

---

COPENHAGEN – Internet Governance Public Session  
Thursday, March 16, 2017 – 09:00 to 10:30 CET  
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, ladies and gentlemen. We'll start in about, in a couple of minutes. We really need to get a move on.

Okay. Derek, are we okay? Well, good morning everybody. This is a meeting on the cross community working group on internet governance. This is a public session. We still have a few available spaces on the table, so if anybody wishes to move from the seats at the back over to the table, that would be absolutely welcome.

We have a good agenda today. My name is Oliver Crépin-Leblond, I'm one of the co-chairs of the cross community working group on behalf of the At-Large Advisory Committee. We have apologies, for the time being, from my colleague, Rafik Dammak, who is the co-chair for the GNSO Council. He is currently in a meeting and will join us later, and I believe that [inaudible] the co-chair for the ccNSO will also be joining us soon.

---

*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.*

---

We have an agenda that's changed a little bit from the published agenda on the schedule. Due to the unavailability of people and sort of double bookings and so on, but people will be coming in and out, as the session progresses. The agenda that's on the screen now, and shared in the Adobe Connect, is the one that we will be following.

So, just a quick update first on the charter drafting and the year review, last year's review. And afterwards, we'll start digging into the main internet governance issues for 2017. After that, we'll have a review of the main outcomes on internet governance, so looking back at 2016. I know it doesn't make sense. We should have looked at 2016 first, and then gone into 2017, but that's due to the unavailability of panelists.

And then finally, we'll have a discussion on, sort of wider discussion on the priorities for the CCWG, taking into account the new global political agenda. And goodness, is that agenda getting more and more complex out there. We have interpretation in this room with English, French, and Spanish. So, you may also express yourself in either one of these three languages.

And if, when you take the floor, you can say your name, that will help with the transcripts and also with people on the interpreted channels. So first, let's start with a quick... Well, first I'll open

---

the floor... Nigel, is there anything else that needs to be said at this point in time? I know that there are a few logistical issues.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes. Thank you. Nigel Hickson, government engagement. Thank you very much for coming. We'll circulate a piece of paper, because we're high-tech here, which we would like you to sort of fill-in, say you're here. Anyone that wants... Anyone that's not on the cross community working group would like to be involved in the discussion, please leave us your business card or just let me know your details, and we can add you to the list.

And we'll also provide in either during the course of this meeting, or on the mailing list, the links to what Olivier is going to talk about in a minute, which is the charter draft and the 2016 year review. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Nigel. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. And so, now let's go to agenda item two and we'll first speak about the charter drafting. So, the history of the working group is such that the original charter that was drafted, was drafted pretty much in haste due to the NetMundial that took place, I think, nearly simultaneously as the working group was being created.

---

The GNSO Council noticed that there were some discrepancies between the charter and the new guidelines on cross community working groups. Since our charter predated the cross community working group on cross community working group guidelines as such. We put together a small group of people from the various component parts of our working group, and they put together a table of the charter, as it stood, with the guidelines, and started amendments, very diligently going line by line, and therefore bringing in any missing parts and perhaps mending or changing the parts that were not in line with the guidelines.

After some work, we have reached a new charter, which is not vastly different from the previous charter, but certainly respects the cross community working group guidelines. And this has been sent, I admit, a little late to the chartering organizations. And I remind you, there are only three chartering organizations: ccNSO, GNSO, and ALAC. And so far, and in our meeting yesterday, we haven't had any feedback yet on the charter, but it appears that it has been received.

And the chartering organizations will hopefully be coming back to us soon with their feedback. It is still a draft, which means it's open for discussion, and I don't know if anybody wished to take the floor on this specific topic, whether there was any points that anyone wanted to make at this point in time.

---

The charter was distributed to the cross community working group on internet governance mailing list. Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE:

Marilyn Cade speaking. I'd like to... My purpose in making an intervention at this point, is to highlight one of the unique aspects of this cross community working group, and I call to your attention, I think there are two unique aspects and it is that we... It's very hard for us to pick an end date. And I think you'll see, after this morning's discussion, that in fact, with the rolling nature of continuing emerging issues on internet governance that are affecting ICANN in the internet ecosystem, that it's very, very hard for us to predict an end date.

And I just want to reinforce that point. And the second thing is that the other cross community working groups have adhered to a more fixed allocation of roles. And we have chosen not to do that, but to be, to treat all of the active participants, first of all, the list is open to sign-up to, but we actually treat the observers at the same level of participation as we do the participants.

And so, participants do have a responsibility to carry messaging back to their, the sending community, and to be responsive about informing them, but we are... I think it's one of the unique factors about this particularly cross community working group and to me, given the topic, it's very, very important that

---

we remain constantly open to new participants and observers joining. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Marilyn. Anyone else? Okay. Well, just closing off on the charter, one of the amendments was to focus the work of the working group a little more than in its original draft, and in addition to this, there are additional deliverables, the working group will be supplying at more regular intervals.

There certainly is an emphasis on each one of the co-chairs to relate back regularly to their chartering organization, and to advise them of the work and inform them of the work of the working group. I think communication might have been one of the factors for the misunderstandings that there really wasn't very much going on in the working group, whilst really this has been a very, very busy year indeed.

Talking about the very busy year indeed, looking at the year 2016 review, moving on to that, this has also been sent to the chartering organizations. I hope that it has been distributed among those organization's members. It has been sent to the working group's mailing list as well. It's a document that was drafted by an external contractor with the input and the help of the working group members.

---

And it looks at the, it's structured in several ways. First, it provides some information as to where to find information on our website, various materials that are online. Then it goes through the events and activities that were arranged and organized by the working group. Looking at the WSIS Forum, the [inaudible], the IGF, the face to face meetings, the conference calls, the mailing list discussions, etc. So, it provides both a set of statistics, but also a list of the topics that were addressed during each one of these calls.

And it really serves as a good way for anyone who hasn't been following closely, what the working group has been doing, and catch-up with activities, so as to be able to be more active in the near future. It also has a list of the working group members and participants, and also this fantastic, well, we say fantastic now because there is so much of it, a diagram of forthcoming activities, which shows quite a crowded calendar ahead of us.

In the annex, we have just a bit more detail on the working group activities and areas of interest, prior to 2016. Since as Marilyn said, this is a continuum, rather than a start and end scenario. And in the annex at the back, there is this timeline that we've been speaking about. Speaking about a timeline, Marilyn Cade has been going around sharing a sheet with tons of information about what's going on. We will be referring back to this, I think, throughout the meeting today.

---

So, if you haven't got a sheet, then have a look. If your neighbor has one, we have a limited number of copies that are available. I was going to open the floor for any comments on the review.

Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE:

Yes. Perhaps we should be more direct in our ask. For each of you who are in a supporting organization or an advisory committee, I think it would be really helpful if you personally could take a look at the report, and raise it with your executive committee, to make sure it is taken up on the agenda. People are very busy when they're here, and we both still welcome your comments, but we really need to move this forward, and you are really the best ambassadors to take it up with your executive committees.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. I don't see any other hands up. So, just Nigel, if I could ask you, will we have links to this report in the chat by the end of this meeting?

Okay, we will. So, Nigel is currently working to try and work out a link to put into the chat, and including for remote participants. Okay. Well, then we can move to agenda item three, looking at the main internet governance issues in this forthcoming year.



---

Quite a few things going on. We'll have three parts, or several parts to it.

We have the working group on the CSTD, the WSIS Forum, the IT expert group on international telecommunications regulations. The World Telecommunication Development conference, the G20, the OECD work on internet, the high level political forum in New York. The United Nations GGE, I don't even know what that is, and the launch of the Commission on the Stability of Cyberspace. There has been, in the past year, a multiplication of these groups.

It has become increasingly hard to cover all of them, but thankfully, we do have several members who are directly involved with the work taking place in each one of these groups, and it is our aim to call upon those people. And experts that are with us to be able to enlighten us as to where we are, and certainly focus, I think, on some of the threats that we might see to not only the internet governance ecosystem as we know it, the multistakeholder ecosystem, but also, how that would affect ICANN in particular, since ICANN is the center of this ecosystem.

So, starting with the CSTD, the working group on cooperation. I will turn over to Ambassador [inaudible]. Welcome.

---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. Well, good morning everyone. And thank you, Olivier, for the invitation to come. Well, I would like to, very briefly, speak about this working group on enhanced cooperation, which I have the honor to chair. This working group was established by the United Nations General Assembly meeting, high level meeting, that took place in December 2015, to review the overall implementation of the outcomes of the World Summit Information Society.

So, happily we call it, in abbreviated form, WSIS plus 10, because the [inaudible] is so big. So basically, it seeks to pursue the notion of enhanced cooperation, that emanates from the Tunis agenda, in the understanding that the two distinct processes will launch in Tunis, the IGF and the IGF, as you know, has been developing over the years. This year, the 12<sup>th</sup> meeting will take place in Geneva.

So, the IGF has been consistently making incremental developments, programs, as I think will be highlighted later on. On the other hand, enhanced cooperation is a process that was called for Tunis agenda, but around which there are different interpretations. And I think here, maybe, is the main problematic aspect of those discussions, because although there are some commonalities in the understanding of what is enhanced cooperation, basically relating to the language that is contained in Tunis agenda, paragraph 69 to 71, which contains

---

elements such as public policy issues, and link the indicate that what is aim is to assist governments in a global way to engage, and to discuss, and to deliberate on public policy issues pertaining to the internet, but not the day to day operations.

So, there are some elements, of course, those come from the Tunis agenda, so there are some commonalities, but a part of that, there are huge differences of interpretation of the very meaning of those words. So, even the definition of what would be the public policy issues, what would be the scope for this effort, how governments should relate to other stakeholders upon trying to establish ways to deal with the public, so that those are open questions and they are different interpretations.

So, this is part of your discussion. This working group is being called [inaudible] two dot zero, because it follows, in some way, on the steps of the first working group on enhanced cooperation that was established a few years ago, and developed its work between 2013 and 14.

And a part of that, there are many previous efforts in that regard. But there is no, unfortunately, no agreed outcomes from those meetings. My personal opinion is that those meetings have assisted us in having a better understanding, but there is no, let's say, common consensus agreement emerging from those meetings. So, this adds to the difficulty of those working group,

---

that is trying to make a contribution on how to and provide recommendations to the United Nations General Assembly through the [inaudible] on how to further implement this concept.

In December 2015, when we were discussing this in New York, there was a general feeling that in spite of the differences of interpretation and understanding, that many things have taken place since 2005. And that there is increased cooperation at the national level, at the bilateral level, regional, global levels. So, there is a sense that things have been moving on.

However, there is also a perception that certainly, some [inaudible] could be made, some ways of doing things could be improved, that the interactions should be improved. So, the mandate is rather challenging from that perspective, we are trying... We are working in an environment in which there are a lot of uncertainties and among different participants, very strong and different positions.

The working group is a multistakeholder group, so it's not, we think it's representatives from government, but also from civil society, private sector, academics, so it is aimed to, by design, to be a multistakeholder group. And the timeframe we have is to finalize our work by early next year, sometime around January, early February. So, this would be in time for our input, for our

---

output to be taken to the [inaudible] and through the [inaudible] to the General Assembly.

So, it is a challenge task, the ambition of the exercise is quite high. However, in the light of the very big differences among stakeholders, I would not raise too many expectations. I think we can make incremental gains in the understanding of trying to form consensus and agree among ourselves.

But, as I have said, there are differences, even with regard to the definitions, to the scope. And maybe more importantly, on the vision of the institutional improvements that should be made. For example, one of the main sticking points in which there are very concrete differences refers to the need to establish one, this is defended by some participants, one single organization or one single process to deal with all internet governance related issues from a fractured point of view.

Even taking into account the different processes and forums, but some parties defend, we need one single home for discussion of internet governance issues such as, for example, we have for health and other issues. And back on the other side, this is completely rejected by most known governmental stakeholders, since almost all non-governmental stakeholders, and also some governments.

---

So, it's really challenging environment. Nonetheless, we are pursuing our work. We had, last year, preparatory meeting, and then we decided to work on the basis of contributions that would come from participants and from the community, wider community, that we would base our work on the basis of this contributions in terms of framing the issue.

So, this has been done, and this year, in January, we met. That was the first substantive meeting. We started to discuss the concept and to structure the work. So, that first meeting, and here, again, emerge these differences, so we had quite some time discussing even how to structure the work, but on the basis on the contributions, we're able to establish a document, a compilation of recommendations at the end of the day, what we have been tasked to do, to provide recommendations.

And my best expectation is that at the next meeting that will take place in May, we can revisit this document, go through the recommendations, and there are different categories for different recommendations. For example, some addressed to national countries. What should national governments do to improve their capacity to participating enhanced cooperation?

They need to force a better coordination among the existing processes and foreign mechanisms, and of course, some other more controversial dealing with the framework. So, my best

---

assessment is that we can identify areas of consensus, in which there will be maybe some general agreement, and that we can build our understanding and maybe work towards having some more commonalities in areas that are more controversial.

So, this is my take for this. And then we'll meet again in September or October, and again in January. So, I would like to take this opportunity to invite all of you, because this working group is open to participation from outside, from observers, both in present and by remote participation. So, the meeting will take place from 3 to 5 May in Geneva, just before this year's [inaudible] session.

And all of you are invited to come and contribute, and which will lead to help us to move ahead in the understanding of what that means, and what can be done to improve the overall work of the system to the benefit of all of us. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. And at the table, we also have Marilyn Cade and George [inaudible], who is taking the place of Thomas Snyder for the time being. Probably for the whole sessions on these issues. The floor is open for comments and questions. You're actively encouraged to take part in this.

---

This, by the way, is supposed to be quite an interactive session. So, please do not hesitate to take the floor and ask your questions and comment.

As I see that Matthew Shears is joining us at the table as well and Rafik Damak has also arrived in the room, after his previous meeting.

I don't see any hands up. Oh, there is, okay [inaudible] for remote participant, and then I'll turn over to the mic in the audience.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Olivier. Good morning. I have a question from [inaudible]. "What is the working group [inaudible] to ICANN work and mandate? If there is any."

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: Marilyn Cade speaking. Thank you so much for that question, and I see that we have another hand back here that I will just call to your attention, Olivier. Maybe I'll make it a little broader, because this working group, in particular, I think has direct implications for ICANN. And I am one of the five representatives



---

from business. So, the Ambassador made reference to the fact that there are also stakeholders who are participants in the working group.

But the reality here is that, all UN organizations are member state organizations. In fact, the CSTD is a quite unique commission, because up until 2006, the mandate was to focus on, is the advisor to the UN through another UN organization, [inaudible], on science and technology for innovation. In 2006, after the conclusion of the world summit on the information society, it was given a second responsibility, and that is WSIS follow-up.

And I say that because I want to put into context why this working group is important to ICANN, because its parent body, the Commission on Science and Technology for Development, is very important to ICANN because of its assignment for follow-up of the achievements toward creating an information society for all. ICANN, when we set it up, and I was very much involved in that, understood, remember we had many fewer users on the internet.

There were roughly 147 million users on the internet in those days. When we set it up, we had a sense that we had to recognize, yes, we had a technical mission, but we also have to understand how policies that relate to the technical function of

---

ICANN, will both affect the technical function, but also affect a larger world.

And this working group, thinking about how can we better improve how governments interact with each other, how governments interact with other stakeholders. Should there be a single umbrella? The debates that we are going to have will include proposals from some, to move some of ICANN's functions and activities into other bodies. I can hardly think of an activity going on, as the Ambassador said, there is no unanimity on this, but I can hardly think of anything more important for us to participant in, then a discussion about where the work that we're responsible for should be done.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Just to compliment what Marilyn has said. I think this question relates to the difficulty I was mentioning before, related to the scope of work. Some participants argue that ICANN should not be part of the discussion of the enhanced cooperation, on the basis on the language of Tunis that says, enhanced cooperation does not encompass the day to day operation, the technical aspects.

So it would be more, let's say, political public policy aspects. But there are different views, different views and the last, the first edition of this working group, the one dot zero, identified

---

different categories of what would encompass those public policies. And one of those referred also to the management of resources.

So, there are different views. I think the... That relates directly to the issue, whether what is done at ICANN involves, and to which extent public policies that should be the mechanisms, that we should be improved among governments. So it's, again, part of the challenge we have to, even to shape the discussion, is to define whether or not we include some aspects related to ICANN's work. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Let's go down the queue. So, next is Richard Hill, who is in the audience.

RICHARD HILL: Yeah, thank you. Richard Hill here. I think you said you weren't sure what the GGE was. The government group of experts, they're working on security issues and they're part of committee one in the UN, and it tends to get very political and the big differences of views between kind of the Western countries and the former Soviet countries and China. Thank you.

---

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Richard. In fact, Tatiana actually already just slapped me for not knowing that acronym, but there you go. We have, at the end of the table, you're next.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. I'm [inaudible] from Tunisia. And I would like to agree about the [inaudible] of the process, regarding governance at the IGF, and to the reinforcement of the cooperation. If you remember well, the IGF is coming from a compromise that was formed at the last minute between the Tunis phase of the SMSI, and there was the [inaudible] one work that was done at the same time.

So, I would say it would be logical, it should be logical that we play a compromise, that we find a compromise with those two axis of work, in order for us to cooperate more. I did propose that the IGF is an opportunity for [inaudible] at the agenda every year, the issue of more cooperation, reinforced cooperation. I do think that this issue of collaboration shouldn't be isolated.

It should be associated at the multistakeholder level and dialogue.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Let's keep going with other comments. Chris [inaudible].

CHRIS:

...English. Chris [inaudible] from the RIPE NCC. I just wanted to note, well, I guess in the spirit of some wider participation in this group from the ISTAR community, the RIPE NCC actually made a contribution to the open consultation period that this working group had late last year, and that was in terms of developing the scope of the group's work.

And I think it probably is very much in line with some of what the ICANN community and ICANN organization interests in this discussion would be. I just [inaudible] myself here, in summary in the document notes, while cooperation amongst all stakeholders is vital in developing internet capacity, it's important that these efforts focus on practical benefits.

And that they may be minimally distortive or destructive to the shared platform that is the internet. So, I think that's a perspective from, well, at least a technical organization. As I say, this was on behalf of the RIPE NCC rather than the RIPE community, but I think the RIPE community is also paying attention to this, and well, depending on our community discussions and we have our cooperation working group co-chair here in the room today as well, we may, we will be following work in this area and may contribute further, as is available to us. Thanks.

---

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Chris. Yes, please go ahead.

OWEN: Owen [Inaudible] technologies, here on advisory council and speaking strictly as a member of the community individually. Many years ago, the United Nations decided that it wanted to help the internet and they sent ITU representatives to IRR meetings, to talk about how the UN could make internet numbers more democratic.

And we discovered that, in fact, that would make them much less democratic, because the UN is very much centered around the idea of one country, one vote, people don't count, countries do, and the size of the country doesn't matter. They get one vote no matter how many people they represent, or much of the world they represent in terms of land mass or anything else.

This is an incredibly big opportunity to disempower the community, versus the multistakeholder group process. And I think we need to be very, very weary of each and every one of these now multiplied pieces of UN attempt to gain some portion of control over the internet. Most of them are largely led by governments that are not big fans of free speech.

---

Most of them are led by governments that are not big fans of internet freedoms, and of the freedom of people to associate and communicate as they wish. The internet is the single biggest and best tool ever, in the history of mankind, humankind, for the democratization of communication and the ability of individuals to communicate and freely associate among themselves.

We must not let that go.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Owen for these inspiring words. Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: Chris, so good to see you back here. Marilyn Cade speaking. I want to make a comment directly in response. You know, when I first became involved in working in the UN family of agencies, I knew nothing about them at all. I just knew a lot about what my own business unit, AT&T World Net, and AT&T Computer Services cared about. Here is what I found in my experience, and particularly more recently.

While much of that may have been true in the past, I think we have a different problem now, that I want to elevate to everyone. And that is, we need to demystify much of what we're

---

doing, and put it into language that is understandable by the person who is all of the sudden, given the assignment of dealing with internet governance.

And we also need to understand that actually, their lives are very much like ours. They too are juggling 27 different things at the same time. So, I think we have a long to go in actually opening up some of the thinking, but I think we have an obligation, not just here at ICANN, but elsewhere, to talk layman language, and to put the complexity of what we do into the kind of language that is about why it matters to them.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right. Okay, we'll need to get a move on, but I'll let [inaudible] have the mic, and then we'll continue with the rest of our... Okay, perhaps...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Olivier. Just to add what Marilyn just said. I agree completely, and I would to actually say that these forums at the UN is trying to come up with, should actually be used by us to extend the understanding of what ICANN is doing actually. And the fact that the first phase of the working group on enhanced cooperation actually almost, I mean, come up with, failed to



---

come up with a satisfactory result, worked actually in our favor to educate the governments.

So, in the spirit of multistakeholderism, those forums should be yes, watched, very closely watched, but also could be used to enhance the multistakeholder perspective of those such governments.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I want to very briefly touch on a few points. First, I think the point raised by Tunisia is very important, because at the UN, the UN resolutions on this topic have consistently called for the two processes, IGF enhanced cooperation to pursue through distinct process, but in a mutually reinforcing way. So, it is completely consistently, that for example, IGF should also discuss enhanced cooperation, seek to contribute [inaudible] those are different focus of different ways, but they should work together.

We certainly conclude them. In regard to contribution, first contribution, I would like to say just the effort from what I see ends at something that will not be disruptive. It is completely, I think, illogical and unrealistic to think that anything that can be done in the UN context may impact directly, for example, what is taking place here or elsewhere.

---

Different [foreign?] processes have different governing mechanisms [inaudible]. It is, I think what is aim is to put something in addition to what we have that can improve the overall functioning of the system. And in regard to the UN, of course, being a diplomat and having served at the UN, I tend to take a positive view in regards of what is done there.

Although we know the short come isn't sometimes some things that are not completely maybe to the liking of everyone, but the UN is all of us. All of our governments are there, not only those governments that may be, in your opinion, against internet, but all of the other governments. So, the decisions that come from there, are decisions that take into account all of the different views.

For example, my delegation, we have been participating those discussion at the UN, sometimes with a multistakholder delegation. That took place at the WSIS plus 10. Brazil was there with a multistakeholder delegation. We made sure to include input from all parties, to make sure that our positions, that they UN reflected a multistakholder approach.

So, and the UN has been changing and trying to... I concur, we both [inaudible] should maybe work with countries trying to, and countries with you with all the stakeholders to try to do something better. This is the approach that we are taking. This

---

exercise and we certainly will try to contribute to that. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. And I would like to get moving, being mindful of the time. So, the next topic is the WSIS Forum. We've alluded to this, and [inaudible] has alluded to the fact that there needs to be some capacity building going on, some information about ICANN's activities about how we do things to inform and teach those heads of state and delegates that are not knowledgeable or cognoscente of ICANN's work.

In the third year running, the working group will be having a session at the WSIS Forum. The first year, we had a session explaining for the process by which the cross community working group on IANA stewardship transition was working, and of course, the overall IANA stewardship transition system.

So, it also included the regional, the proposal, the process by which the proposals for the IP addressing, and for the protocols had been put together. Last year, we had one on the accountability cross community working group, so the process by which we had reached consensus, etc., and this year, the we have just received confirmation that we're given a greenlight to have a presentation on capacity building programs at ICANN and elsewhere.

---

This is all work that is put together by the working group, and then presented using panelists that are funding their own way to Geneva, or that are attending in any way. And therefore, we hope to have the same impact as in previous years when the sessions were very well attended.

I don't want to sort of delve too much on the... Okay, perhaps a couple of words from Marilyn Cade and then we can move on with other pressing topics.

MARILYN CADE:

I'm going to just mention why the WSIS Forum is important to ICANN, because we are going to use it as you just heard, to do a workshop. But the WSIS Forum is focused on the implementation of the WSIS action lines. And now with the incorporation of the UN sustainable development goals, the WSIS Forum this year will focus on that integration.

The other thing that happens at the WSIS Forum, besides workshops, is a high level track of speakers drawn from different companies, NGOs, and academia, and the technical community, but a very strong focus on ministers, deputy ministers, director generals from governments. There is a terrific opportunity for high level participation, by the CEO and president of ICANN, as one of the speakers in that high level track, which is an opportunity also, I think, for ICANN.

---

And in the past, that has been taken up and I hope this year it will be again.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. And so next is the ITU expert group on the international telecommunication regulations, which I think are quite important. Is there a remote participant question or comment?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, one person has raised and it's [inaudible]. So, I don't know how she will...

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [Inaudible], did you wish to say something briefly?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, very brief. WSIS has a hackathon, so I'm going to throw an idea out there for this group to participate. We have this quite interesting material, which can be great to reorganize and rebuild on, and I think it would be a first for a working group in ICANN to participate in a hackathon.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Marilyn?

---

MARILYN CADE: [Inaudible], thank you for the compliment, but I'm not turning that chart over. You should read the caveat on it.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So, the ITRs, international telecommunication regulations. Some of you might have heard of the world conference on international telecommunications, the WCIT in 2012 in Dubai. These are regulations that are primarily telecommunications, but at the time of the discussions, there was some push from some countries to bring into the regulations a whole component part of internet, including IP addresses, domain names, root servers, etc.

History... If you don't know the history, it's all out that with very different people having various views of what happened, whether anybody walked out, whether there was the serious decent, or whether it actually all was fine. But there is now a working group that has been put together to prepare for the next, potentially the next WCIT at some point.

I'm not sure who wishes to add something to this, but perhaps should we...? Nigel? Okay. Nigel Hickson.

---

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, good morning. Just very briefly. So the IT, the last plenary conference in 2014, passed a resolution to setup a working group on international telecommunication regulations. This working group that met earlier in the year in Geneva, and will meet three or four times before the Council session in 2018, is not to draft new regulations in any sense at all.

It's a working group to look at the current situation where some countries signed up to the 2012 international telecommunications regulations, where a lot of countries still abide by the 1988. So, there are two sets of international telecommunication regulations, 1988 and 2012. And one of the tasks of this working group is to look at the, whether there is any problematic issues, contractual, legal, commercial, in countries having two sets of these international telecommunication regulations.

This working group will report to council. Council then may decide, of course, to have a discussion, or member states might decide to have a discussion at the plenary petitionary in 2018, as to whether a new process, a new [inaudible] should be forthcoming. But that's some way off. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. Judith Hellerstein.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, this is Judith Hellerstein for the group. Nigel, will the group also be looking at the five countries, mostly Caribbean, who never signed on to either of them?

NIGEL HICKSON: Just very briefly, yes. I mean, the group is looking at a number of things, and one thing they are looking at is whether, because of the developments in the markets in a number of countries, and because of the development of telecommunication networks and more open access of networks that have now been introduced in terms of IP networks, etc.

Whether, in fact, any regulations are pertinent to the international telecommunications. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. Olivier speaking. Suffice to say that this is still very early days, but this work will eventually lead to another conference on international telecommunications, and it has to be monitored very closely in this working group is certainly doing so, because rather than end up with another furor, flamboyant display in a few years' time, maybe things can be worked on early on.



---

So, I think we can just move swiftly on to the G20 and OCD work on the internet. For this, maybe Nigel, do you wish to follow-up? Or, who is more suited?

NIGEL HICKSON:

I mean, we can briefly mention it. I know there is a whole host of other issues on the agenda. So, I think the significance is that in recent years, the G20 and G7, which are primarily, of course, governmental groupings, have opened themselves up to some forms of multistakeholder input. And this year, under the presidency of Germany, the G20 group held a multi-stakeholder conference on ICTs and telecommunications and the internet earlier in the year, in Germany.

And on the 6<sup>th</sup> of April, we'll be having a multi-stakeholder dialogue on ICT issues, especially digital transformation, ahead of the ministerial that will take place on the 7<sup>th</sup> of April. So, this is an opportunity for organizations like the Internet Society, ICANN, and others to have an input into this process, and to comment on the action papers and the communiqués that will be produced. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. Okay, I'll give the floor to Marilyn and then speak on the process. Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE:

Thanks. Marilyn Cade speaking. I think we probably need to be a little bit clearer when we describe a process in the G20, G7, OCD, and other UN organizations that are now saying that they are multi-stakeholder. And just distinguish about the different way that stakeholders are invited to contribute into those activities. What's going on, which is a good thing, but it is a hierarchal thing, is that representatives of different stakeholder groups are now being invited as panelists or, to have special dialogues with the G20.

I organized a side event in Korea for a B20 meeting. But there is a limited number of representatives that are ever able to have access and input into those settings. So, one of the other things that I think we need to think about, is why should ICANN be there?

Well, ICANN will be one of the groups who will be able to have that high level interaction, while most of us will not make into the small group of different stakeholders that are interacting. Now, I'm not saying this is a criticism, I'm saying it as a point of information, because many governments have begun to hold consultations in preparation before they go to these meetings.

And 17 years ago, when the G20 was founded, the only ministers who met were the finance ministers. That has really evolved and

---

changed, and because of their focus on digitization, the internet, online technologies, and the impact of technology, is very much on their radar screen.

I'm just going to mention one other top priority for the G20 this year. By the year 2050, there will be 9 billion people alive on the earth. And we will need be able to feed all of them. So, you know, we might think, well, there is no role for the internet in solving that problem until we think about E-agriculture. So, I think that just having an informational brief on this, perhaps even thinking about putting more information up on our website to explain what's going on, briefly, at these activities, and why ICANN will be following them and attending them.

Olivier, it make sense for us as a follow-up to this.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you, Marilyn. It's Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. And the way that the process has worked, which is that ICANN staff is attending these working groups. They relate the information and what's going on, within of course, if they are allowed to relate back, if there is public information they will relate it back to the working group.

If there are decisions or comments that ICANN wishes to file, then the comments are usually shared with the working group

---

ahead of the comment being filed, and feedback taken from the community. So, the working group does act as a good bridge between the ICANN community and those external processes, and keeps everyone in synch so as to be sure that everyone is aware of what's going on.

I'm mindful of the time, yet again. We have several other topics in that subsection, like the global commission on the stability of cyberspace. Is there anything to sort of focus on immediately right now? Otherwise, I probably suggest that we can move on.  
Tarek?

TAREK:

Thank you. Tarek [inaudible] for the record. I just wanted to comment on the G20 event very specifically, because it has been an initiative from the German government. They have invited ICANN CEO, Göran Marby. He will not be able to go to the multistakeholder on the 6<sup>th</sup> of April, so he has asked Nigel and myself to represent him, and probably use [inaudible] from the Board will also join us.

I think our participation is vital, since they are really discussing issues that are indirectly touching on ICANN's remit as well. There is an excellent report that has been issued by the G20 with the OCD on the 12<sup>th</sup> of January about digital transformation.

---

And it is quite comprehensive and quite useful. And when I went through it, I saw that in many aspects, whether in areas related to internet of things and other areas, it touches on ICANN's remit, sometimes directly and indirectly. So, our presence to be in the room, to make sure that wrong factual information are mentioned is important, and in order to let me provide feedback as well to the ICANN community and ICANN Board, about what's going on there.

So, being part of this dialogue is extremely important, because I consider them as a locomotive of the [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tarek. [Inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes. We have a question from Peter. “Do you think that G7 and G20 [inaudible] of ICT are more practical [inaudible] than the [inaudible] in wider UN forums?”

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: Let me... I'm sorry it's Peter who... Oh, just Peter, sorry. And would you...? So, the question is, are the declarations coming

---

out of the G7, the G20? Are they more impactful than the resolutions in the UN? Is that the question?

[SPEAKER OFF MICROPHONE]

More practical. The G7 and the G20, we must remember, are the most developed industrialized and emerging economies. And the... They have a significant focus on the issues that relate to financial stability for the world. As they are developing materials, they are very well supported by economic analysis, and by the kinds of thoughtful examination that you would expect, because think about the fact that the OACD is contributing, and they have significant expertise, as we all know, in certain areas.

So, the recommendations that come out of the G7 and the G20, tend to be, first of all, at a fairly high level, but also take into account how each of those economies is going to implement them. And I think that's a major difference to me, because the resolutions that are passed in the UN agencies are very, very often trying to guide further work. And these declarations that come out... Remember that the G7 and the G20 worked together on an ongoing basis.

The summit is where they issued the main declarations in June. Probably most of you don't have the time to read the materials, but they have an excellent website, and I would refer you to it,

---

just maybe on a pick and choose basis, and you'll see some of the background information that's there, that's very, very informative to all of us.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. Mark [Carvel].

MARK [CARVEL]: Yes, thank you Olivier. Good morning everybody. Mark [Carvel], UK government. There was mention of the G7, and just for the information at the meeting, the G7 ICT and industry ministers meeting takes place later than the summit. Takes place in Turin in September 26<sup>th</sup> of September, on the theme of making the digital economy and society inclusive, open and safe.

We've had a concept paper from the Italian president of the G7, and the first [inaudible] meeting. I wanted to lead UK officials in that process to prepare for the ministers' meeting. It will cover issues relating to free flow of information online, intellectual property rights protection, cybersecurity, skilling up businesses to engage in the digital economy, transformative technologies for industry, AI, robotics and so on.

There will be a ministerial declaration, and we expect a kind of action plan. The day before the ministerial meeting, there will be a multi-stakeholder conference, so you might wish to bear

---

that in mind, and that will, the idea is for that to feed messages into the ministers' meeting, so there is some interaction with the wider stakeholder community on digital policy and so on.

So, we're just starting the preparatory process. There is an overlap in terms of common areas with the G20. There is a separate G7 cyber track, which is looking at very high level cybersecurity areas in particular, threats and mitigating actions, but that states can take to deal and address those threats.

So, that's basically what the G7 agenda is, and I hope that's helpful, and please bear in mind that there will be that multi-stakeholder conference in Turin on the 25<sup>th</sup> of September. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Mark. I'll let Ambassador [inaudible] say a word, and then please be very brief, and also to [inaudible] afterwards.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. There is briefly, just to add to G7 and G20, the importance of [inaudible], the work that is being done in the OCD. And I think the importance of the outcomes and the documents that are producing those, let's say, more smaller environments, in relation to what is taking place in global



---

environment, is that it provides very good information for discussions take place in an informed environment.

We are participating very actively at G20, in preparation for the G20 summit, and also in OACG. OACG, for example, is engaging in what is called the horizontal project that will encompass the assessment of digitalization across all sectors. We think this is a very important development, one we wish to follow. And OACG is also servicing in a way, the G20 meetings.

So, it is very important, the expertise, the quality of information that emerge and that is very helpful for all of us upon discussing things and making decisions as appropriate. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Javier [inaudible], please.

JAVIER: Briefly. Javier [inaudible] for the record, ALAC. Just a question for anybody that's willing to answer. Has there been any different or any change in position officially, by the United States that we know of? The new administration, regarding any of the issues, you know, that we are discussing? Any official changes, whether it's the UN representative, or any other, you know, regarding prior postures? Thank you.

---

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now, that's a question. Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you so much for that question. Instead of answering it directly, I'm going to give you a very quick update. Key positions in the relevant agencies are not yet fully in place. And you know, we're very lucky in the United States that we don't have a turnover at the managerial level, but we have, of course, turnover at the political level.

And there are a number of positions that held the responsibility for, for instance, you know, we're all here very familiar with Ambassador Danny [inaudible] from State, and Larry Strickling from Commerce, and some of the FCC, FTC, etc. Some of those positions are still being filled. So, I wouldn't expect there to be any major declarations or change, announced change, until those positions are filled.

But they are moving rapidly now.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. Now, I'm going to change the topic over to the IGF. And Switzerland is hosting this year's Internet Governance Forum. I was going to turn to [inaudible], I get it

---

right now, [inaudible]. What can we expect in Geneva, besides wonderful Swiss hospitality?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello. Good morning to everyone. My name is [inaudible]. I'm with the Swiss government, GAC representative, and also involved in the organization of the IGF this year in December in Geneva. While the dates, they are fixed, it's from the 18<sup>th</sup> to the 21<sup>st</sup> of December. It's in Geneva. It's at the [foreign language], the seat of the United Nations in Europe.

And in a way, it's also going back to the roots where the World Summit for the Information Society started in 2003. So, I guess that you are all familiar with the IGF, and if you are not, the IGF is one product of the World Summit of the Information Society, probably one of the most important ones. It is a multi-stakeholder forum, which started to work in 2006.

And in 2015, its mandate got renewed by the United Nations for another 10 years. So, after the excellent start in Mexico last year, in Guadalajara, we are now in Geneva, having the second meeting in the new 10 year mandate.

You could expect that I tell you what we are going to discuss at the IGF, but the beauty of the IGF is precisely that it's really multi-stakeholder. So, it's up to you to make the program of the

---

IGF. Not only you, of course, because the IGF is there for the wider internet governance community, but for sure, the ICANN community and all related more technical communities, communities related to the DNS are key in this work.

As a host country, our role is to help that the IGF works well. That there is some catering. That everything is very well organized. And that people find their way to meetings and so on and so forth. We're working, of course, with the IGF Secretariat because it's a special occasion that we are holding the IGF in the premises of the United Nations.

So, we are very closely working together with the IGF Secretariat, [inaudible], whom most of you will know, with the Chair of the MAC, of course, Lynne St. Amour, and with [inaudible] all the involved agencies. So, really this is a call on you, if you want to have an excellent and exciting this year, the call for workshop proposals will be out there in the coming hours, I hope, and will be online until the beginning of May, we as Switzerland, we can try to give ideas, but we cannot, of course, shape that program.

We helped a little bit in shaping the title for 2017 IGF, which is shape your digital future. So, it's underlining that it's in your hands to do that. We would like to shift a little bit, if possible, also program and the contents to cover some of the digital

---

transformations in politics and economics, and the rules that govern the digital world.

But again, it's up to you to come up with excellent proposals, and to for the multi-stakeholder advisory group, to develop the program. What can I say more? We had a first preparatory meeting two weeks ago in Geneva. We will have the next meeting after all of the workshop proposals come in between the 13<sup>th</sup> and the 15<sup>th</sup> of June.

And the same week as the WSIS Forum. So, you would be all very welcome to attend that preparatory meeting, and to help in shaping that program. And in Switzerland, we are of course, very, very happy to host the IGF. It fits excellently also with our national efforts in this realm. We are having the third Swiss IGF on the 30<sup>th</sup> of May.

We are having other events, building up to a national conference on digital policy in November. And so, the global IGF in December will be a very good opportunity to really make all the national, and of course, all of the international debates converging in Geneva in that week. So, I'm open for questions. I think that Mark was... Who, by the way, as you surely know, played a key role in establishing the IGF in the beginning, wanted to say something.

---

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Mark [inaudible] please. And if I could ask you also to perhaps to [inaudible], well quickly into the review of the main outcomes of internet governance [inaudible] 2016. I know that Nigel also has a quick report on this, but over to you Marcus.

MARCUS: Yes, thank you. I was just going to provide a broad perspective on the IGF, and I'm speaking in my capacity as the chairman of the Board working group on internet governance. I gave this purpose perspective yesterday at the cross community working group on internet governance, but I think it's worthwhile to bring to the attention of the broader community.

We had actually, at a Board workshop in early February, we had a session discussing the IGF. And I'm happy to report there is very broad support of the Board, of the IGF. We really collectively think it is an important event, and we reaffirmed the importance of ICANN to continue to support the IGF financially, as the ICANN has been doing for the past 10 years.

ICANN is the biggest contributor to the IGF trust fund. Because non-government contributor to the IGF trust fund. As you may or may not know, the IGF is funded through volunteer contributions that has been shaky throughout. I mean, it's not that easy to get the funding for the IGF in place. And the host country, obviously, play an important role for funding the

---

annual event, but the ongoing operations are all funded through volunteer contributions.

So, the Board, again, has strong support for the IGF, and we see the IGF as an important event in the broader internet governance landscape as it helps to promote and to consolidate the multi-stakeholder model of internet governance. That clearly is in the interest of ICANN, and we have also seen as a sort of subsidiary effect, that the IGF is also an excellent place for recruiting new members into the ICANN community.

We have seen that also at this meeting, there are people who attend the first ICANN meeting, because they are drawn into the ICANN world through the IGF. While that is not a main objective for ICANN's participation, it's a welcome subsidiary side effect. So, again, the Board is fully supportive and are very grateful also for the work that ICANN org does.

And to your other question, we have noticed is, internet governance is not over. The transition has been an important event, and it's an important stage in the evolution of the internet governance landscape, and it goes on. Before the IGF was the only kid on the block, but there are now many, many different initiatives, and we touched on those from G20 to the global group of experts. So many things are happening.

---

The question arises then on the scalability of ICANN's engagement, and that's why I think it's also important that the whole community is involved, and that we do it also through our respective, other organizations, that we are engaged. That we keep spreading the message.

As a Board, we have worked out with ICANN org sort of filter for the engagement. There is three types of engagement. One type is where we really take a lead on issues related to the DNS [inaudible]. The second stage is more the supportive engagement, where we support other organizations like Internet Society in defending and promoting the multi-stakeholder internet governance model.

And the third, it would be more selective engagement when issues are being discussed that also touch on ICANN, such as human rights, but we are clearly are not in a lead position or security touches on DNSSEC, for instance, but we clearly are not a cybersecurity agency.

So, these are has been proved useful filter for selecting the type of engagement that again, these types... It's fluid. I mean, sometimes, you think it may be a type two engagement, just all different then it turns all of a sudden into a type one, when DNS issues come to the floor of a conference. But this is just a very broad overview, and again, to sum up, the work doesn't get



---

diminish it gets more. And thank you all for being engaged.  
Thanks.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Marcus. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. And just to add that the cross community working group has been actively engaged with the Board working group on internet governance, and we therefore coordinate our actions, I think, pretty well, ever since the creation of the Board working group.

Kaili Khan, very briefly please, and then I think we'll have to move to agenda item, well the second part... I don't know if we missed anything on agenda item four, but perhaps five afterwards. Kaili Khan.

KAILI KHAN: Yeah, thank you, Olivier. Kaili Khan of ALAC. Very briefly. Just, as I see ICANN and other NGOs, worldwide international internet organizations, like IGF, ISOC, etc. they highly compliment each other. Okay. ICANN, the strength of ICANN is executability. It is in charge of domain names and internet addresses.

So, what decided by ICANN will be implemented, executed. On the other hand, however, ICANN's weaknesses is that it only has a very narrow field, and also, as time passes by, the domain name and address becomes more and more off the central stage

---

over the last 30 years, and even more so as more and more apps come to the front stage. Okay?

On the other hand, like IGFs, ISOCs, they're very proud range of issues covering about everything about internet governance. However, it doesn't have much of an executability. Because it's not, doesn't have any teeth, or is not in charge of anything, that area that has to come along, get along with. Okay.

So, therefore, I will see, I would [inaudible] more and more cooperation between ICANN and IGF, and ISOC, and other international NGO or MPO, internet organizations. And maybe, even eventually from different backgrounds they might even come together to be just one organization in charge of the overall internet governance.

And as I see that might be a bright future for us. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Kaili. And Nigel. So, is there anything that we haven't touched on in the main outcomes of the IG front in 2016? Because I know that we've spoken ahead in 2017, but a lot of it has been covered already.

---

**NIGEL HICKSON:** Thank you very much. This is Nigel Hickson. What we'll do, as time is short, we'll post onto the list the, just a record of the various consultations that have taken place in the working group have contributed to, there in relation to the CSTD, the enhanced cooperation working group that was mentioned, the ITUW, the TSA discussions that took place last year, and the ITU open consultations on the enabling the environment and the developmental aspects of the internet. Thank you.

**OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you, Nigel. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. We have five minutes left. If I could ask if the interpreters could remain another five additional minutes with us, it would be... I see, thumbs up. Thank you so much. I love you guys. So, let's go over to the discussion on the internet governance priorities for the cross community working group.

There are quite a few of them. We have Matthew Shears with us and Tatiana [inaudible], who can perhaps focus on some of the upcoming things that we need to focus on. Should we start with Matthew? Or Tatiana, okay. So, each is pointing to the other. Tatiana, you're in the hot seat.

---

TATIANA:

Thank you very much. Tatiana [inaudible] speaking for the record. Well, okay, I will go to some particular challenges which I'm dealing with, and which I'm foreseeing to influence the internet governance environment in the next year or few years. And I want to make a caveat in the beginning. I don't think that ICANN shall engage with all of these issues, no.

But I do think ICANN, as an organization and ICANN as a community, should be informed about them, because they, in my opinion, they might threaten the multi-stakeholder model of governance. And one of the priority issues, I think, is of course, cybersecurity, because cybersecurity in a narrow ICANN mandate, of course relates to stability and resiliency of the domain name system, but cybersecurity is a much broader issue which collates with the multi-stakeholder model or concept of the internet governance.

And as it is not regulated, kind of internationally, some of the governments think that they can lay their hand on this issue, and promote, for example, via ITU, via EGG global group of governmental experts on cybersecurity. How this will go, I cannot predict, because I don't know how the political landscape in the world will change in the next few years.

And I believe that the discussions in the ITU will depend on this. But what we see now, like for example, recently, we saw the

---

China strategy for the internet governance, and security and stability. So, I believe that the cybersecurity governance might affect multi-stakeholder models, and it's not like I'm [inaudible].

If you, for example, look on the level of the European Union, there has been a conventional wisdom for like last 10 years, the cybersecurity issue should be governed in a multi-stakeholder manner that we need public/private collaboration on cybersecurity. What happened at the end last year, you approved the national, sorry, network and information security directive, which is pure non-multi-stakeholder, which outlies the governmental interventional regime, for many of the entities which were not regulated before.

It's absolutely unprecedented. And I see this strand of moving more to the regulation, of moving more to the governmental intervention, as something that might, at the end, affect ICANN. Because if they're now regulating, let's say, cloud service providers, ISPs and so on. They might regulate at the end, registries and registrars, this is the first point.

Second point, we will talking recently at the NCUC session about what we call shadow content regulation and [inaudible] like for corporate issues and so on, and the notion behind reaction in the ICANN community coming up with some core and self-regulatory measures, for example, for addressing copyright

---

threats, the notion behind this, we are reacting to the pressure from the governments.

And if we are thinking in the cybersecurity context, we never know what kind of pressure from the governments will be tomorrow and what kind of pressure ICANN community will have to react to. Well, and my last point, I'm sorry, I probably took a bit longer. The cyber sovereignty concept, because if you look at position of some of the countries, they do outlay this as one of the main goals, that they want cyber sovereignty.

And while some of these issues implications will not probably affect ICANN itself, like for example, civil liberties, human rights, they will affect the development of the internet apparently, but where I see correlation of the issues of ICANN is infrastructure, decentralized, centralized, the technical issues of the infrastructure. And the more pressures from the governments, we will have heading towards cyber sovereignty, the more the technical issues, technical environment ICANN is operating in would be under pressure, or even under threat.

So, I will wrap up now. I think that we have to be informed about these issues, and not only we have to grasp these and see how it goes, without maybe engagement, but we also have to channel the ICANN multi-stakeholder governance model to that

---

community, so this has to be conveyed as well, that there is multi-stakeholder model. It works.

It works here, here, and there, and maybe you can leverage. Thanks a lot.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Matthew Shears.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Olivier. Matthew Shears. Tatiana has put her finger on something that's very important, which is the increasing diversity of issues that we face in the internet governance space. And Marcus said it very well when he said internet governance isn't over. I think the temptation was, after the IANA transition, to say, oh, we're done. We put a little bow on internet governance and move on to other things.

Unfortunately, that's not the case. If anything, it has become more challenging now, because the issue of internet governance is spread into so many different dimensions, and when we have NATO declaring that cyberspace is the fifth domain of warfare. You know that this means that we have to pay attention to an increasing range of issues.

---

But as others have said, it doesn't mean we have to be involved in all of those issues, of course. So, what is the...? Bring it right back to the question. So, what is the role of the CCWG? We really have a number of challenges in front of us, as you've heard, ranging across a huge diversity of forums and processes that was highlighted earlier on. But at the end of the day, when ICANN as a core entity in the internet ecosystem, we have no choice but to watch for issues that are coming up.

Just to give you a sense, they may have been touched on before I came, I apologize coming late, but issues such as digital object architecture, issues such as IOT standards. These are things that we need to pay attention to, and should be on our list, whether or not they're priorities, I think we have yet to determine, but they are certainly issues that should be on the list.

We have a real need to coordinate internally, but we also have to take into consideration that our objective, certainly as a part of the CCWG IG is really to inform the community, to really share our understandings of these threats, and opportunities, and challenges with the community so that there is a greater understanding of what the issues are.

These are also should be, just this work should also be performed by a cooperation for the coordination with the Board working group. I think there is great opportunity to share



---

experiences and share understanding of what those challenges are. So, I'm hoping that will be a key highlight of the work going forward.

And we can't do it without you. Somebody else has said it in the chat, at the end of the day, we need the community to bring issues to us to look at. We need your information from people working in standardization bodies, from people working in policy spaces, that we might not be aware of, to bring those to the community here, to bring them to the working groups, so that we can then consider them and assess them in terms of the opportunity or threat level.

And I think that's something that we're going to have to do on an ongoing basis. It's not something we can do on an ad-hoc basis, and certainly for myself, speaking as somebody who has participated in CCWG, I see this as a great opportunity to play a very valuable role going forward in this increasingly complex space called internet governance. Thanks, Olivier.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Matthew. We have one minute remaining in our extension. Jim [inaudible].

---

JIM: Sure. Jim [inaudible] for the record. Just wanted to note one thing that I think is a change from previous sessions. Usually this is held at 6:30 in the evening. Look at how many people are here. So, thank the scheduling gods and push forward at a more reasonable hour going forward.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jim. And with this, I think we've done a good enough [foreign language] for today. So, thanks to all of our panelists. Thanks to all of you who have taken part, members of the audience as well, and please continue to take part in the discussions on the mailing list, if you aren't part of the cross community working group, then please ask and we will be working something out to put you on there.

Thanks very much, everyone. This meeting is adjourned. Thank you. And thanks to our interpreters. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**