PANAMA – NextGen Presentations
Monday, June 25, 2018 – 09:30 to 11:30 EST
ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Okay, everybody. Welcome to the ICANN 62 NextGen Presentations. Thank you for the audience members who have joined us today.

I'd like to thank my ambassadors who are here to support me as well, Clement Genty of France, Amira Mahmoud of Egypt, Eric Mwobobia of Egypt, Huthaifa – I do not know how to say your last name. I'm so sorry.

HUTHAIFA ALBUSTANJI: Albustanji.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Albustanji from Jordan, and Mauricia Abdol who is going to join us later from South Africa.

We're going to get started right away because we are on an extremely tight schedule. My name is Deborah Escalera. I am the NextGen Manager for the Public Responsibility Support Department.

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're going to start with Cristina Morales from Nicaragua. Christina, go ahead and start your presentation. Thank you.

CRISTINA MORALES: Good morning. I'm Christina Morales. I'm from Nicaragua. I study at the Central American University.

Today, I'm going to talk about Freedom of Expression and Internet. You might wonder, what is freedom of expression? As we know, freedom of expression the right all human beings have to share their ideas, communicate their thoughts, works of art by any means.

The United Nations has set for that access to Internet improves freedom of expression. Why? Because as we know, Internet enables us to reach the global arena. We may have access and share our ideas and thoughts with people from all over the world. Therefore, it's very interesting and effective.

In the past in the previous centuries, this was a limiting factor because we might have had a great idea, great thoughts, innovations or an innovative way of dealing with an issue, or we just wanted to share our point of view regarding a political party or any issue but we weren't able to share that information with people from elsewhere. We didn't have interaction, the

interaction we have today and which Internet fosters. So the Internet is very important.

I would also like to talk about the individual dimension of freedom of expression. You might wonder, what is freedom of expression in its individual dimension? The individual dimension means what we do on a daily basis. For example, all the pictures we are sharing on our social media. We are expressing or sharing out activities, our thoughts.

Internet enables us to express why we feel it's important to do this or that. Because we know there are other ways of sharing information which are [not] the local medium, radio and TV broadcasts. And now we have Internet which enables this communication.

Another important point of view is that the United Nations have made a statement regarding freedom of expression on the Internet. This is quite new because we know that Internet is an open space, a global one, a decentralized one. There are no restrictions. So these principles are aimed at access.

What do we mean by access related to freedom of expression? If everybody has access to Internet, they may have the opportunity to express their ideas, share them with people from all over the world.

These principles also apply to pluralism. Pluralism and freedom of expression apply to each of us. Here we have people from civil society, the technical community. So this is the point. We should be able to express our ideas freely using the Internet, and this should reach all members of society no matter what field they work in.

Another important principle here is nondiscrimination. That is, we should find a way of improving and giving access to the Internet to the weakest communities. For example, people from native populations, people living in rural areas in most countries, women and children. Because these communities which are vulnerable also have the right to have access to the Internet and to express their ideas freely.

Another principle is related to net neutrality. This means that the way I express my thoughts and ideas, the people who are receiving this information should receive it the way I have issued it.

So it's very important that countries consider these guiding principles for Internet and include them in their legal framework through laws, bills, or public policies because this would benefit freedom of expression on the Internet and we will not have any restrictions or limitations to this right.

In many countries which are the countries that don't guarantee free disclosure or dissemination of information on the Internet, it's important to promote policies that set for that the Internet should be open so that there isn't anything hindering freedom of expression on the Internet. Because if something hinders freedom of expression, this would be breaking a fundamental right.

In most countries in the world, freedom of expression is a fundamental right. However, access to the Internet is not considered such a right. In countries such as Mexico, the constitution sets forth that Internet access is a fundamental right.

I don't believe that all countries [should] have access to Internet as a fundamental right. They should at least guarantee it. They should guarantee Internet access so that everybody may exercise its right to freedom of expression using the Internet.

I would also like to suggesting that public policies should be used here. In most countries or regions passing an act is quite complicated. It takes time, investigation, research. So one of the most feasible solutions would be to use public policies for this goal.

Public policies are the activities government or states carry out for the benefit of their population. That is, public policies should

turn the Internet into a common goal for the benefit of society as a whole. So if governments start developing programs for the most vulnerable groups to have access to Internet, they would be guaranteed freedom of expression. This would bring along other rights, such as the right to information, the right to receive and communicate information.

Another public policy which the countries might carry out would involve training their legislative branch so that they would pass laws or amend laws that would guarantee access to Internet or at least they would guarantee net neutrality in these countries so that this would entail freedom of expression on the Internet for the population.

They should also create national environments where all the members of the communities in a country would get involved with the Internet, should learn about respecting the online rights of everybody so that the digital rights are known to the population as a whole. This would not only guarantee freedom of expression but also other rights.

Thank you very much. Do you have any questions?

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Thank you, Christina. Very nicely presented. Okay, we're going to move on to our next presenter, Elisson Diones from Brazil. Elisson?

ELISSON DIONES: I'm going to present in Portuguese. Hi, everyone. I'm Elisson Diones. I'm from Salvador, Bahia. I'm 23. I am a student of business administration, the President of the Youth Observatory, and I collaborate with Safernet Brasil.

I am going to speak further on about Safernet Brasil, but now I'd like to talk about capacity building. You all know here what capacity building is about. This is training people, but this is focused on the use of the Internet. This is a very important process. We all here went through some capacity building process, but the focus of my presentation here is to transmit the idea that all these processes should focus further on end users.

For me, it's end users who need these capacity building processes, especially processes related to the Internet and anything connected with human resources. End users must be heard, must be included. Their wishes and their needs should be approached. We have many capacity building projects going on in the Internet, but most of them are not focused on end users. Most of them are focused on their own internal groups and not

on end users. The goal should be on end users and not on people who are already savvy on the Internet.

It's like an endogamic way of working or of approach, what we have today, and we should open this endogamic approach and focus more on end users. Because information does not get to end users, and when it gets to end users it's in a blurry way.

In Brazil, for example, most of the Internet end users do not have a basic knowledge on network neutrality or privacy or ISOC or ICANN. Most of the users go to school, then study systems and engineering and etc., but they do not know that in Brazil we have the CGI, the Steering Committee of Brazil. They just buy the domain name .br, but they don't know anything about the domain name for Brazil, .br.

So we need to focus on end users. Again, they need to receive basic information to be able to engage and participate with the Internet processes.

I know that this is something quite complex, furthering capacity building focused on end users. It's difficult to cater to everybody in Brazil, but I think again that if every organization and business focused on end users with a basic or core knowledge, we'll be able to change this scenario.

Here I have brought some practical examples of projects that we have worked in that are focused on teaching and training on the basics to end users.

Here is Safernet Brasil. This is the organization I work in, in Brazil. It's a human rights focused organization that is focused on protecting children and adolescents in the Internet.

This project here we see on the picture. It was on the Safernet day in Brazil. Fourteen young men and women got together during a weekend. We spent the whole weekend here with training sessions related to different topics of the Internet. Each one of them when they returned to their own cities and villages went to the different organizations of human rights and to schools, etc., to transmit all this knowledge and to try to reach as many persons as possible.

Also, this is an educational project on the safe use of the Internet because many people use Internet only through the Facebook or What's App, but this is something we'd like to expand, this knowledge.

We have our Youth Observatory. I am the President. Veronica is the Vice President. We have different processes going on, different projects on capacity building. We have this picture here [inaudible] took place in Brazil. Next month we'll have it in Argentina.

In this observatory, one of our focuses is on building capacity. It's really a network of youngsters who are interested in the Internet and who want to make an impact on a population. In this [inaudible] we have an internship program, although not the best resumes are chosen. We choose those who have less knowledge of the Internet because we want them to grow and learn and have an impact. So we transmit a minimum amount of information for them to develop and make greater contributions in the fields.

Then we have the Cyberneteens Project. It was last year. We worked with the Brazillian chapter of ISOC. We participated in a large competition and worked in schools in different teaching organizations. We talked about Internet safety and human rights programming. Gustavo who is here also took part in the project. We had different representatives from different regions in Brazil because we believe that this type of project is absolutely necessary, always focused on end users because they are the ones who need more to learn about the Internet.

So what's coming next? What should we do in the future? This is just some food for thinking. What I believe is that we need to lay stress on this focus and work further on this type of project. We should really focus on end users, as I said before, because they are the ones that are most in need of getting this information.

So thank you so much for your attention.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Thank you, Elisson. Are there any questions for Elisson? Okay, can you come grab the mic? Can you grab the mic for her?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This one is working.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you for your presentation. I wanted to ask you if you have any project that is targeted to elementary kids or primary education? I think those projects are really interesting to build that knowledge, the Internet knowledge to get them in the Internet ecosystem at a younger age.

ELISSON DIONES: For young people, most projects that I participate that are focused on youth are Safernet Brasil. In some projects we visit children from ten years old and older. We talk about the safe use of the Internet. We talk about the use of the Internet, the potential of the Internet to give them some essential knowledge.

We want them to have no issues related to bullying and safety issues, so we do capacity building with the teachers, which is very important. So they themselves can include Internet in their

teaching. We wanted to broaden this discussion so despite these young people are not working with the Internet yet, they should have some basic knowledge to safeguard them from future problems.

So we are focusing not only on young adults, but we are working with children at early ages so they can develop this knowledge.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: [inaudible] the example of the little bird with the sticks. That was very cute. Okay, thank you so much. Let's move on to our next presenter Gustavo Paiva. Gustavo?

GUSTAVO PAIVA: Hello, everyone. I'm Gustavo Paiva. I'm from Brazil. I'm here today to talk to you a little bit about a few lessons I've learned over the last four years while I have created and managed a few governance projects.

First my little CV. I've been to two IGFs. I am a member of NCUC. I've been to two governance schools, and right now I am working with Brazil's [inaudible] to offer some course, some teaching on the area of Internet governance.

Well, let's start. It begins three or four years ago when I got into university. Where I live, we don't have any organization at all

that deals with governance in any shape or form, and that's a big problem for us. It means we don't have any internship opportunities. Our professors are very outdated. Unless there's a fellowship going on, it's hard participating in any onsite event. And innovations take a long time to get to us so we can discuss it.

Not only that, we have all the issues every place has like cybercrime and our law enforcement isn't really used to dealing with cybercrime. There is very little incentive for people to work on this area because it's all volunteer work. And no outreach to the community whatsoever, so the population, everyone often complain that there are no resources. What should you do? What should I do if something goes wrong? We had all those issues.

But what did we even have as resources? Well, the organizations that were available did offer support. Safernet did offer support. Brazil's Steering Committee on the Internet did offer support, even if at a distance, and sometimes they would send people too. We also have a good community of professionals, some of them even with political influence, but they were very disjointed.

I quickly realized that if we had good leadership going on, those people were willing to put in the work. My first project was creating a research group on Internet law in my university. After

two years – I've managed it for three years, I can say it was very successful in a few aspects, not so much in others.

We did create an excellent team, an amazing team that's still doing good stuff. And, well, I came out of it too. Many other projects sprung up from it. Our partnership with Safernet, the projects we do at my city Natal greatly depended on the research group.

At the same time, we also suffered with university bureaucracy and student engagement. A problem we had was that the group grew too quickly. It became too big, too fast. We realized that a big team is oftentimes just worse. You lose so much time trying to manage all those people.

But last year, I was contacted by the Attorney's Order of Brazil and by another group, the [inaudible]. I was contacted by them, and they wanted me to come up with a course. Not only one. I was supposed to teach a few courses they already had and also come up with a new selection for the next few years.

My first proposal, I'm working on it right now, is an introduction to Internet governance greatly based on Brazil's Internet Steering Committee's course. It's very high quality, and I really like their approach. And also, of course, based on Kurbalija's book.

The first test run is scheduled for when I come back from Panama. We are going to offer it around the state on the second semester. It's very basic, really.

This time what I learned from my first project and I'm implementing now is that by having a partnership with the Attorney's Order things are very different because they charge for the course. Not a lot. It's a very small quantity, and sometimes they don't even charge money. They can charge, for example, food for a donation for a charity. But they always charge.

That's important because this allows me to bring in people and really require them to work on it and really put attention to the detail and they will get paid. They will get compensated for their time, and they will be compensated for improving themselves.

Some of those people – well, I am a student. I'm trying to pay for my masters degree. I'm trying to save money. Some people are like that too. By paying them, we are also supporting them in building up their capacities.

The Attorney's Order also deals with logistics and infrastructure. They have classrooms all over the state. They also have an official driver, an official car. Since they charge for the course, they also have all the incentives to offer it as much as possible.

So if someone 400 kilometers away wants the course, then we can offer it. It is feasible and it is sustainable.

We can bring the course to the countryside, and it's just great bringing all this knowledge, trying to evangelize those people. It is very tiring. Sometimes those trips can take more than six or seven hours by car, but it is worth it.

The idea is by offering this course, by offering this knowledge, oftentimes at a nearly negligible price, we are really trying to engage the local population, the state's population into this discussion and bringing it in an accessible language with which they can relate so they can debate it.

Since the course is very introductory, it is meant for people who have never been in contact with Internet governance. They can then study further. They can pick the subjects which they are more interested in. Since this course is aimed at first for now at attorneys, surely we want to know more about the laws. But there are also social, cultural aspects and so on, and economical ones too. After this course, they will be able to explore those issues further.

So after what I've exposed, I want to offer four little advices for people who also want to start their own small governance projects.

First is start small and don't inflate your team just for the sake of it. Get together a few people who are trustworthy and productive, and then start something very small, very focused. Don't try to embrace the world. Remember, the bigger your team, the more you will waste time trying to manage those people. Don't forget that. There's a principle for it. It's the Pareto Principle.

Another advice is look at your problems, the issues you are facing, and look at what you have. What are your resources? Do you have financial resources? Do you have human resources? What do you have? Look at those two points and try to plot your course from one point to the other. You want to solve your problem, as small as it is, with what you have. Don't try to just explode this and require resources you can't possibly have.

And don't try to mimic big projects just because they're successful. You need to find your own formula. Big projects are successful because they managed to fulfill their mission with what they had, and you probably don't have what they did.

Another piece of advice is even in underserved regions, even if there's no big institution nearby that can offer you support or expertise or an internship or whatever, try to find institutional partners. Even if there's nothing relating to Internet governance,

try and find someone who is willing and who wants to help you do what you want to do.

In my case, my first project was my university. In my second project right now, it was the Attorney's Order. Some people would say the Attorney's Order is an unlikely partner for Internet governance, but it has been working wonderfully.

And seek the counsel from people who have executed projects in a context similar to yours. Right now, we have Elisson. We have people from the Youth Observatory. They all have experience in trying to muster an effort from the ground up. You can talk to us. You can talk to those people and see what we have to say.

Here is a very small list of projects, and there are many more. This is my contact information. And here there's a small suggested reading I have for you from the Berkman Center that talks about successful governance projects.

Thank you very much. Any questions?

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Any questions? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you for your presentation. You talked about the engagement between civil society and making Internet

governance policies, and you mentioned two projects in your university and another one. Do you have in your country another organized project by civil societies, by another organization, end user societies or for the engagement and making Internet governance policies? For example, in ICANN there are lots of policies for engagement, which is public comment and reviews. I don't know if in your country you have. Please tell us.

GUSTAVO PAIVA: Well, the answer is yes and no. While we do have civil society organizations, Safernet is arguably one of those, and we have organizations acting in this capacity, but we don't have a place like ICANN. We do have the Internet Steering Committee, but it isn't as open to participation as ICANN. But going back to the question, yes, we do have civil society organizations working on this and bringing those issues to light. But we don't have something like ICANN that allows for such direct participation.

STEVE CONTE: Thank you. Steve Conte from ICANN. One of the comments you made in the beginning of your presentation caught my curiosity. CGI, the Steering Committee for Brazil, has been extremely involved with Internet governance, IGF, since inception. I'm curious of what your perception of the disparity between the heavy involvement of CGI and IGF. And you said it doesn't come

down to the civil level. Where do you think that disparity is, and how can organizations at the level of CGI help move forward and come to the table to meet halfway and create that parity between the two groups?

GUSTAVO PAIVA: Okay, that's a big question, actually. Here's the thing. CGI, they do make a big effort to offer initiatives. Let me go back. I mentioned that I did go to the governance school and my course is greatly based on theirs. [Their IGF], the Brazilian governance forum, it is itinerant so it goes from region to region. those efforts, they are good. They do really help out a lot. They also sometimes send their instructors to teach courses. That's good.

But it is difficult still to make an institutional partnership with them. It isn't impossible. Far from it. But it isn't exactly the simplest thing either. So that's a point, but they do offer a lot. They offer books if you want. They offer [capacitation] courses. They offer a lot.

But the way I see it is that we can't rely on them for everything. We really do have to put in the effort because they can't keep a dedicated team anyplace that's necessary. I think each place has to muster up the human resources and the organization to take care of itself to a certain extent. We can't depend on ICANN or

the CGI for everything. I think each community has to put in the effort too.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, I have a question, a small one. I remember a Request for Comment 820 from Jon Postel where he explains the delegation system of ccTLD, and we had a lot of concern about that. I remember [those] interns explaining that the registry has to serve the community. Do you think now the registry of a ccTLD has to promote help, promote assistance in order to understand Internet governance?

GUSTAVO PAIVA: Well, I think if a registry must offer this support, that is a debate. I think CGI offers it. I can say it is not perfect. The last years, Brazilian Internet Forum was all about it. It was all about discussing how to perfect the CGI system and how to perfect the selection of councilors. So it is far from perfect, but they really do put a lot of resources to bringing those issues.

Personally, I think that is a good model. I think the CGI can improve a lot. We had big discussions, great discussions last year about this. But I think the general idea of a ccTLD registry offering, being in a way serving the people like this, I like that proposal, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So you're talking about model and proposals because we are in front of people from ICANN? You think that we should propose a model based on the service to the community by offering ccTLD registrations and promoting Internet governance?

GUSTAVO PAIVA: I wouldn't go so far because that is a bigger discussion than I'm willing to have, I'm prepared to have right now. I can say in Brazil it works. But if we are going to put it all over the world, well, we need to debate that a lot.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Gustavo.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Okay, thank you, Gustavo. Very good presentation. Okay, let's move on to our next presenter Jaqueline Pigatto. Jaqueline?

JAQUELINE PIGATTO: Hi, everyone. Good morning. My name is Jaqueline. I'm an International Relations Masters student from Brazil. My presentation is about the role of Brazil in Internet governance and the multi-stakeholder model.

I'm going to try to do my presentation in English. It's not going to be perfect, but I will try my best.

This presentation is part of the research I made during college, and it was the subject of my monograph. What motivated me to get started in this subject and to know more about all of this and engaging the Internet ecosystem was the Snowden case that happened in 2013. It was one year before I got into college. As you all may remember, [inaudible] reviewed the NSA espionage that included Brazil's government one of the main victims of this espionage.

These disclosures caused some diplomatic tension at the time between the United States and several countries, including Brazil. The international community created pressure on the United States to decentralize the control of the network. A few years later, that resulted in the IANA transition. In part thanks to the coordination between ICANN and Brazil's [foreign policy].

The Snowden case also permitted Brazil to advance nationally Internet governance. In 2014, our government approved the Marco Civil law. That's like a bill of rights of the Internet. This law ensures our rights as citizens, Internet users, such as freedom of speech, respect to human rights, network neutrality, privacy protection, among other principles.

But what is great about the Marco Civil is that it was decided based on a public consultation carried out by the Internet, which means that the bill passed through the control and review of different sectors of society: activists, private sector, technical community, academics. So it really was a multi-stakeholder process.

Also in 2014, Brazil hosted the NETmundial. It was an event proposed by ICANN who recognized Brazil's [protagonism] in this new phase of Internet governance. The main topic of the summit was the IANA transition.

This event was very important because it produced a multi-stakeholder document. It included the participation of several countries. The multi-stakeholder statement addressed to define common global principles for conducting a global Internet governance and to create a roadmap to evolve this ecosystem. It also recognized the global nature of the Internet and warned against possible fragmentation of the network. Of course, not all countries signed this statement.

This cooperation between ICANN and Brazil's government to create this new platform, NETmundial, is very unique and special because it brought together issues besides Internet infrastructure and called attention to subjects such as human rights and socioeconomic impacts of the Internet.

We had all of this process, and now we do have a global multi-stakeholder ICANN. One of the requirements about the transition made by the U.S. through the Department of Commerce was that they would not accept a proposition where their role would be replaced by a government or a multilateral organization. Meaning that they recognize the importance of the multi-stakeholder model.

But in spite of this, I see that countries still play an important role in a process like this, as we can see from the Snowden case and the consequent IANA transition and now with the European Union implementing the GDPR, for instance. So I see that we have as a civil society or academics or activists, we have important role in trying to keep the agenda on our countries because like many other issues in politics, we do not always have a continuity from one administration to another. So the NETmundial itself is another example of this discontinuity.

The multi-stakeholder model is a very interesting case, especially for my field of study international relations because countries do have a role but they are not the main actors in this ecosystem. So I believe we have today a challenge to consolidate this model in this kind of space in governance globally. And the IANA transition, I believe, it was just a first challenge. It's also important that we try to improve this model, and I see that [discussion] already exists here at ICANN because I

see that we have a large number of participants and we do not always have a deadline for policy development, so this really can [slow down and difficult] the process.

I believe this is it. Thank you so much.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Okay, do we have any questions for Jaqueline? All right, then we will move on to our next presenter Jhon Caballero. Jhon?

JHON CABALLERO: Good morning, everyone. I'm going to talk about trust in blockchain times. This is based on what I'm doing in my law course. I'd like to tell you why I ended up talking about blockchain. In Colombia and Latin America there has been a trend related to blockchain. There was a boom, especially related to blockchain. We lawyers want to trust blockchain because we are thinking of intelligent agreements. That's why I decided to analyze this blockchain, cryptocurrency, and intelligent contracts or agreements.

So I wondered, why is there such a boom here? I tried to find the reasons why, and the answer was in trust. But before talking about trust, I would like to talk about blockchain. What is blockchain? Blockchain is a ledger, a distributed ledger. It operates through the network.

All the users of blockchain are nodes and for a transaction to take place through this blockchain network there must be consensus. If A and B want to [conduct] a transaction, it is necessary for other nodes C and D to reach consensus to agree that that transaction is feasible.

How do they know that this transaction is feasible? Because each node has a copy of the registry. Blockchain is the [inaudible]. There is no blockers. There is no central authority that will tell me that information is true. The information is true because many people, many nodes have a copy of the information so that when a transaction takes place, that transaction must be confirmed with the other nodes. And once there is consensus, it gets into the blockchain [net] through a block.

How does the transaction get into the block? At a given time a new block is being created. This block is a set of transactions. When the transaction enters the chain and the capacity of a block is completed, it gets linked to previous blocks. These blocks in turn are encrypted through unidirectional encryption, the hash in the digital signatures.

Though there are different blockchains for different kinds of encryption, the most popular one is the unidirectional encryption. Therefore, we are able to guarantee security and

unchangeability. That is, transactions will not be fraudulent, they might not be altered. But I would like to stress not so much the operations of blockchain but how the network operates through a user's network based on consensus. Other people in the network must agree to a transaction so that it will take place.

I would like to run an exercise with you. I would like you to answer who you trust. We have three people: Mark Zuckerberg from Facebook, we have Donald Trump from the U.S., and we have Sophia. Sophia is AI. Right now you might be wondering how much do you trust these three characters. Please, raise your arms if I ask you. Who trusts Mark Zuckerberg? Nobody trusts him. Okay, one person trusts him. Okay, who trusts Donald Trump, President of the U.S.? Nobody. Perfect. Now who trusts Sophia? So most of you, there are still a few people, but most of you trust Sophia, artificial intelligence, more than the President of the U.S.

This is amazing. We trust technology more than people. But why is this the case? Why are we trusting algorithms more than people? Because trust is changing. Trust has changed, has evolved. In the past, we would have local trust, the trust that exists in the community. Everybody knew everybody else in a community, and therefore there was trust. There was a social

reputation. So if a person [inaudible] somebody else, everybody stopped trusting that person.

But cities grew. People would not know everybody else in their community. So it was necessary to create institutional trust. In institutional trust, information was centralized. So now we have third parties, brokers, intermediaries. I need somebody whom I trust to tell me that I can trust other parties. So there we have banks, governments, personal data dealt with by private people.

But institutional trust is facing a crisis because governments have [really defrauded] people through corruptions. We don't trust financial institutions because of fraud. We don't trust social media because they are sharing our information with third parties we don't know. So there is a trust gap.

Now trust has evolved and has turned into a distributed trust. There information has become massive, and now we have the collaboration economy like Uber or Airbnb services which enable me to get in touch with people who are just like me, who drive their cars, who offer a room in their homes for lodging.

But even in this [muted] model, information is still centralized. And that is why distributed trust, at least from the point of view of collaborative economy, still faces issues.

But now we have blockchain that is here to change the way in which distributed trust is dealt with because with blockchain I am not part of the system, but I am the system. We are not hiring the service, we are becoming the service. So people are empowered and people trust people who are like themselves rather than third parties who are bigger than they are.

This distributed trust is not seen only in infrastructure or in networks, but it's also a social phenomenon. Let's think of bitcoin. And there shouldn't be a confusion between blockchain and bitcoin. But bitcoin is a very good example here. How has bitcoin become popular? Why has it grown so much without paying anything for advertising?

This was thanks to word of mouth communication. It's a very successful marketing example because we don't trust the people who want to sell something to us. When someone tries to sell something to me, I don't trust that person. I know that person is trying to sell to me. But if there is something people trust in – people trust their friends, people who are like themselves – if my friend, the person I trust, tells me that bitcoin is reliable, I'm going to buy bitcoin. Bitcoin's growth has been so important, and the price is defined by the social reputation. The price may go up because of what we read in the media.

But now we know that distributed trust is expressed in blockchain and also it has been compared with a social phenomenon, word of mouth. How do we [relate] this to Internet? The Internet is very useful because it gives us access to information. It enables us to share information anywhere and anytime.

But we still have a trust issue on the Internet because I might have access to information but that information, is it secure? Is it reliable? So we might think of using blockchain with the Internet, using the Internet network to create a trust network through blockchain. This will create more trust, enable us to carry out transactions between the U.S. and Nigeria without being afraid of being subject to fraud.

So I believe this is the tool I suggest. I believe we should develop infrastructure [on] the Internet and we should work so that this software, this new innovation such as blockchain, will be opensource. Nowadays, there are many patents being filed for [inaudible] and this will be a [inaudible] for blockchain for something open for everybody.

Thank you very much. If you have any questions, I will gladly answer them.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Oh, there's one back there. Can you give him the mic, please?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. I am investing in bitcoin personally. But what do you think about the attacks that may be targeted to blockchain? Because blockchain is not a perfect network. I am not talking against it, but what do you think about it?

JHON CABALLERO: Well, in bitcoin, the blockchain [inaudible] users have two keys, a public one and a private one. The public one refers to the address. The one I share with the other person who wants to do the transaction. But the private key is a personal key. And there are several services, several wallets on the bitcoin network which enable me to manage this private key in a different way. If I have an offline wallet, I am going to manage my private key. But very often I use services or third party wallets, and they are the ones who manage the keys for this private [one].

When there is a cyberattack on one of those services, all the private keys are compromised. Therefore, we will have bitcoin. So the best way is to use a wallet where I can manage my keys myself. So if there is a security breach in a public wallet, there is a high risk here. I may lose all my assets, my bitcoin. So the security issue is not on the bitcoin network but on the

management of the passwords. Who is managing my passwords?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: For example, if 51% of the [inaudible] would be attacked, what would you say?

JHON CABALLERO: Bitcoin works on the mining system. It is necessary for other organizations, other people to give it computing capacity. There is an issue here because we now have the mining bots and they began to centralize information. And we fear that the mining bots might reach this consensus on 51% of the network.

This is one of the criticisms against this system. It has been suggested that the way of reaching consensus should be changed. There are other cryptocurrencies which have changed the way in which information is centralized. This is a big problem per se, however it has been said that usually it is more expensive to invest in reaching the biggest concerns [so start investing in bitcoin]. But it is still the same problem. It's a latent issue, and this is a problem related to the change of the code, of the infrastructure.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Okay. Thank you, Jhon. Okay, let's move on to our next presenter Veronica Arroyo. Veronica?

VERONICA ARROYO: Hi. Good morning to everyone. My name is Veronica Arroyo. I'm from Peru. I'm going to talk about a very hot topic. I know this is a very controversial one, and I know there are a lot ideas going on. I really respect all of them, however I'm going to just tell you what I think and hopefully at the end of this presentation you will say, "Okay, this girl has a point." Hopefully.

I will go straight to what I think because I have not too much time to talk. What I think is that WHOIS is a tool to access public information. This might sound like a crazy idea, but I don't think so. I have three arguments that support what I believe. We'll move to those ideas right now.

For those who don't know what WHOIS is, this is a protocol that allows to have information. It gives you information about a domain name. It tells you who has registered this domain and his or e-mail address, contact information like telephone number and address, name, and some technical information as well.

So at the end, what we are talking about is information. What about information? Information for years, from centuries and

until now, is a source of power. We have created laws and regulations to retain that power. When I'm talking about information, I'm talking about all the varieties of information that we can imagine because information is everywhere.

What we've tried to do all this time is to control that information, to take some control on that. However, despite all the efforts that we have made through all these years, we have copyright infringement and we have data breaches.

Why this happens is because it's impossible to control information. What I'm talking here is about the reality. You cannot retain information and say, "This is my information and I want just this for me and I don't want other people to take advantage or I don't want people to copy my idea, to copy what I created for example. You cannot do that.

Why you cannot do that is because information behaves as a public good. That means that there is a [free rider] problem. When we talk about a WHOIS issue, for WHOIS it means that whatever the ICANN board decides at the end, if WHOIS is so important for our society, for our community, at the end we will have WHOIS. If tomorrow the ICANN board decides that WHOIS should go black, we're going to create, we'll open a door to create a black market of information about WHOIS. Or maybe if

we put high barriers to access to WHOIS, at the end someone will lower those barriers in an illegal way.

What I mean is that information flows, and it will find its way because that is how it behaves by nature. That is my first point.

To go to my second point, I want you to see what WHOIS gives to us. I think that information that we find on WHOIS is public information. Again, do not be afraid of [calling it] public information. I think this is not the first case nor the last one where we are going to find a tool or maybe a resource or a database, a public one, that hasn't [signed inside of] personal data.

For example, in my country, I come from Peru, you can have information about a property because there's a public registry for properties if you have the number of the property. As well, you can find the complete name of a person if you know their ID number. That's for free, and that's online.

Why do we have those kinds of tools, those kinds of registries or databases? We have those ones because it helps our community and it benefits everyone. That is why it is so difficult to [inaudible] or find a very specific purpose as the GDPR requests us when we talk about data processing. With public information as WHOIS allows us to have, we can prevent fraud, we can prosecute crimes. And then each of us can find its own purpose.

I think here at ICANN we have already admitted that, not in an explicit way but in an implicit one. Why? If you read the framework that is open for comments or if you read, check a little bit this intermediary process for registries and registrars, you will find that much of the discussion goes on the idea that how we can give access to this tool.

When you ask that question, when you pose that question into the forum it's because you have already stated that people need to have access to this. So then the next question is how we can make it possible. When we are in a point where we have this data protection issue and personal data, but we also are trying to see how we can manage this with public benefits and public good and all the things that I'm telling is because we are in the middle of something.

I think we're in the middle of two approaches, and that is my third point. We are in the middle of two approaches that overlap sometimes. And for lawyers who are here in this room that's quite common to have rights that overlap and this is the case. For example, we have data protection and we have on the other side access to public information, also called transparency or open data.

What we have been doing all this time here at ICANN is to analyze this issue using the [eyes] of data protection because

GDPR is a regulation on data protection. However, if we see and use the focus of access to public information, we will see that this is easier and that this is useful. Because it gives us more tools to analyze, for example layers or to analyze restricted access or accreditation process and security measures that we can take or we can decide to implement here. And I think it's easier.

So my three ideas here, the first one that information flows and it will find its way whatever we do despite our efforts; second of all that we don't need to be afraid to say we have a public resource that benefits our people, benefits our community, and it has personal data, yes, but that's what we have and not be afraid to tell it; and [third of all] to use these two approaches and in the specific case try to put more focus on this access to public information. If we have these three points and if you understand what I was telling you all this time, you will understand why I see that WHOIS for me is a tool to access the public information.

That's all I have to say to you. Thank you. You can reach me on Twitter. That's my handle. If you have any questions, I'm open to answer them.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Thank you, Veronica. And, yes, it is a very hot topic. Any questions?

CLEMENT GENTY: I work for a French registrar. We are the number two in the world for UDRP [filing]. Be aware that a lot of WHOIS is full of useless information. People are filling not really accurate information about themselves. That's the first point.

Second point, I think that if we do not have [any ways] for a lot of registries in Europe and abroad, it's not the fault of GDPR but only of ICANN. And registry [we didn't work] [inaudible] in order to propose a new model for WHOIS system. Maybe have you seen the [inaudible] model, maybe have you seen other models suggested by the GNSO, by the IPC constituency and so on?

The fact is today GDPR didn't erase the WHOIS system. ICANN decided to [hide] it while we do not have a new model for WHOIS. So I'm just [arguing] in order to say that one day, let's hope it will be soon, but one day we will have a new WHOIS system and everybody will have access to WHOIS system.

VERONICA ARROYO: That would be perfect. I mean, we always want to improve what we have. I think that if GDPR is trying to challenge what we already have [inaudible] WHOIS system and we can improve it,

it's good. I think that's fine. But the problem is that if we think that just GDPR matters here, I think it's not just GDPR. It's also public benefits about the community as well.

CLEMENT GENTY: Just a last thing, it won't last a lot. We do analyze this about WHOIS system in order to have access to domain name portfolio for our brands, for government, and so on in my company. And we can just see that there are about 800 TLDs right now. You have 280 ccTLDs and you have 280 models of new WHOIS system that is on GDPR. It just means that no one worked together in order to have a common model just before 15 May.

VERONICA ARROYO: Okay, thank you for that information.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Thank you. Are there any other comments or questions on this hot topic?

PAUL WILSON: Hello and thanks for that presentation. It's really interesting and great to see the focus on the essential nature of public information. I think there's not enough talk about that or recognition of that particular factor.

I'm Paul Wilson. I'm the head of APNIC, which is the IP address registry for the Asia Pacific. I wanted to just mention the importance of identifying what WHOIS you're talking about. Because, as you said, WHOIS is a tool and it's actually a tool that can be used to access registries of all kinds. It's not just names. It's also numbers. It can also be other information like routing information. So it's kind of useful if talking about WHOIS to talk about which particular WHOIS you're talking about. So I'd just make that point.

But also support the fact that WHOIS is designed specifically for public information, and the other use of WHOIS which we're involved with which is for IP address registration is actually critical information to have publicly. Actually, that is vital for the integrity of the Internet, not just for fault finding.

So for instance, if someone is spamming you, you can find out where it is that that traffic is origination. But also even for interconnection of ISPs. You can't have an ISP able to understand WHOIS interconnecting with them and whether they are legitimately able to use the particular addresses they're trying to use unless that ISP has got a registry to look at to actually identify those people.

So some information is by nature public, and whether it's a matter of operational integrity or in the case of, say, a lands

registry it's kind of a public rights issue really. IP addresses are very much like real estate in that they're a single global common pool. There's an ethic which also says that those of us who are citizens of that world actually do have a right to know who has any particular part of real estate. If that information happens to involve personal information, then so be it. There's an argument about the fact that the essential public nature of the information can trump the personal, private, the personal data protection which some people have placed above everything else. I think it really is a good thing to question that, so thanks for the presentation.

VERONICA ARROYO: Oh, thank you. Thank you for the clarification. And, yes, WHOIS [allows] to have not just DNS information but also IP address and the root [inaudible], yes. While reading up for this presentation, I found out that and I tried to type in and put some [inaudible] my IP address at home and I found out information. I think that for technical purposes that's very useful as well.

The thing is that we need to balance rights here. We have data protection over on one side, and we have access to public information on the other side. What we need to do is to take up proportionality [inaudible] what lawyers do here and try to balance what really benefits everyone and what is best for us.

So I think that's all. Thank you very much.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Okay. Thank you, Veronica. Okay, our final presenter today is Mariana Canto. Mariana?

MARIANA CANTO: Hi. Good morning, all of you. I promise to be brief because I know all of you want to have lunch soon. So let's start it. I'm Mariana Canto. I'm a Brazilian law student at the Federal University of Pernambuco [in the northeast]. I'm going to talk about Brazilian privacy scenario nowadays.

Today we have privacy as the hot topic of the moment. But I want to clarify first how did [all this] start? Before the Snowden case and everything [with] Cambridge Analytica, how the right to privacy became the right to privacy.

During the [1800s] two lawyers who were really annoyed by the media and all the paparazzi and everything decided to write an article and publish at the Harvard Law Review about the right to be left alone, also known as the right to privacy. Those two lawyers defended that the individual should be left alone in their intimacy and the private space should be protected and barriers should exist from the public interference.

So today privacy became a hot topic also because the new GDPR, the new General Data Protection Regulation, the European, which has an extraterritorial impact. So that's the main reason why the GDPR is so important to the world.

The GDPR is going to bring some aspects to enhance privacy in the world and to protect the users of devices and applications in the world. One of those aspects is the implementation of privacy by design as a really important thing. Because now you have to produce and to develop your app or your device in order to think about privacy first.

Many researchers defend that this can create some kind of barriers to innovation and to development of new technologies, but I tend to disagree with this view and some other researchers do because it's not the first time we have privacy or security by design. We had other industries that also used the same model.

Maybe if I can do a poll, not a really good comparison but still a comparison. The automobile industry used to not think about the security of the users at the beginning and many car crashes happened and many deaths happened until seatbelts and airbags and all of the security improvements came and made a safer industry.

So I truly think that technology and Internet going on this way to secure data and everything because business has to change its

view and to see that regulation sometimes is also good for them. When you have scandals as Cambridge Analytica, you have a lot of fines and everything and sometimes you lose investments. So regulation is not bad and every time it's not always bad.

The second thing brought by GDPR was the right to be forgotten. It's already implemented in lots of countries. It's not like a new thing. But in Brazil it's kind of dangerous. Not all in Brazil, but especially where I studied, you have to be careful with the censorship in this case because we have to balance between the right to be forgotten and the right to access to information.

As was said in the last panel, there is some kind of information that is public information, you cannot hide. In Brazil, you have some politicians who want to get rid of the information online about procedures and everything that they're facing justice. So they apply for the right to be forgotten be applied in the judiciary. I saw research that next to elections this increases 100%, the petitions are increased really highly.

For last but not least, the privacy impact assessments which are reports made. Now the GDPR demands those reports made by business to see how probably the data breach can occur in the company or how the data of the users are being protected and how likely it is for a breach to occur.

In Brazil, we have what we call the privacy paradox. Many Brazilians say they care about privacy and they really do everything [in their hand] to protect their data and everything. But in reality it's not what occurs. I kind of disagree with these numbers on this research. It's one of the most important ones, but I think it's even higher than that.

We see that 31% of the Brazilians are not likely to read the terms and conditions and the privacy policies in apps and devices and everything. But I think it's really higher. If I ask friends, none of them read this. I work doing privacy policies and drafting of that and contracts, and no one cares about it really. We have a really huge issue [in this field].

I don't think we don't change our passwords frequently either or we have any kind of enhancement on our computers for privacy besides the basics of antivirus and stuff.

In Brazil, we have five different law to protect privacy. The first one is the bill of rights of the Internet, also known as the civil framework for the Internet. We have the consumers code and the civil code and the constitution where privacy is a fundamental right for us. But in general, all of this cannot really protect us, so we are trying to elaborate a general data protection law.

The gaps we have are still big and we have to develop something to go because we still use a lot of jurisprudence and we want to [use more] of the letter of the law.

So we have two projects and two data protection bills. They're currently being analyzed by the senate. The first one is the 5276. It talks about – it's mainly a Brazilian GDPR. It's more complete and had a public referendum and a public consultation. So it's the preferred one by data protection researchers. The second one is the 330. It's less popular and less concerned about access to information. It doesn't let the government be under the law. So if the government wants to collect data for any kind of use or to surveil their [citizens], it can be possible with this one. So that's our biggest concern.

We have our general elections this year, so our laws might not be turning to [enacted]. But we are still hoping to be. Another point is there's a conflict between the authors of the law. Politicians want to be the author of the Brazilian general data protection law. So we have a kind of dispute in the senate to approve the law. So it's kind of a complicated scenario right now.

This is my presentation. I'm open to questions if you have any. Thank you very much for your attention.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Thank you, Veronica. Are there any questions? Clement?

CLEMENT GENTY: Hi. There is a bridge between [inaudible] and Brazil showing that Europe and Brazil are creating links together. Do you think the next law in Brazil concerning data protection will be just a copy of [inaudible] GDPR?

VERONICA ARROYO: Hi. Thank you for your question. Yes and no. I think we have many articles based on that. I saw both bills, and we have many, many articles similar to the GDPR. But we still have some differences because the Brazilian jurisdiction is completely different than the European one. [It's a regional one.] But I think the GDPR is going to be like the base. We are based on the GDPR for sure because we're creating this also to be GDPR compliant, so that's why.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Okay, are there any other questions? Okay, that concludes the NextGen Presentations for today. I'd like to thank our audience members for joining us today. I'd like to invite you back to the same location tomorrow from 9:30 to 11:30 to conclude our second half of our NextGen Presentations tomorrow, same place, same time. Thank you for joining us.

NextGen, please stay in place. I'm going to ask you to line up at the table here. Audience, you're free to go. NextGen, line up at the table here. You're going to sign in, and then we're going to give you some more things for you to take with you. And then we're going to step out and have lunch. I'm going to ask my ambassadors Clement and Huthaifa to help me pass out some items to the NextGen.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]