
HYDERABAD – GAC Commonwealth Meeting
Saturday, November 05, 2016 – 17:00 to 17:45 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It is November 5, at 5:00 p.m. in Hall 4. This is the GAC Commonwealth Meeting.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Good evening. Welcome to the Commonwealth GAC Meeting. I know it has been a long hard day and it's 5:00, but I thank everyone for being here with us. Before I start, can I ask the delegates just to identify the countries they are from if that is all right by you?

Nigel, you are from ICANN?

NIGEL HICKSON: Sorry, Nigel Hickson, ICANN staff.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Yes. Sir, you are from?

FRANCIS OLIVIER CUBAHIRO: My name is Francis, I'm from Burundi.

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.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Burundi. Australia?

ANALISE WILLIAMS: Hello, Analise Williams from Australia.

ANDREA BRAMBILLA: Andrea Brambilla from Canada.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Canada, okay. Madam there. You are from Kenya?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, I'm from Kenya.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Gentleman in the back. Just the country you're from. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: United States.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: UK, although, I'm here representing Save The Children Italy. Unfortunately, Italy never was blessed by being a member of the British Empire so.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I come from Chad.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Nuay]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Cook Islands.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Malaysia.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Jimson Olufuye, Africa ICT Alliance, Nigeria.

DENIZ SUSAR: Deniz Susar, United Nations.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Singapore.

MARK CARVELL: And me, Mark Carvell, UK.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Thank you. The first item is actually to be presented by Mr. Henri Kassen who is the GAC Vice Chair, but unfortunately he's not yet here with us. So could I ask Mark to go present the 2nd item?

MARK CARVELL: Thanks very much, Lasantha.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: I'd be very happy to introduce myself.

MARK CARVELL: Do you want to introduce yourself first?

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: [I forgot] to introduce myself. I'm Lasantha De Alwis from the Commonwealth Telecommunications Organization. The CTO organizes Commonwealth GAC meetings and these [inaudible]. So, Mark.

MARK CARVELL: Okay, thanks very much. While under Stewardship Transition, I guess we're all sick to death of it now actually. So I don't want to take up too much time and I don't intend to run through, comprehensively, the state of play. But I think it's just an opportunity for all of us in the Commonwealth to reflect on this

historic step that's being taken with non-renewal of the contract that ICANN had with the U.S. government at the end of September on the 30th. The contract expired and there was no renewal of that contract so that's a major historic development.

I think many of us in the Commonwealth for a long time had not really expected it to happen. But suddenly with the announcement in 2014 from NTIA, here we are now 2016 having achieved it as a stakeholder community working very effectively to develop the proposal for the Stewardship Transition. And many of us in the GAC have been following that very closely if not actively participating in the conference calls and working group meetings, to develop the proposal. Various points there were some difficult issues, no doubt about it but there was perseverance and determination and a very good spirit pervading the whole process that ensured it would stay on track and produce a final proposal.

We all remember, those of us have been on the GAC for some time will reflect on some intense discussions for us as government representatives. Reflecting on the role of the GAC as we looked at the accountability and empowerment framework that needed to be established to ensure that transition could take place. We would reflect on some very challenging issues and hard work. We came through it, which is great. And there

was a spirit of compromise pervading the process very positively.

So we've heard at this meeting the progress with establishing the smooth switch over, if you like, to the PTI. And the bedding down of all the elements of the transition proposal itself. And then, secondly, we've had pretty good accounts of the subgroups established under Work Stream 2 on Jurisdiction, Accountability, Diversity, Human Rights, Transparency, and the Ombudsman Staff Accountability – areas that perhaps are not so critical for the GAC. But I would just suggest to you that certainly diversity and human rights and accountability are going to be issues for the Commonwealth GAC representatives to focus on.

And I leave it at that really, and just invite you to comment from your perspective on where we are and the road ahead to the middle or perhaps late next year when all the Work Stream 2 subgroups will have completed their work.

So if anybody's got any comments, any views on how to facilitate more participation in the subgroups. We heard calls in our discussions here yesterday in particular for more active participation by GAC representatives, and a more diverse group of GAC representatives. Perhaps we as a Commonwealth group might well reflect on that and how more of us could engage and help fulfill the mandates of the subgroups and Work Stream 2.

I leave it there, so, and I invite any comments. Anybody who wants to make a comment on process and opportunity or how help can be provided for us. Thank you.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Thanks Mark. Any comments, questions?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's a question. I've followed the small print, or even some of the big print that closely. So on the transition, is it now literally the case that there are no residual clauses, powers, subparagraphs or anything which puts the government of the United States in a different position from any other government. And for example, and specifically does ICANN have a league of a right to transfer its headquarters out of the jurisdiction of California?

MARK CARVELL: Thanks [Joncar]. I will defer to Nigel if he wants to add a comment. But the situation is, as somebody described it, the U.S. government is now out of the loop as far as all the IANA functions are concerned. So they are just like any other government and the accountability framework is now such that all governments have a role to play in ensuring true proper accountability for the actions of the Board and the staff and so on.

So they're on an equal basis with all the other governments who participate through the GAC, which is now what, if you include African Union Commission and European Commission, it's now 170 members of the GAC.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So there's nothing which would allow the U.S. government for example, to say that the terms on which the IANA transition were made not being honored in their view and giving them a right therefore to say, "Well, we're gonna go back on it."

MARK CARVELL: As far as I'm aware, that's the case. Does Nigel want to comment?

NIGEL HICKSON: Well just simply, thank you, Mark. I mean, just simply to reaffirm that. I mean it's a historic move. The community put an awful lot of effort and commitment into this transition. The U.S. government showed commitment to the process throughout and in the final stages of the transition were incredibly supportive when ICANN was subject to quite a few attacks, so to speak, in the U.S. Congress. And yes, you're right I mean the situation is that we're obviously, the U.S. is very important because that's the jurisdiction of ICANN and that's in the Bylaws.

But in terms of the day-to-day business, it's the U.S.'s one member of the GAC along with all the other members.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Nigel, there was another wish and that's to whether there are any plans of taking the headquarters out of U.S. jurisdiction.

NIGEL HICKSON: No, no the jurisdiction of ICANN is to defined in the Bylaws and of course the Bylaws can change from time to time, but that is the situation.

MARK CARVELL: And just to update the jurisdiction subgroup is not now looking at that. It's looking at many other jurisdiction issues, this multi-layered conceptual approach to the issues of jurisdiction. And when all that's completed, then they will look at the issue of location. So it's come at the, it's kind of [par], if you'd like, that question for the subgroup until they've completed all the other work on jurisdictional issues.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Thanks, Mark. There is a question there?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Not really a question, a comment [inaudible]. My name is Jimson Olufuye, Chair of the Africa City Alliance [inaudible] Abuja. Well from the private sector and just as you mentioned, many people actually, as Mark, felt the transition may not work really or will not succeed, or will not happen but the business community did a lot [especially] from Africa and a true alliance as well, to [inaudible] a lot of credibility to this. And now that we have this, we do know that the work of the phase 2 of the working group on [inaudible] corporation is ongoing. This calls for the Commonwealth group to do a lot to engage countries from developing countries to be more proactive in this. Because the issue has been that the developing countries are known to [table] so they're not part of it so we need to get the developing country's government to be more actively involved. So I'd like to relate a request that the Secretariats do more for the communication, correspondence, and engaging the governments so that they can play their role actively. Especially now that the phase 2 of the working group on [inaudible] corporation is on and we know the primary reason why we have that at the United Nation is because there was no such situation like this. Now that we have it, so we need to engage and give them justification why they need to engage. Thank you.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Thank you very much, and I think that takes us to the next item on the agenda. That is the discussion on how to improve the participation of Commonwealth countries of the GAC. We actually had two, sort of aspects to this question. One is the participation, number two is the active participation. There are, last count, there are about four countries that are still not member of the GAC and we would like them to be members of the GAC.

Number two, it's not simply enough to be members of the GAC, we would like the Commonwealth countries to be acting members of the GAC. And this is a question we would like for the members here to find out how we can encourage and improve the Commonwealth's participation of the GAC. So can I ask first, Mark for his views? And then others can make their contributions, thanks.

MARK CARVELL: Thank you, Lasantha. Well there's no doubt about it, this is a heavily loaded committee. It's very challenging. I think all of us have wide dossiers back in capitol. We have to do other work across the ICT sector and many of you are in small teams with limited resources to keep track of the wide range of issues that are now coming to the GAC in an increasing volume.

And at the same time, the GAC operationally is changing. It's going to have to work much more intensively between physical meetings with engaging in GNSO Policy Development Processes. Potentially if there are petitions under the empowerment framework of accountability, the GAC will have to take part in those. And they can't wait until the GAC meets.

So all of us are facing this challenge and I think it's a problem and it's a deterrent, a barrier, to active participation, there's no doubt about it. The volume of material to get through and the sense of having sufficient grasp of issues to be able to be confident enough to actively play your part. But it's important that you do because diversity of participation is key. And the Commonwealth as a forum provides us with an opportunity to ensure that we can maximize that diversity of the whole GAC.

So one of my points that I made, was it the day before yesterday? It might have been yesterday, was that the GAC Secretariat could look at how they resource support for individual GAC members to be able to participate actively on specific issues. Maybe that's one way of meeting a need, to be able to do that, to lead on issues or to contribute actively to dialogue on issues and so on.

So that's one point that occurs to me, that the Secretariat level there could be the opportunity for them to work more closely

with representatives who are hard pressed, who find it difficult to get through the volumes of work, to manage that and also to get their resources sufficiently at a level to be able to then be proactive in ICANN processes.

So that's my thought, I hope that's helpful. Thank you.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Thanks, Mark. Mary, you had a point?

MARY: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mark for your comment. First, I'm starting with the title of our meeting, "Commonwealth GAC Meeting." And I want to know whether this is exclusive for GAC members only, that's one. And if not, because some of us are not in GAC, so that we'll know that we are at the right place or not, that's one.

Secondly, I want to say that there are other constituency members. It's not only in GAC that you don't see Commonwealth, especially the developing countries, participate, not only participate but effectively participating so we still have those challenges and all the consequences. I don't know how many of them that we are keeping track of it. And if we are not keeping track of it, I think it's something that we should consider.

The third thing I want to say that the Commonwealth IGF should not die. If we can revive Commonwealth IGF, that's a platform where we could do a lot of outreach in getting those countries that are not members of the GAC for common, or participate, not only participate in but effectively participate in.

The fourth thing, I know that most of us are from developing countries and funding is a challenge for us. So those are things that somewhat are groups that try to organize their community. Also try to look for how to improve on however they can with a means of getting these developing countries participate in the ICANN process. So in that way would be able to see that there will be improvement, not only in GAC, in all the consequences of ICANN. Thank you.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: If I may answer the several points you have raised, and afterwards I will ask Mark for his views.

First question about the GAC. It is not only for GAC, we welcome all stakeholders. And this is not only Commonwealth, we welcome other countries as well and you can see Burundi, we had Chad, so other countries as well. Commonwealth is a very inclusive body, so we welcome participation of everyone.

Second point you raised was about whether we keep track of the constituent's members. We do have mailing lists, we do periodically mail out especially nearer and even we remind people of what we are planning to do. Not only here, but even at ITU. So we try to keep track. Of course, we can improve.

Commonwealth IGF, definitely it should not die. It should [inaudible] when it does provide some good relief, and you'll be happy to hear that we are planning to be at the next IGF as well. We have IGF right throughout. I will give a briefing about that item after next one, about what we plan to do.

Funding challenges, definitely there are funding challenges and especially in the Commonwealth we have a larger proportion of developing countries and their challenge. So two things, one is that we at CTO would very happily provide our activities as platforms for engagement, for advocacy, and consultations that is a low-cost way of engaging because you can kill two birds with one.

The other one is actually on the next point and this is a question for Nigel which will come later. Whether there are plans for any kind of support from ICANN on, or enhanced support, I would say, for the engagement of developing countries.

Mark, would you like to add anything?

MARK CARVELL: Well, Lasantha I think you've covered all the points very comprehensively, thank you.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Yes, [inaudible].

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah, this is Jimson. Well I want to find out is it only during ICANN meeting that we have this meeting? How about if you have, say – based on the list we have, you could have conference calls and be monthly before all the next ICANN meeting, maybe intersessional. And then ensure we have the updated list of country GACs that we don't have their validated list or those that are not responding, we can then communicate to find out maybe there have been changes in those countries, or at least keep some form of online engagement. And there are many of the [inaudible] tools that could help to do that. Zoom is there, Skype and all those things.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Thank you, that is an [inaudible]. The one thing we would not want to do is to load people with too many engagements. Right now with the GAC itself, I think some people are feeling

challenged because the number of e-mails one receives on the GAC e-mail group if you are to hold a day job, it's a bit difficult follow. So without adding too much pressure onto the stakeholders, we will definitely look at other opportunities of keeping engagement alive in between meetings. And again, going back to my point, CTO [inaudible] activities and we will happily host consultations in the margins of those equities. Cook Islands.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. I just want to make a comment because this particular topic overlaps with the work we're doing in the underserved region. I'm a co-Chair of the underserved region and we're actually addressing this in the underserved region and I'm wondering whether we can coordinate efforts rather than having various layers of exactly the same thing.

If I can just go back to what Mary said earlier on there are challenges that we share and we don't want to hinder our participation with too many of the same things within ICANN. So I think we should coordinate our efforts just so there's better participation. We talk about funding, we talk about capacity. For me personally, we are limited in terms of people to participate effectively in ICANN so if, again, I can't stress the importance of coordinating our work here. Thank you.

MARK CARVELL:

Thanks, if I could come in on that. That's a very valid point. We don't have, as a Commonwealth group, a clear strategy yet on this issue, but I think it's a vitally important issue. Many Commonwealth members are exactly as you described. They're in very tight situations with regard to resource and money to travel and so on. And so I think we, as a Commonwealth forum, can help with the working group on underserved regions. Or you're changing, you're looking for another name aren't you? I wonder if it might be something like "Development Outreach Group" or something like along those lines to capture the sense of this is about capacity building, and providing the channel for ICANN and GAC representatives included, to be able to contribute to development and spread of the digital economy in all countries and so on.

So, there's a synergy here and there's a membership here of the Commonwealth group. We can actually coordinate, I think very effectively, in the future but we as I say, we don't have anything on the go if you like, as a Commonwealth group. But as a forum, we should look for opportunities to assist.

And if I could just also comment about Jimson's point about regular sort of contact. I think that's a very valid thing to raise at this time when the GAC is going to be working much more

intersessionally and also the wider community Commonwealth stakeholders who are not with the government. They are having to engage pretty much throughout the year, nonstop on ICANN issues. The GAC is moving into that modality as well, as I said before. It's not matters of going to a meeting and then waiting until the next meeting. We have to initiate work straight after meeting and respond to issues in the intervening period before we physically meet.

So I think we'll take away that idea about having a periodic updating calls and so on. Thank you.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS:

Thanks, Mark. There had been a bit of miscommunication. Henri has been waiting in the other room because in the first e-mail I sent, it gave a different room number so my apologies to Henri.

Can we go to the first point of the agenda and Henri will make the presentation.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Sorry Lasantha, Nigel here. Could we just cover, I have to sort of go to another meeting, so if you could briefly cover, just take a minute if that's okay.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Okay, Nigel. So we go to the fourth item: update on capacity building through the [fund] from gTLD auctions by Nigel. Thank you.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes thank you very much, Nigel Hickson. Just ICANN [staff]. Just two points really, the first on what we were talking about before and the real value I think, of what Jimson and Mary and others said in the bringing together of Commonwealth voices. I think is just so valuable. And it's valuable in the ICANN context and of course it's more than just the GAC itself its stakeholders. It's valuable in the IGF context as it's been made clear. It was very valuable in the ITU context.

I mean Lasantha and I were at a meeting of Commonwealth governments, primarily, at the ITU WTSA meeting in Tunisia last week and that meeting where we were able to discuss proposals of common interest was just incredibly valuable at bringing everyone together on these issues. So that's the first point.

The second point on the auctions, I don't really have an awful lot to say so I've got the auction money here. So the process on the auction money has been ongoing. As several of you know and there's been a working party meeting to discuss the best modalities in taking this forward. And what is being decided by the community members of this working party is that there

should be a cross-community working group. You all have experienced cross-community working groups in one sense or another and of course it was cross-community working groups that affected the IANA Transition.

And on Tuesday next, or is it next week? Yes, it is next week still. Tuesday the 8th at 5:00, there's a session here on the cross-community, the new GTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group. So this really is the launch of the cross-community working group at this ICANN meeting. Cross-community working groups are completely open. There are several ongoing at the moment as people know. And this cross-community working group will be looking at drawing up, if you like, a framework under which the rules of engagement, if you like. In terms of the auction, one will be established. I don't know the time frame for the working group, but it will have a timeframe which will be discussed, no doubt on that Tuesday meeting.

So I think this is clearly very important indeed. I don't need to stress this. And the auction proceeds, I think stand around \$200 million. So it's reasonably substantial. And there's going to be an important component to work as we look forward in terms of new gTLD processes, etc.

So I urge people to go along to that meeting and obviously if you can go along to that meeting, there is always opportunities of joining cross-community working groups, either as a member or as observers. Thank you.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS:

Thank you, Nigel. So the advice is for all stakeholders to engage with this cross-community working group. Coming from the Secretariat, so to speak, our expectation is that a part of these proceeds will go to support the engagement of the members, so our stakeholders. Because end of the day we are talking about engagement, inclusivity and there are real challenges to most of our member countries to engage in the process. So any help that is being given would actually improve the process within ICANN as well. Thank you.

NIGEL HICKSON:

I went to the, there was a discussion in Helsinki on this very point about how to spend the \$200 million or whatever. And there was quite a strong argument made that it shouldn't do that at all. Because it's, as it were, ICANN consuming its own benefits as it were for the purposes of helping ICANN and its work. So I mean, I'm not saying I disagree with what you've just said, Lasantha, but I can tell you there certainly was a strongly expressed view that it shouldn't do exactly what you've just said.

And that instead it should be used to support a whole load of other charitable purposes not connected with the Internet. So, it's a live issue. So, if anybody thinks like you do, they need to get in there in that point of view and know.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Thanks Nigel. Mark can you [inaudible]?

MARK CARVELL: Thanks. Yeah. Thanks, Nigel, drawing that attention. My [thought] immediately occurs that we as a Commonwealth group may wish to present some kind of input into the motions, proceeds, working group. I probably haven't got the title right. But on how the auction proceeds can be used to facilitate and then support sponsor participation and active contribution.

So, we will circulate as part of a record of this meeting, that as a possible idea for our colleagues to react to. And then, one of us will go along to that meeting and we can also report to the Commonwealth GAC Network on that and also make that public, so nongovernment stakeholders can pick it up, so the CTO website, Lasantha, is that right? That's the visibility window for all our work, CTO website.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: So, the [inaudible] is that the ICANN circulate the notes of this meeting and along with that if we can have a small [inaudible] about what our thinking is. To contribute that on the discussions on it and of course, it will be on the CTO website.

I think every one agrees with that. Are there any objections to it? Thank you.

And right now, we'll ask Henri to make his presentation. This is Item 1 of the agenda [all about] the year ahead. Can we have that presentation, please? Thanks.

HENRI KASSEN: Good. Thank you, Lasantha. Good afternoon colleagues or good evening.

My apology, we were at Room MR102 and we were luckily rescued by our [sister] from [Cayman] [inaudible] because that was the messages that we got. So our apology, my apology for not being here earlier.

I am glad that my presentation didn't got stuck in the room MR102 and it's at least it's here. It was just like an introductory introduction. As far as the GAC programs and the overview of GAC arrangements are concerned, I suppose I missed Mark's intervention or Mark's presentation. I suppose a GAC member also had given some background.

There are many, many issues that is currently challenging, a challenge within the GAC, Government Advisory Committee, but I just wondered in terms of the first presentation or the first slide, just the next three meetings, three is a nice number, one, two, three. The next three meetings is 58, 59 and 60, which will be in Copenhagen, Johannesburg and Abu Dhabi.

That's of course GAC will be meeting at all three meetings, Meeting A, Meeting B and Meeting C. Meeting A being a smaller meeting in terms of the meeting [inaudible] or the meeting [inaudible] meeting strategy, B is policy and C is the big one that we are now having also here in Hyderabad.

So, it's just an overview of the year, the next year coming up to the end of, of course November and the GAC will as usual meet for the whole duration of the week also that we are there.

The next slide.

Then, in terms of the next slide, I think in terms of priority work areas, those first two I think has been – the input in the GNSO PDP, I think that's a major activity or major focus for the GAC because it's public policy issues that is very important.

We had a presentation – we had a meeting with the GNSO and I think we got some feedback or some overview of what they are planning but we realize that we are but in an interim period with

the IANA Transition process and the new Bylaws being adapted, the new Bylaws of ICANN and there are a number of things that GAC must do as is the other ACs and SOs.

So, the third point on the left the priority is the input. Our input to finalize the impact of the new ICANN Bylaws, there are issues of Empowered Community nominations that GAC must do. And, as you can imagine, about 150 countries in the world as a decisional participant in the Empowered Community deciding on a petition and you need to decide on that within a week or within two weeks or so. It's very difficult to get consensus but GAC is grappling and is busy sorting out our involvement as a decision of participant in the Empowered Community under the new ICANN structure, as well as how to make nominations.

I know it sounds not very complicated. You just call for nominations and people nominate and then you just endorse them. But in the GAC, it's not that easy because as I've said, 160 countries, sometimes people need to consult the capitals, they need to consult [inaudible], they need to consult [inaudible] and so on. So, it's not so easy.

And then, of course, there's also the new requirement, not new but an additional supplementary requirement in terms of GAC advice. We used to give advice to the Board and the whole

[meta] of our rationale and the whole [meta] of consensus is put back into the spotlight so GAC is also dealing with that.

Then the fourth bullet is also in line or is complementary to the first thing, to the third bullet where GAC is continuing to review its operating procedures and principles. Of course, with the new ICANN Bylaws, it is critical that the GAC operating procedures and operating principles to be reviewed. So to be in line with the new ICANN Bylaws, although we have realized that there are new principles or new provisions that we need to provide for which is highlighted in the previous bullet concerning Empowered Community, etc., etc.

And then of course, development of the public policy expertise in emerging GAC economies is an ongoing priority for GAC to ensure that Emerging Communities, emerging economies and developing countries in transition, etc., etc. that we develop capacity within those countries in terms of the GAC lending its support and its advice to be able to bring to bear initiatives that deals with capacity building.

Well, in fact, GAC has got a committee that is also looking at this area. And it speaks to the red entry sentence there that keep priority for GAC is to get more representatives, more deeply involved in the work that enables the GAC to give time the advice to the Board.

To the right, it's just basically what GAC – what our call is to the wider community and that's to join relevant working groups and then one, two, and then the third one, critically to review and comment on documents circulated, make sure that your country is heard and be involved.

We have seen a marked increase in GAC members as I've said years ago. When I was not associated with ICANN, there was a few countries. And now, I'm talking about 160 countries in GAC and a marked increase also in countries from emerging economies in transition, developing countries, etc., etc. especially from Africa.

But please, we need your voice, we need your involvement in GAC. We need you to comment and to review issues. Thank you very much, Lasantha.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS:

Thank you, Henri. Are there any questions? Yes, [it don't] look like we have questions, so I would go to the next item, which is about CTO's strategic plan and our work program related in cyberspace. I'll be brief since we have taken longer than we anticipated.

It comes in three or four categories. One is this Commonwealth coordination of vis-à-vis coordinate Commonwealth GAC

Meeting at the IGF [inaudible] organize the Commonwealth IGF. So we plan to be there at the next ICANN Meeting in Copenhagen as well, so that there is a continuity and we like to be engaged with us.

In cyber security, last year CTO developed cyber security strategies in four Commonwealth entries: Fiji, Botswana, Cameroon and Uganda. This year, we are developing strategies for three more countries: Malawi, Mozambique and Tanzania. Also we provide implementation assistance for those countries where we have developed strategies.

Second project is about cybercrime. We have a project in developing the capacity of telecom sector to tackle cybercrime because cybercrime is such a vast field that [inaudible]. But CTO proposed that it will [inaudible] its strengths and work with its stakeholders to tackle cybercrime.

This project last year was delivered in Nigeria, it went very well and this year, it will be delivered in Bangladesh and Pakistan. Hopefully, the workshop will be in the second week of December. We have follow-up activities in Nigeria as well.

The third project is quite interesting. It is about promoting cyber standards. In five selected countries, we work with another organization called IASME, a UK-based organization to promote a standard in cyber security, which is called Cyber Essentials,

which is a standard UK government has sort of in a way endorsed by making it compulsory for any entity that is doing business with the UK government to comply with that standard. I have a flyer here along with some other materials from CTO, so you are most welcome. I like this.

And, the last item, the most important one is, as you may be aware, CTO launched a study on ODDs. ODD is a topic that it works very strong emotions for [inaudible]. What CTO proposed that Commonwealth build on consensus, his ideal place to consider the many aspects of ODDs and come up with an operating framework that is [fair] by all stakeholders.

This survey is available online. Now, it is open. If you go to the CTO website, there is the link and you can fill the survey. We seek inputs from policymakers, regulators primarily from four segments.

One is public sector that is policymakers, regulators, ICT-implementing agencies.

Second category is operators that is network owners, ISP so on and so forth.

Third category is ODD service providers because we need to hear from them as well.

And the fourth category is from civil society and consumer education groups.

So please take part in this survey, provide your inputs. And we plan to finish this part of the survey by end of November. And then, outcomes will be taken for a further round of consultations through national, regional and even global consultations in the margins of other events that we will get further inputs from the stakeholders, [inaudible] to providing a final report by the second quarter of 2017.

Thank you. So, if there are any questions, I can answer.

Yeah, Jamaica.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Lasantha, when does this survey close?

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: It will close by 28th of November. It's not a lengthy survey but it is designed to capture the key points and it's an online service so it is not very difficult. Please make your contributions. And they seek contributions from all stakeholders including sister organizations like CTU. So Nigel, we would welcome your inputs.

Yeah, Cook Islands.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Lasantha, the work in progress that you're doing, is it limited to members of the CTO?

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: When you say work, the ODD study is open for all stakeholders. Actually, we have started sending invitations to the key stakeholders from Commonwealth and Non-commonwealth entries. We [want to] get as many, diverse [users] as possible.

And even other activities, CTO activities are open around Commonwealth countries. Obviously, there are some slight difference but Non-Commonwealth countries are most welcome to participate.

If that is the case, then can I ask Mark to go to the next item, which is the Commonwealth's plan to the IGF.

MARK CARVELL: Yes, thank you, Lasantha.

IGF 11 is coming up pretty quickly. It's in Guadalajara on the 6th to 9th of December. Indeed, there is a Commonwealth Open Forum on day four, so that's the 9th of December. And, the agenda is something that was still working on, I believe.

Lasantha may be able to provide the update on that. But for speaking specifically to the Commonwealth Open Forum, which

is in effect our Commonwealth Internet Governance Forum because we don't have a standalone event for the Commonwealth Internet Governance Forum but we have a website on the courtesy of the CTO.

But before turning to that, just recounting where we are with the IGF because the IGF is now into the new phase, if you like, following the renewal of the mandate for ten years – its' been for ten years, previous mandate for a five-year period. The General Assembly in New York have renewed the mandate. So this is following that.

It's also following implementation of a whole series of improvements of the IGF in particular with regard to it producing tangible outcomes. This is in four forms. I think firstly, best practice fora. There are four on ISPs, IPv6 transition gender and cyber security, so we've got four best practice fora. They have been worked on intersessionally with inputs from the national and regional Internet Governance fora and other expert stakeholders.

So they produce outputs in terms of best practice. Some of those four will continue into next year, presumably cyber security will continue.

And secondly, you got the Dynamic Coalitions. There are 16 coalitions of stakeholders, some involve in governments. I just

point out for the Commonwealth context. There is one on connecting the unconnected and also one on Internet of things.

Thirdly, you've got a program of work now into the second phase enabling access for the next billions that produced, documented as the outcome of this first phase and now it's being worked on in terms of actual scenarios and practice on the ground, if you like, to increase the numbers of people with access to the Internet.

And then, the national and regional IGFs are now 65 including 40 national ones. Many of them include Commonwealth countries and they are coming together much more effectively now and producing direct inputs into the global IGF agenda and there's also the opportunity to share best practice, something which the Commonwealth initiated two or three years ago as I recall how to set up a regional Internet Governance Forum, how to set up a national IGF. So you got that.

Workshops by the hundred workshops out of a record number of 260 proposals. Registration so far is about 1,200. Many opportunities to participate remotely in the past, the numbers of participants has doubled if you take into account remote participation to over 4,000 I think in [inaudible].

So, look at the opportunity to participate remotely. If you can't actually get to Guadalajara, this information on the IGF website about that.

Just quickly scanning the program, which is now pretty much fixed. Day one include sessions on Asia and Next Billions Connecting the Disconnected. Day two include sessions on my workshops on linguistic and cultural diversity, collaborative security. This obviously tend to be issues of the great interest to Commonwealth colleagues. The African Union has a workshop on – was maybe an open forum on day two.

Day three, there's a roundtable on the Small Island Developing States and Internet of Things for Sustainable Growth. Day four, we have a Commonwealth Forum but there are also sessions on Cyberspace for Youth in Asia and Africa, Solutions for Sustainable Development Goals, Small Cities in the Global South and so on.

So, there are a lot of developmental and capacity building workshops that the IGF does a very rich program in that respect.

So, I'll stop there but you're going to comment on the actual agenda for the Commonwealth forum, Lasantha, yup.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Just two pieces of information. One, the UN [inaudible] is on 9th December from 9 to 10. Around the end of the agenda, it has four primary aims. One is to inform stakeholders of the work of the Commonwealth within the Internet Governance Forum.

Two, to follow-up discussions started at IGF 2015 in Brazil particularly on encouraging great engagement by Commonwealth stakeholders, just the point we raised about GAC engagement.

Three, to [inaudible] regional and national best practices pertaining to potential rule of Internet Governance in inclusive and sustainable growth.

And four, is to inform stakeholders of upcoming activities that [inaudible] basing Internet Governance and we will develop an agenda along these lines and it will be sent to all stakeholders very soon.

Thank you, Mark.

MARK CARVELL: Yes. Thank you, Lasantha. I neglect you to my one further point about the IGF agenda and that there's a workshop on the We Protect Global Alliance on Child Online Protection. This was some initiative that the UK started but we now have Canada and Namibia, New Zealand and Nigeria as partners in this global

alliance, and of course, we're looking for more Commonwealth members to join that. So, I hope you will take away a note of that opportunity to hear about the progress of this global initiative on online child protection and the opportunity for Commonwealth members to join and for stakeholders to support it.

So, I'll finish there. Thank you. Child protection.

Just to further points on online child protection, the Commonwealth IGF as some of you may know develop a child protection toolkit, which John Carr here was a major contributor to. So, that's on the website of the Commonwealth IGF.

I don't know, John, do you want to say a couple of words about the possibility of refreshing that and coming back to it at the Copenhagen meeting for an update? Thank you.

JOHN CARR:

Yeah. I mean, that was written four years ago now I think. Certainly, it was written before We Protect came in to existence. One of the key things that we protect is [inaudible] apart from distribute money is develop the model national response, which I think is one of most comprehensive blueprints for how to evolve a national strategy around online child protection.

So, I've wrote – I talked to Mark about this the other day. I've written ICMEC because they would join [authors]. That's the international Center for Missing and Exploited Children who are based in Washington, D.C. to ask them if they will join with me in writing an update in time for Copenhagen.

Apart from anything else, they have also updated their statistics and data on how Commonwealth countries have been legislating to deal with some of the online child protection issues. So, at Copenhagen, if we can [inaudible], that will be an up-to-date picture presented.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Hey John, can I ask one question? Now, as you said, this toolkit was developed about four years back and I know it was showcased around Commonwealth. Do we have a measure of to the extent it has been adopted by member countries?

JOHN CARR: I think ICMEC are doing some qualitative assessment of the work that's being done in different countries in relation to implementation. If not, specifically tied to the toolkit but more generally, which also where [inaudible] same thing. But I have no idea how far they've dealt with it. It's a very tricky difficult thing to do.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Thank you, John. Are there any other questions about IGF? Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thanks. Mark, you were talking about the Commonwealth having initiated some work on developing Internet Governance for maybe three years ago. Was that in the context of the global Internet Governance Forum or was that something different and we might be able to find information on that? And also, the child online thing you were just talking about, is that on a Commonwealth Internet Governance Forum site or Commonwealth Secretariat at site or where? Thanks.

JOHN CARR: Thanks very much, Nigel. Yeah, the Commonwealth IGF as a concept developed as an opportunity for Commonwealth stakeholders for more constituencies to get together during the global IGF, during the UN IGF. So that's how it's always been. We've had a Commonwealth IGF profile, if you like, at the global IGF. It's been in the program. We've had it most years over the last, last ten years. So I think there was one year we had to miss out.

So, there's never been a standalone event. One day, hopefully, we may have somebody stepping forward to offer to host a standalone Commonwealth IGF event. We'll see.

So, the information about all of that and the outcomes of previous the work, the child protection toolkit and also the Commonwealth Cybercrime Initiative, the CCI, that was a product of the Commonwealth IGF discussions during the global IGF and that launched the whole process of setting up the Commonwealth Cybercrime Initiative where we brought together CTO, ITU, Council of Europe because of the Budapest convention, the UN Office of Drugs and Crime and ICANN, and many other partners to come together in the Commonwealth Cybercrime Capacity Building Initiative.

So all of that information is on the Commonwealth IGF page on the CTO website, Lasantha. You can go to it and see the toolkit on online child protection and then I think that's a link to the CCI. I haven't checked it recently but CCI had its own – eventually had its own website. But yup, so it's all there.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: But definitely, the Commonwealth IGF site is available on the CTO website. People with the previous material and with the way it's updated, it will be posted there. Jamaica.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm aware that the ITU also has a child online protection initiative and has had one for some years. So, what are the synergies, if any, between the two? And I think we fall and find ourselves in the same kind of situation that we always find where we have several organizations doing the same thing.

So, that's just an observation what – I mean, the question I was asked, what has been the takeoff but then when you have two separate organizations, you may very well know one and not know about the other, and then you may have buy-in into an ITU and so people might not take up the CTU because it might be seen as duplication. I don't know. But I throw that out as a question and an observation.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: Before I hand over to John, CTO actually was a member of [cope] initiative of ITU, the child online protection and actually CTO and ITU did a joint project to promote the [cope] initiative in five West African Commonwealth countries. So we work very closely with them.

The toolkit was developed separately and would I ask John to give [inaudible] some comments on that.

JOHN CARR:

I work very closely with the ITU, I've done for many years and still do. I've just finished a piece of work with them looking at online child protection policies in 15 Southeast European and Baltic countries.

You're absolutely right about the points about duplication and no question about that. From a policy point of view, in other words, the kinds of things that the ITU is suggesting or advocating or promoting, there's almost no difference between what they're saying and what is in the toolkit and the work that we're all doing.

Different organizations develop with different people involved with them and they just go and do their own thing. It would be wonderful if we could say to everybody, "Leave your badges at the door. Let's all concentrate on one big initiative." But it just doesn't work that like that but it is very annoying.

Apart anything else, nobody has got the travel budgets all the time to attend all of them even if they wanted to. And if they did, they'd hear the same things.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS:

Yes, [inaudible] to that. We do not try to promote one of the other. What [do] comes first and what there is more appropriate, we try to promote it. And actually, the very first days of the

toolkit, CTO was not exactly nor very close [inaudible] it. And actually, CTO was working closely with ITU on the [inaudible] initiative. Now, that CTO with the common element between these two, they should be able to harmonize activities and make sure that there are synergies and then stakeholders do not get dragged in two different directions. But thanks for that point. The point [is] taken.

Any other questions? I think then we can close it on that basis. We budgeted far for now but we spend one hour. I thank all... Oh, I'm sorry, Canada, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you very much. I won't hold anybody very long. I just wanted to perhaps make a suggestion for future meetings and it sort of picks up on the thread mentioned earlier about engagement for Commonwealth GAC Members.

And I think the updates on past events are sort of useful reflections. It may also be helpful in terms of enabling engagement to take a more forward-looking approach and inform on upcoming opportunities or ongoing work at ICANN that may be of interest to Commonwealth GAC members and how to engage.

And I think Henri did a great job of covering key areas of focus for the GAC. There are also other opportunities and other parts of the ICANN Community. And I know Mark, you sort of mentioned the CCWG on ICANN Accountability post-transition.

There's also a working group that is or will develop a framework or a mechanism for the allocation of new gTLD option proceeds. There's also work on the use of three-letter country codes at the top level. So these are just maybe some things in addition to other I guess opportunities to consider. Thank you.

MARK CARVELL:

Yes, thank you. Thank you very much and this is a very valid point I think. We're doing some of that. We will provide more focus I think at future meetings and online.

We do have I think have one action point on the action proceeds working group that we discussed earlier, so I think I look forward to receiving the views of colleagues on there to how the Commonwealth as a voice on – can engage on decisions about motion proceeds. Thanks.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS:

Again, thank you very much for that point, yes. I take the point because people will not simply take part unless there is something of interest. We will help to identify sort of the key

interests of stakeholders and then [inaudible] assistance so that access a bridge for them to engage in a wider ICANN policy debate. But you have a follow-up question, I suppose.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, I just wanted to clarify that it could also be in an individual capacity as well. Thank you.

LASANTHA DE ALWIS: So thank you very much and on that note, I close the meeting. I thank everyone for being here at this late hour and I thank to my fellow presenters. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]