that we can analytically look and see, "This function is going here, that function is going there," and so on. Thanks.

RAKESH LUCHMUN: Thank you, CTU. Any other comment?

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

[SINGAPORE]:   Thank you, chair. In response to your request, we don't have a lot of interaction with IANA. I can recall a couple of occasions where we do IANA more to update some of the records in the zone file, and when we implement IDN, it's sort of the dedication of the IDN streaks. So generally, we have not many problems in IANA. Of course, this may not be representative of other ccTLD who may have a lot of difficulties with IANA.

Looking at the issue objectively, we have a feeling that the model that put forward so far by [inaudible] is too complicated. We agree that when you transit IANA function to a multi-stakeholder, I think we just need to abide by a certain principle like multi-stakeholder models, accountability, a [inaudible] process. Other than that, we should look for a simple and effective model.

I think as you know [inaudible] three communities address the protocol well. They seem to [be] quite happy with some of the improvement made in the process and the summary that the proposal is only the names community.

Judging from the feedback, I know from yesterday's interaction with the CWG and other forum, some people seem to be thinking of maybe we should just stick and enter, look for, and ask ourselves whether we really need such an elaborate models for the transition. Maybe a simpler model with improvement of the [inaudible] process, some of those issues.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

On the whole, our view is that the proposal perhaps can be simplified somewhat rather than just so many permutations in the model. Thank you.

RAKESH LUCHMUN: Thank you, Singapore. Mark, can you just be very brief on the IG?

MARK CARVELL: Yeah. Just very briefly on that, as I said, I think the CWG is going to reflect on exactly that sentiment. The way it's being presented is creating actually a perception that is very complicated. But actually, when you look at it, just the key element, is quite simple. You have to have some kind of appeal panel of some sort. You have to have the stakeholders engaged and you have to have the customers' interest taken care of. So I think the CWG will go away and streamline and communicate the proposal. Maybe some elements can be stripped out.

But anyway, we're under time pressure, so I'll just quickly go to – just to flag up really what else is happening and there's something pretty big. It's the WSIS+10 Review, which I expect most of you will be familiar with.

As we understand it from the U.K. government perspective in terms of process, the key event which is the culmination of this review – it started with a UNESCO event a couple of years ago and ITU had a high-level meeting in Geneva last year on the WSIS Review – this is all going to culminate in the high-level meeting in New York at the UN or certainly run by the General Assembly in December of this year.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

It should be open to stakeholders. It should not entirely be run and managed by the government missions in New York. The second committee which negotiated the modalities for this review said the actual high-level meeting should have some involvement of stakeholders. How? We don't know. I'll explain very shortly the point for us to look out for in regard to that.

Secondly, the second committee said that there should be a proprietary process that would involve outreach to non-governmental stakeholders. So that would run probably from September through to December. Again, the modalities are not yet decided.

The modalities for both the proprietary process and the high-level meeting itself will be decided by two co-facilitators, two ambassadors in New York – one from the developed economy and one from the developing economy. They will be appointed in June. We don't know yet who they are. There are sort of feelers going out as to who might be interested in undertaking that role.

So the two facilitators firstly will decide how the stakeholder engagement will take place, how ICANN, for example, will be involved but also the business sector, Internet Society, non-academics, civil society and so on – how are they going to be able to contribute to an outcome from the high-level meeting which is some kind of document which is going to set the WSISs agenda from 2016 onwards.

So that's basically our understanding of the process. If anybody else does have some insights to share with us, that's great. Again, I think it's important for the Commonwealth community to understand this because Commonwealth institutions and processes and websites and so

ICANN | 52
Singapore

on can broadcast the importance of stakeholder engagement in this final phase of the WSIS Review, because it's got an impact on ICANN in terms of the future of the multi-stakeholder model, the future of the IGF (Internet Governance Forum). And that is another important point for us all to consider, the renewal of the mandate of the Internet Governance Forum.

There was an attempt by Mexico which is – it wants to host it in 2016 to get second committee last December to agree to renew the mandate then that was opposed. So this decision about the future of the IGF is not going to be taken until the WSIS+10 Review takes place within that context.

So again, I think it's important for the Commonwealth to gear up for this process of engagement both at the government level and also at the stakeholder level. The governments and the Commonwealth institutions like the CTO and the Commonwealth Secretariat and the regional bodies in the Caribbean, Africa, and also the regional and national IGFs that involve Commonwealth states should really gear up and get this message out. Now is the time to engage on how Internet is going to be governed in the future. I hope that's helpful.

Anybody who wants to chip in on that and react? Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Nigel Hickson, I have staff. Yes, indeed. The WSIS+10 Review is something which ICANN is taking very seriously. We've been involved in the preparation process, the conferences hosted by both UNESCO and

the ITU. And we're involved in the UN CSTD process in terms of drafting input documents for this review in New York in December.

As you say, it's slightly unclear what's going to happen and what might be decided. The review itself is on the WSIS outcomes. It's not supposed to, if you like, be a summit on the future of Internet governance but by its very nature, by the fact that 190 governments or whatever will gather. There will be a debate on the future of Internet governance in one shape or form.

I've just come from talking to civil society, which I apologize for being late for this meeting. Civil society are asking questions about the future of the multi-stakeholder approach, how they become involved in these international negotiations and, of course, it's quite difficult.

But I think the Commonwealth has a particular role to play here because the Commonwealth represents countries in so many different regions and represents countries that have done so much in terms of spearing Internet growth and spearing Internet accessibility.

And I think as we come to these discussions, we have to remember that having one unified Internet has made such a difference, and if we are going to go down the road of fragmentation, the real economic costs to that will entail for so many different countries. Thank you.

RAKESH LUCHMUN: Thank you, Nigel. Before I wrap up, is there any further comment? Yes, Singapore?

[SINGAPORE]:	I don't know where the members can – maybe [inaudible] can share a bit of insight. We heard this at NETmundial Initiative. Do you see that as a – you talk about WSIS and then we have NETmundial Initiative that's going on now. And now [inaudible] moved to World Economic Forum. So how do you see this to sort of initiative. Will there [be] some convergence or are they going to be [inaudible] in a different way.

MARK CARVELL:	Thanks. It's a very important question. The NETmundial Initiative which was launched by the World Economic Forum has now got some kind of council authority which has representation from the U.S. government and from the European Commission amongst others. ICANN is a partner alongside the Brazilian Steering Committee on Internet Governance.

So this is taking off, but it's going through a kind of consultative phase. So it's pretty much for us in the U.K. are watching brief. We think it could complement the idea rather than undermine it or cut ground from the IGF. We would be very worried, especially as we're donor – we put money into the IGF. We would be very worried if the NETmundial Initiative started to take ground away from the IGF at this time of mandate renewal. And of course, we've seen the IGF very well supported and moving forward with implementing improvements and so on.

So we were very apprehensive about the emergence of this NETmundial Initiative when we had been saying in the UN in the Commission on Science and Technology for Development we don't want any new

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

processes. The existing mechanisms are working well and they attract stakeholder support and including the support of a lot of governments.

So, it's a bit of a watching brief. We potentially see it as contributing very effectively on capacity building and bringing in some heavyweight industry, business interest into the sphere of Internet governance, stirring that into capacity building in developing countries and creating the opportunity for platform and portal for advice, expertise for developing country administrations and business communities in developing countries to tap into. That sounds a very positive opportunity.

I would hope that's the direction it will go. Now ICANN is here, so Nigel, you might want to say something as I say a partner of that NETmundial Initiative. Do you want to say something?

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very, Mark. I'll just be very brief. I mean I think where the NETmundial Initiative, if you like, intersects with the WSIS is that under the WSIS process, one of the calls, if we go right back to the World Summit in 2003 and 2005, one of the concerns of governments, one of the legitimate concerns of governments was how governments are involved in public policy discussions on Internet issues.

Obviously within ICANN governments are involved in the GAC of course and the fantastic representation we have in the GAC from governments. But in other areas of Internet governance, often there isn't this involvement.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Then of course we have the excellent discussions in São Paulo last year at the NETmundial conference that Brazil hosted, which clearly showed how governments could be involved in a process that involved all stakeholders discussing important issues such as surveillance.

And the NETmundial Initiative, this platform that's been created by the partners in the NETmundial Initiative again will give a platform where all the stakeholders can come together to discuss certain issues.

Now, it's unclear what those issues will be. It will be up to the participants in the Coordination Committee which has been formed to identify an issue – cyber security and privacy, whatever – and then bring together people to discuss that, bring all the stakeholders together to discuss it.

RAKESH LUCHMUN: Thank you, Nigel. Should we wrap up now due to the fact that we are [inaudible].

MARK CARVELL: Yes, thanks. Can I just make one suggestion as a sort of takeaway from this meeting? Perhaps we could do a kind of calendar of key Commonwealth events and how they intersect with the WSIS+10 timeline, if you like, up to December. And also the dates for public comment periods that I mentioned in respect to IANA and accountability – if we could put it at that kind of calendar up on the CTO website. Maybe that could be shared by other websites, too. I think it's an important opportunity or mechanism for enhancing awareness. Thank you.

RAKESH LUCHMUN: I think is an excellent idea. Before wrap up, just another thing that we will discuss, we will do a parallel session most probably in Kenya. I'm going to consult internally and probably we'll talk to Nigel and see if we can do that in Kenya for the consultation. And as suggested by Mark, we'll look at the key dates of the event until December. Thank you.

I'd like to thank Mark and Tracy. And thank you, everyone. I know I've taken time for your lunch but we will send you a brief minutes as soon as possible. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]