
ABU DHABI – Internet Governance Public Forum
Wednesday, November 1, 2017 – 12:15 to 13:15 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

RECORDED VOICE: November 1st 2017, Hall A Section BC, Internet Governance Public Forum, 12:15 to 1:15.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Ladies and gentlemen, we'll be starting in two minutes, two.
[AUDIO BREAK]

Well, it's not good morning, it's good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to this meeting of the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance, it's a public meeting. We had a face to face meeting yesterday of the Working Group and today we are going to be sharing some of the work of the Cross-Community Working Group with two sections in our agenda, the first one being an update on key internet governance activities and of course speaking about the report on this year's Cross-Community Working Group activities, and then after that, we'll be going directly into a discussion on why internet governance is important for ICANN and in what respect it is important for ICANN.

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.

Joining us at the table, we have a lot of people so I'm not going to go through a full rollcall, but just noting that Rafik Dammak, the co-chair from the Generic Name Supporting Organization is present with us, and I think that Young-Eum Lee, the co-chair from the County Code Name Supporting Organization will be joining us very soon as she's right next door.

Without any further ado, let's first go into the 2017 report of the working group's activities. There is a report which has been sent to the chartering organizations. I'm not sure if it's available on the website yet, on the wiki; maybe that would need to be done. Nigel, did you want to just go through the main points, please?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you very much. Good morning, Nigel Hickson, Government Engagement. We've commissioned a report for the 2017, which as Olivier has said, has been sent to the chartering organizations. It was sent out to the CCWG mailing list at the weekend and it will be available on the website.

Primarily, it factually goes over the activities which the working group has been engaged in, both the actual physical activities in terms of face to face meetings and presentations at the WSIS Forum, and also notes the interactions that the CCWG has had

with the organization and also with the board working group on internet governance. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I also wanted to recognize at the table Markus Kummer, the chair of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance, and also the incoming Board Working Group chair on Internet Governance, Matthew Shears.

Are there any questions on the report itself? I don't know if everyone has read it; it's a big question mark. Okay, well then since we don't have very much time, let's go -- yes, Farzaneh Badiei.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Thank you, Olivier. Farzaneh Badiei speaking. Can we make comments on the format of the report now or shall we do that on the mailing list?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Farzaneh, it's Olivier speaking. I don't want to get stuck in processes and things, format is probably something that we can discuss within the working group. Content I think is what we have to focus on today.

FARZANEH BADIEI: I just think content wise it would have been nice if it was not just explanation of the events that CCWG IG had organized; the purpose and why we are doing this as a CCWG IG would have been better as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Farzaneh. That's noted and we'll make sure we take this into account for the next report.

Now, we're at agenda item number three, and that's the update on the key governance activities since the last meeting in June, 2017. Summer and early part of fall, that's been pretty busy, as you can see from the list we have on the screen. We have various experts, people that have attended those different meetings and we'll start with first the ITU WTDC, which has happened in Argentina just in October, so very, very recent indeed. Nigel has just come back and unpacked his bags and will be able to let us know about what's going on, what happened there basically. Nigel Hickson, you have the floor.

NIGEL HICKESON: Thank you very much, Olivier. Again, a report of the WTDC was put to the Cross-Community Working Group, to the mailing list.

Now, I appreciate that people here that are not on the mailing list, if you would like to get on the mailing list please let us have your contact details and I'd be more than happy to send the report to anyone at all of course that wishes to see it.

Primarily, the ITU World Telecommunication Development Conference is the four-yearly conference of the development sector in the ITU. It's a conference where the membership of the ITU, which is the member states, 196 member states plus sector member and academic institutions come together to define the work program for the ITU, for the development sector for the ITU over the next four years and agree on a strategic outlook and various priorities that the ITU should be involved in.

Traditionally of course, because it's development, one expects a number of resolutions and work items concerning broadband, concerning connectivity, concerning affordability, concerning accessibility and a range of other issues. That's what was in the strategic outlook, very much ties the work of ITUD to the 2030 sustainable development agenda of the UN.

Our involvement as ICANN is in the regional preparation phase for these ITU conferences and that's how the program, that's how the proposals are formulated in the ITU regions, and our global stakeholder engagement staff and government engagement staff get involved in some of that preparation work.

At the conference itself there were a number of proposals that did touch on the domain name system, including resolutions on cybersecurity, on nondiscriminatory access and on capacity building on internet governance issues. Our mission clearly is to ensure that the work of ICANN is properly reflected, if it is reflected, and that things are not agreed upon which might conflict with the policy development process going on, or where possible, with the processes of ICANN. I think that was accomplished, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Nigel. What's the next steps?

NIGEL HICKSON: The next steps for the World Telecommunication Development Conference sort of ends; there's now on the ITU website, there's the report of all the resolutions and all the different plans that have been agreed, so that's all done so to speak. The working groups of the ITUD pick up the new program.

For us, the next steps are in terms of the Planning Potentiary Conference because every four years the ITU has a Planning Potentiary Conference which is more significant in terms of the sort of overall work program of the ITU and this is where they can address, the IT membership can address the constitution

and the convention of the ITU and we'll be involved in that preparation process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Any comments or questions? Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Marilyn Cade speaking, and thank you, Nigel, for that high-level report. I'm just going to ask for a show of hands of everyone else who may have been at the WTDC. I think it's important to note there's a number of other people from the community that were there. Now, I'm going to make an observation, as a member of the business community that up until this last year has attended all of the major discussion making conferences of the International Telecommunication Union. I think that might be a helpful observation.

When you ask what are the next steps, I think we need to develop a slightly better understanding of the working methods of UN agencies. This one in particular is a specialized agency and the working methods there have significant potential risk to the internet and to the stakeholders unless the governments, who are the primary decision makers there, are advised by other stakeholders before they go and informed.

Very, very often the delegates who attend are considered the specialist in that particular UN entity, and they often do not have access to the kind of expertise; even though they hold consultations, that doesn't necessarily mean they're hearing from the right people. I want to commend ICANN for being actively involved along with the technical community and others at the national level in helping to inform the preparatory process, but also to tell you that when things are not resolved and cybersecurity in particular was not resolved, that actually opens up a big door for that issue to be taken into the next big ITU conference as Nigel was saying, the Planning Potentiary. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. And I don't note any other hands up. Let's move then to the next section of agenda. Just noting that Young-Eum Lee has made to it the table as well, welcome Young-Eum.

G7 ICT Ministerial, back to Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thanks very much, Olivier. Just one comment, because I forgot and I do apologize, to say that ICANN benefited enormously from the relationship that we have with the RIR community and ISOC

on the ground at Buenos Aires and in the regional preparation process. We worked very closely with our colleagues and we're enormously grateful for that.

The G7 ICT Ministerial, I'll be very brief. We put a brief report around the CCWG list and it included the ICT Ministerial Declaration. The G7, I don't think one needs to explain that, traditionally, there has been a meeting of ITC ministers over the years at the G7, formally the G8. In the last two years, the hosts for the G7 have included a multistakeholder process in the ministerial conference. This isn't a multistakeholder process in the promulgation of the declaration of the ministers, but it's a multistakeholder conference, an opportunity to engage on the themes that the ITC Ministerial is addressing. This year was in Italy, had the chair of the G7 and the conference was in Turin on the 25th - 26th of September.

Göran Marby as the CEO had an opportunity to speak in the Ministerial conference and various members from the ICANN community were there as stakeholders and were able, in the last session of the day, to interact with the G7 ministers, which I think was useful. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. Are there any comments or questions? Wolfgang Kleinwächter.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you, Wolfgang Kleinwächter. I had the privilege to be there in the multistakeholder conference and I just want to share the information in the Ministerial Declaration, which was adopted by the ministers. You have a number of interesting paragraphs and one supports, expresses [inaudible] the NETmundial Declaration and the principles which were adopted in Sao Paulo.

I think this is an important signal that the ministers of the G7 put their authority behind this document; I think ICANN was deeply involved in the NETmundial Conference, and insofar we should probably be thinking forward to consider whether in the future there would be an opportunity to evaluate the outcome from this Sao Paulo Conference in 2014. Probably the IGF will take place in Germany in the year 2019 and the idea is floating around to use this event for a so called NETmundial Class 5 Evaluation Meeting. That means the Sao Paulo document did not disappear in the nowhere land, so it's still alive and I think it's important to have the support of the G7. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Wolfgang. I don't see any other comments or questions. Nigel, it was going to be the same question, next steps on this, what's the next meeting on G7?

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you, Olivier. Well, the baton gets passed on so to speak and I hope I get this right, it gets passed on to Canada for next year and discussions are taking place with officials and the various countries on what Canada may or may not do in terms of their ITC Ministerial, whether they'll have a multistakeholder dialog as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next, it's the International Telecommunication Union Open Consultation on Over the Top Internet Services. Judith Hellerstein.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, hello. This is Judith Hellerstein for the record. This was the open consultations of format that has been working to get included stakeholders from all the different areas. It's the only chance the ITU, the council working group is a closed meeting and it's only invited member states, and US and others have been working for a long time to try to get more opinions from

civil society, from public private, stakeholders academics, and so they pushed to have an open consultation.

This one was on policy considerations for OTT and it was one of the best held ones lately. It had over 70 contributions submitted and from a variety of stakeholders and regions. Ten of them were from government or public-sector entities, 44 were from the private sector or industry associations, 13 were from civil society, w from Academia and 2 from international government organizations.

The questions, they are framed around a series of questions, so the questions for the OTT were, what are the opportunities and implications associated with OTT? What are the policy regulatory matters? How do OTT players and other stakeholders offering app services contribute? What a process might be considered regarding OTT to help the creation of environment and with all stakeholders' ability to prosper and thrive? How can OTT players and operators best cooperate at local and international events?

Within here, there was a series of both those that submitted contributions and then also, at the physical open online consultation, there was a panel discussion and then there were the groups who submitted a contribution were able to present them from anywhere from three to five minutes.

It generally was a very good event on that part. It was very well received, especially by the members who were in the closed group. Some of the ideas discussed were about OTT's being able to bring considerable socially economic benefits, contributing to increased digital inclusion, promoting communication, promoting innovative services and applications and enabling the growth of entrepreneurship; and that they also have a role to play in the implementation of the 2030 development agenda.

They also talked about how OTT services can stimulate greater demand for broadband connections, but as usual with these things, there's several push backs from other countries who felt that OTT had led to a decrease in operator revenues and could have an impact on expansion of infrastructure. What also is more of a concern is not in the open consultation, but in the closed-door meeting where there were four contributions; two were made by Russia, one was made by Brazil and one by the US.

The Brazilian one was more of an information document, talking about the success of the multistakeholder meetings that were held prior in preparation for their contribution to the OTT and how they surveyed 77 participants from all sectors and resulted

in presentation of eight different contributions from either civil society, academia, government into the event.

The US reiterated the main takeaways of OTT and the benefits that OTT can bring on a country by country basis or in flourishing an environment that is minimal in regulations.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Judith, I'm going to have to ask you to shorten this a little bit, please.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Sorry. I think what the problem more is, is that some of the other states are putting in contributions of how this can infringe upon internet freedoms and on some of the internet governance that we're watching closely, especially as they are looking at opening up the planning part resolutions one or two to make certain changes on internet governance that could significantly have impact on the structure and issues that are concerning most to ICANN and to this committee.

The next one is open now on Bridging the Digital Divide and contributions are accepted until December 23rd and then they're going to have the consultation in January 22nd.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Thanks very much, Judith. Are there any comments or questions on this track? Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. I'm going to make this very, very quick. I think that in the interest of informing all of you, that it would be good for us to put into our next version of our document clear explanations of how these various things work. So rather than going into detail, what I'm taking away from this is, we should be more information into written form.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. That's noted as well. Jim Prendergast.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Thanks, Olivier. I thought what was notable about this one was the tremendous amount of participation from parties that typically don't participate in ITU activities. I think the topic obviously drew a lot of people in and I think a lot of people's eyes were opened up to how the ITU works and the opportunities for private sectors, civil society and others to participate on one day and unfortunately not on other days.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Bill Drake.

BILL DRAKE: I'll just echo that and say that often in the ITU it gets construed that this is simply a contest between monied players; you know, it's Telco versus Google or something like, and what I think was helpful was to have all the internet freedom type organizations, also speaking to the issue in a manner that was consistent. I think that it could no longer be presented as just this narrow interest that was being defended. I think that that's the kind of model of cooperation that has to be followed going forward.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Bill. John Laprise.

JOHN LAPRISE: Since the ITU is largely a black box within the actual consultation, do we do any evaluation to see what from the open consultation actually makes it into an end product? It would be interesting to see what effects the open consultation inputs have. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, John. Like statics and so on. Marilyn Cape.

MARILYN CAPE:

John, this is why I think that we need to do more written work. These are ITU council working groups, they are not working parties within one of the three sectors, radio, telecommunications and D. You all might think of this as being the whiteboarding, what's going on trend wise, how do the member states learn about new technologies or trends and then what do you pick out of that, that then goes back into each of the sectors because the actions are the resolutions, recommendations, those take place in the sector.

To your point, I will be on the record as having strong concerns about this working group because it seems this whole working group, the Internet Public Policy Working Group, because it seems to me to be a search for an increased role of the ITU in areas that belong elsewhere, but it also has an aspect to it of what is the connection with the underpinning technologies that legitimately the ITU does have in their constitution and convention. Maybe at our next meeting, we could actually plan ahead to delve more into that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. Judith, we need to push along now. We'll move to the next thing and that's UN CSTD Enhanced

Cooperation Working Group and we have at least a couple of speakers that have been very deeply involved, starting with Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca.

BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you, Olivier, thank you for inviting me. I have the honor to chair this working group on enhanced cooperation [inaudible]. Just before reporting on it, I'd like to refer to what was stated by Wolfgang, [inaudible] going out of my way just to acknowledge and to praise you for this initiative towards making NETmundial plus 5 happening in 2019. I think it's very important to keep alive this period and the effort that led to NETmundial. We are really thankful and we'd like to be involved and look forward to that.

In regard to the working group on enhanced cooperation, of course that relates to the mandate or the process that is referred to in the Tunis Agenda, coming from the World Summit on the Information Society. There are a number of paragraphs that refer to enhanced cooperation, but maybe I should just point out paragraph 69 of the Tunis Agenda, which states, "We further recognize the need for enhanced cooperation in the future to enable governments on an equal footing to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues pertaining to the internet but not in the day to day technical

operational methods that do not impact on international public policy issues.”

I was not there at the time, but I hear from people that were that that kind of language and together with other portions of the text, was carefully crafted to address difficult issues in a way to resolve it from the perspective of what was there, but the meaning and the extent which this should be read remains at, until today, 12 years later, still that there’s no consensus on what we mean by enhanced cooperation’s.

What is the scope? Whether or not it has already started? What areas would be encompassed? How governments would -- since there is a very specific focus on public policy issues, so there’d be a [inaudible] for governments but how this would relate to the multistakeholder format? How are the non-governmental stakeholders who participate? Whether we need or not some new framework to address enhanced cooperation?

All those open questions and the discussions we have had in the group reflect very wide sometimes differences among participants in that regard. This group was mandated by WSIS plus10 and exactly trying to shed some more light on those issues. It is a multistakeholder group, so not only governments but representatives from all stakeholders are there. I see around

the room a few participants, including ICANN, GNSO and others also that have been participating actively.

The group is open, not only for the members but also for observers, and I make my best to offer opportunity for all to participate because we are mandated to try to reflect a diversity of views and to develop recommendations on how to further implement that concept. There is an understanding that those recommendations should be adopted by consensus, that's part of the consensus we have but there's no consensus on how to reflect the diversity of views. So I am about to prepare a first draft of the report because we have to conclude our work by late January, early February next year.

We are moving from the phase in which we have heard many recommendations, we have discussed extensively recommendations; we are moving to a phase, a drafting mode. There are a few issues I will have to address in regard to the various inputs we have.

Just to conclude to say that from the perspective of governments, this is a very important process because since this was a process proposed by the WSIS together with IGF, IGF would be the second distinct process launched by WSIS.

For Brazil we see there is a very strong interest in showing that enhanced cooperation is also developing, is also progressing because, in a way, especially when we are working in a governmental setting, there is some kind of frustration on the part of many countries that the IGF, that is the multistakeholder process that has been developed over the years, we are now had it to the 12 sessions of IGF. That has been showing progress and evolving, so there is sometimes the frustration with enhanced cooperation that would be aimed at assisting governments in regard to address internet related public issues has not had the same evolution.

As I said, there are different opinions on that; some think there has been evolution on it, but it is important I would say for governments as a whole to have this perception that things are moving in both processes more or less in an even way. This is what we aim because as full support of the multistakeholder models, we want also to show there is progress in something that is very important and dear to many governments, also as a way to show that this is something that should be seen in its entirety, both legs of the processes that were launched by WSIS.

At this moment in time, at this point, I would have to say we expect more best progress. They'll not be ground breaking progress because differences are very wide apart in many

important areas, but we hope at least to provide recommendations that could serve as a basis for further progress that would provide some incremental gains in regard to the shared understanding of what enhanced cooperation means and what should be done to further implement it. I'll stop here and see if there are any questions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Ambassador. Let's turn over to Jimson Olufuye for a business perspective.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Olivier, and good afternoon, everyone. My name is Jimson Olufuye, I'm the chair of the Africa ICT Alliance, based in Abuja, Nigeria. My day job is running [inaudible] and I've been involved in IG issues since 2010 and been involved thanks to this wonderful lady here. I dive into ICANN and I've been hearing recently that she would like ICANN to evolve in IG; why not? Why should that question ever arise because it's so critical.

As the distinguished Ambassador mentioned, at the WSIS Forum 2003 2005, two key resolutions on IGF. IGF has been moving on very well but the second track, enhanced cooperation has been stalled and we're trying to find a solution to the deadlock. So I

want to use this opportunity to appreciate his Excellency, Ambassador Fonseca for the very unique way he's steering this second stream of the working group on enhanced cooperation.

The first track was a deadlock, we made some progress but we didn't hit it on the head, and so that is why the UNGA constituted the second track, that is UNGA 2.0 with distinguished ambassadors leading, charring. I'm one of the five business representatives, and Marilyn is there, and I can see [inaudible] from the Civil Society, a very great participant.

ICANN is actively very involved. I've very optimistic that this time around there will be a resolution, because as the Ambassador mentioned, the key issue is how can governments on equal footing discuss international public policy issues pertaining to the internet. Of course, with the presence and full participation of all stakeholders, including business; I represent business, my business on the internet, the data center, what have you.

We are very much interested and had the privilege of making a proposal and I hope ICANN will support it fully. Making a proposal that look, we can actually resolve this because we have a system framework. There are two opposing sides, one says that there should be new mechanisms and the other says, "No. no, we don't want new a mechanism. Business we don't want a new mechanism actually because the cost is so much and we

don't want bottleneck internet because of the design is multistakeholder and it's subject to innovation, so we don't want any bureaucratic processes to stall innovation, so there has to be flexibility.”

But the other side said, “We want a new mechanism,” and the others said, “We don't want a new mechanism,” and that's where business stands.

Along the line, a proposal came that we actually use assisting framework and that is the the CSTD process. And CSTD already has a mandate actually because CSTD has a mandate on public policy; CSTD wants to consult with recommendations on public policy and internet public policy is a subset of public policy, so you can send it to ECOSOC, that is Economic and Social Council and the Economic and Social Council can always advise the UNGA, just like we now have what we call the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, which most countries bought into.

There is no form of [inaudible] that you must implement it just like we have the MDG 2015. Some countries fulfill that, but some other countries could not meet the target. Now we have another target, 2030 as you all know.

So, the summary is that we can use this assistant framework to serve the purpose pretty well. I believe governments should be

happy because they're already working and the business door is open. [Inaudible] for business to participate, at least since 2012 I've been participating in the CSTD activity and I can ask questions, I can talk to everyone; it's like on an equal footing as well. So, I think that might be a solution and one to [inaudible] your indulgence to support it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jimson, for this energetic intervention. We are running out of time, so I think we need to jump straight to the ISOC Global Internet Report on the future of the internet, and for this we have the pleasure of having Salam Yamout from the Internet Society.

SALAM YAMOUT: Thank you, Olivier. I'm the regional director for Internet Society in the Middle East and this year Internet Society has put a lot of effort into publishing this future of the internet report. 3000 interviews were conducted to global surveys. A lot of data, we talked to a lot of people in order to produce this report. That is important for us because how can you do the right strategy today if you don't know where you're going tomorrow.

The results are divided. People were not in consensus about the future of the internet. There's the optimistic people that

thought everything will be alright, but on the other hand the pessimist people thought that internet is entering a dangerous phase.

The report identifies six areas of impact and three drivers and three areas of impact in the internet; I'm going to summarize them. Internet economy is the first driver of change, so it's the way we see taxation, there's a lot of money now in the internet that makes it have a lot of power so a lot of people need to control it. That affects internet governance.

The second area is the role of government. We talked about the ITU and other governments now are more interested in the internet and how to regulate it. The third area is the technical area, the pervasiveness of that connectivity, artificial intelligence, internet and the physical world, that the refrigerator is talking to everybody, all the data that is already there, and this is really having profound impact on internet governance as well because today we count on laws and maybe in 20 years we'll be counting on ethics, so it's not going to be so easy to make decisions. Also, perhaps we need to have robots as a category in the multistakeholders committees.

The last area is cyber threats, cyber security. We all know that we might come to a point where it's going to be very difficult to

use the internet because of all these attacks. You can Google the report, it's online, I invite you to read it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. Next, we'll have Chengetai Masango from the IGF Secretariat who will be providing us with an update on the preparations for IGF 2017. Chengetai, you have the floor.

CHENGETAI MASANGO: Thank you very much, Olivier. I'll be quick. As you all know, the 12th annual meeting of the IGF is going to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, hosted by the Swiss government, 18 to the 21st of December, at the Palais. Off note, we're going to have an International Geneva Track, discussing IG and big data issues with organizations such as CERN, WHO, WTO and [inaudible], so we're taking advantage of all these organizations that are based in Geneva.

Just a few housekeeping announcements. Please, if you want to come to the IGF, please register now; we are working through the registrations as quickly as possible. The registration confirmation should be enough to get you a Visa and the Visa should be free of charge. If they decide to charge you for the Visa, please just come to us and we'll try and sort it out.

We still have the intersessional work, which is still ongoing, which is the best practice forums, the connecting in the next billion and the NRA sessions. For the badges pickup, you can pick up your badges from the Friday before the meeting all throughout the weekend.

One final announcement is that we're doing the renewal process of the Multistakeholders Advisory Group and the deadline there is 10th of November, so if anybody is interested in becoming a member of the IGF's MAG, please just go onto our website and be nominated or nominate yourself. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Chengetai. I think that is going to then bring us to the second part of our agenda. Although a little bit late unfortunately, but it's a big question, why is internet governance important for ICANN. We've got about 15 minutes to go through this. Adam Peake.

ADAM PEAKE: Good afternoon, everyone. I just wanted to follow up quickly on the IGF because this announcement relates to ICANN's activities there. ICANN will have a booth at the IGF and it's for all of the constituencies. If you have people who are attending the IGF,

then we would hope that at some point during the meeting, you'll be very welcome to use that as a meet up point.

In the same way as we're doing these ICANN meetings where there's an ICANN booth, we invite people to schedule a time when you would be able to come and speak, perhaps 15 or 20 minutes and we would try to publicize that, so that they would know that a particular stakeholder group AC or constituency was there at a particular time.

So I hope that as you give feedback from the CCWG to your various groups, you will let people know this available and also materials that you may have and may wish to share there, then we'll of course be very happy to make sure that those are distributed. There is the ICANN booth and we very much welcome participation from the organizations involved in the CCWG. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Chengetai?

CHENGETAI MASANGO: I have a couple of flyers; if people are interested in more information, just come and see me and pick one up, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. Just one last note which is that the working group has a multistakeholder governance of the domain name system, lessons learned for other IG issues workshop at the IGF.

We have someone in the back; okay, we really are pressed for time. I don't know if we have a mic?

ADIL SULIEMAN: I'll be quick. I just want to make an announcement; my name is Sulieman, with the African IGF Secretariat. Just want to make an announcement that the African IGF is going to be organized in Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt, from 4 to 6 December. The event is going to be preceded by two events. We are hosting also the African School on Internet Governance, as well as the North African IGF. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for that announcement, and Sharm el-Sheikh is a very nice location. Let's then move on. Oh, please no, we really need to move on. I'm sorry, Renata.

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: Very, very, very quickly about IGF.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, 30 seconds.

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: I am [inaudible] Steering Committee, and for the ICANN community, there will be a Civil Society pre-event and we would be looking forward for your involvement. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Renata. Let's go to our next agenda item, why is internet governance so important for ICANN? There's been a debate within these walls, in various parts of the community as to why it's so important and we felt it was maybe a good idea to have a discussion here.

Marilyn Cade, you've indicated you wanted to speak first and I was going to go over to Markus Kummer immediately afterwards, so Marilyn, you have the floor.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. Well, looking around the room I see a combination of some of you like me who's been around from the beginning or joined early in the journey, or many, many new comers. I'm really pleased to see all of you and in my view, I spend 75% to 80% of my time working in the multi-lateral world and in the

international governance world, but I also am a deeply embedded member of the ICANN community.

In my view, the reason internet governance is important to ICANN is because we want ICANN to succeed and we want it not to be misunderstood in its function, but we also need for it to affect the larger internet governance ecosystem; because what we do -- I recently used a teaching tool when I taught a internet 101 course to children ages six through twelve, and the internet teaching tool I used, because it so hard to explain what the internet is, even to us and what the internet governance environment is -- in my view, we want ICANN to survive.

The internet governance environment is very, very complicated, we are a part of it, we're not all of it and decoding that and figuring out where we work and why we need others and the rest of the ecosystem to understand where we work, I think is our biggest challenge.

One of the things I'm going to say is, I hope at our meeting in ICANN61, we will talk only about that and provide written reports on other things.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Marilyn. Markus Kummer.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Thank you, Olivier, and to follow up on Marilyn, indeed there were different views held in the community on how far ICANN should be involved in internet governance discussions, and one view was after the transition that internet governance was over and done. We heard also from Nigel and the report on the WTDC, this clearly is not the case and the discussions will be ongoing, and we also heard from Ambassador Fonseca about the discussions on enhanced cooperation.

We created a board working group on internet governance that has been active for 18 months by now, and we had worked with ICANN org to develop a strategy on internet governance, and the good news is the board has coalesced around this strategy and we have presented it also here in this group and they're also meeting, the board working group, with GNSO. The GNSO council wanted to know, is the Cross-Community Working Group actually important, is this engagement important and our answer unequivocally is yes, it is important.

The board has no opinion as to in what form this should be discussed and we had the joint meeting yesterday, but it is important that there is a Cross-Community engagement on internet governance. And why is it important for ICANN? Sometimes issues related directly to the DNS are on the

discussion, that is obviously the core of our engagement and there ICANN takes a lead position in addressing these issues and explaining the role of ICANN and maintaining the integrity of the DNS. There are other issues which relate more to the entirety of the multistakeholder system; there ICANN plays a supporting role and other organizations such as ISOC take the lead in explaining how the multistakeholder system works.

The third category, more selective engagement on issues which were maybe not on the radar originally, but which then gained an importance. Human rights is one of these issues and obviously privacy is another hugely important issue. We had these discussion throughout these ICANN meetings, and there ICANN needs to be in the room because it effects ICANN's operation, how the laws are implemented and how they are designed.

All this to say, yes, it is important for ICANN to stay engaged and the good news is, is that we do have a strategy which has wide support I think within the community. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Markus. Bill Drake is next.

BILL DRAKE:

Hello. Marilyn said she looks around and she sees a mix of people who have been involved in different ways. I've been involved in these public sessions for a decade, whatever; I tend to think that we see mostly though people here who are also involved in other aspects of internet governance. Very often when I look around the room, I'm seeing I know from the IGF and from other UN kinds of context etc., and the challenge I think is really that if we're going to do a public session devoted to the why question next time, we really need to reach out to the people more narrowly bounded, DNS industry and AP issues, and get them here because talking to each other about why this is important is redundant, because I think most of us get that already.

The one point I guess I'd make and listening to -- I watched the board working group session the other day and I said yesterday in the face to face, I really applaud the board for making that visible to us; it'd be nice to be able to reply to and talk in the chat, but okay, to listen was great.

I just want to emphasis that to me, these issues are indivisible, these three sets of priorities. Very often there are people, one runs across in the community, who tend to think that ICANN should only focus on the first set, that is to say when somebody is in the ITU or some other venue, making a proposal that

directly impacts ICANN's activities or the DNS, then we should participate but the rest we don't have to be too visible; and I just think it's really important to emphasize that the collaborative participation stuff and the selective engagement stuff, these configure the attitudes that feed into any policies or proposals that might be put forward with regard to ICANN's remit.

More generally, ICANN cannot thrive in isolation. The naming and numbering system does not live on an island by itself, it is integral to the internet. The internet is impacted by lots of things that are going on and lots of environments. We want to not only be defending ICANN from attack, but I think trying to help to encourage an enrichment of understanding throughout the ecosystem of the importance of multistakeholder engagement, of the importance of open internet etc., and it's really I think crucial that ICANN do that, and it's not inconsistent with the narrow mission of ICANN at all.

To me, this is low cost high value-added engagement that I think is really important. So I think that the argument about this needs to be made to the broader community, in a more coherent way that people will be able to grok and I think we have three months to figure out how to do that. I leave it there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Very wise words, Bill, thank you. Farzaneh Badiei.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Thank you, Olivier. I'm going to be very short. I think as Bill said, it is very important to be involved with these processes to emphasize on the importance of the multistakeholder approach and also, if there are discussions that are related to ICANN, to be present there and provide input.

Unfortunately, what I did not see in the discussion that was going on in the beginning, the relation that they have to ICANN directly or indirectly, and I think this group has multiple times been talking broadly about internet governance without considering ICANN and yet this does not signal to the broader community why we are talking about this at ICANN, and even sometime confuse the attendees of these sessions that we are about broader internet governance issues.

We should fix that, we should say why we are talking about OTC and other like enhanced cooperation when we talk about them in these meetings. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Farzaneh. For yet another perspective, Christopher Wilkinson.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Olivier. I didn't expect to be the last speaker and this not by way of conclusion, that is for the chair in a few minutes. I just wanted to reorient the discussion slightly from the point of view of improving the image and expectations of ICANN internationally, and particularly in the group of fora and entities that we have just been discussing.

First of all, I would say straight away that there has been, and I've been around for nearly 20 years in this field, there has been considerable improvement in the way in which ICANN is perceived. So don't take my comments as particularly negative, but I think there is work still to do.

Secondly, I recall that although for some of you at some stage or other, ITU has been perceived as a bit noir, if I listen to what [inaudible] and Steve Crocker said to each other last night, it seems to me that there is a great deal of fun, of goodwill and mutual understanding on which we can all draw in the future.

How could we improve matters? First of all, through my experience with several working groups, there is in practice some misunderstanding about the way in which ICANN reaches what is called consensus in all its forms. I think more work needs to be done on that, first of all to improve the

understanding of how consensus is perceived outside the working group, and secondly to, if I may say so, encourage some participants in the ICANN community to be a little less intransigent and to listen more to what is being said by the co-equals and participants in the work that we do.

Related to that, there is this question of for whom one is speaking. On the one hand, working group chairs often say, “We just take individual contributions;” this doesn’t really work. It’s quite clear that some of the contributions are directly motivated by the corporate and associative interests which have delegated the function of contributions to individuals yes, but not speaking really on their individual account.

It also puts government spokespeople in an awkward situation. I know from personal experience years ago, really a long time ago, that when I was speaking on behalf of the European Union, I occasionally felt irritated by the response that, “Well Christopher, what you have to say is just an individual contribution.” This didn’t go down particularly well with my colleagues and authorities who thought I had gone to ICANN to speak on their behalf.

We could however emphasize very significant improvements in the way ICANN works over recent years, and the most obvious one is the improvement in diversity of all kinds. I know there’s a

lot of people and I shared some of these views, the need to improve diversity further, but my goodness, compared with 10 years ago, just think what you have achieved, both in terms of geography and gender.

And finally, I would mention languages; I think the IDN program came in too late, but it is now up and running and one of the major tools that we have, which we can be extremely proud of, is the ability to facilitate the expansion of the internet world wide.

So, Olivier, I didn't want to sound negative. I hope I emphasized the positive aspects, but I do think it's important that vis-à-vis the scope of the interactions that you will be having internationally that we also be sensitive and indeed knowledgeable about how ICANN is perceived by the outside world. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Christopher. As you will have noticed, we have reached the end of our meeting. It was only a one-hour meeting. I'm sorry we didn't have time to have a full conversation. Perhaps, Jim Prendergast, you wanted to just make one intervention.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Yes, just before we depart. Markus, I'd like to thank you for all the hard work that you put into establishing the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. I think it was something that we all very much appreciate, and Matthew, the charge is now yours to continue the great work and I think everybody in the room looks forward to working with you on it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jim, for mentioning this. I was actually going to go even further and invite Markus to join the Cross-Community Working Group and internet governance since we've just lost a member to the Board Working Group on Internet Governance; what can you do.

Thanks very much, everyone. It's been a good meeting. Anybody interested in continuing and being involved with the work, there is a mailing list so you can come over to speak to Nigel and give your name. We hope to see you in the next meeting, bearing in mind, there is working going on to change the charter and to make this a Cross-Community Engagement Group on Internet Governance, but that's just a further update and keep watching your emails. Thank you, this meeting is adjourned. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]