

---

ICANN70 | Virtual Community Forum - ccNSO: IGLC  
Thursday, March 25, 2021 – 09:00 to 10:00 EST

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Hello and welcome to the ccNSO IGLC on Thursday, 25<sup>th</sup> of March, 2021 at 14:00 UTC. My name is Claudia Ruiz and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the Chair or moderator of this session. If you would like to ask your questions or comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone to take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly and at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphones when done speaking.

Thank you very much. And with this, I turn the floor over to you, Pierre.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you very much, Claudia. I hope everyone is hearing me well. Thank you for this introduction. I was about just to ask you to remind us all the rules of this distant meeting.

First of all, thank you all for your participation. I know that there is a online fatigue after a bit more than one year of not seeing each other. I thank very much the ccNSO Council and especially the group in charge of preparing the planning because for the second time, the Internet

---

***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.***

---

Governance Liaison Committee has been allowed to organize a meeting during the ICANN, which is very nice. We usually use this time to have face-to-face meetings and open our discussions to a broader audience. And we, as a group, know that it's sometimes difficult now to add some new sessions in a more and more shrunk agenda of ICANN online meetings, so thank you very much for that. We will try to give you good reasons to keep on organizing regular IGLC meetings during the ICANN.

So, for those of you who are not familiar with the IGLC, just a very quick reminder. The IGLC is issued from the ccNSO. It's the ccNSO Internet Governance Liaison Committee. The IGLC has been established, as you can read, to coordinate, facilitate, and increase participation of ccTLD managers in discussions and process pertaining to Internet governance. And the membership is open to all ccTLD managers whether members of the ccNSO or not.

We have been launching a new call for participation to the IGLC at the end of last year. And I must say that this call was very fruitful and we have a lot of new members within the IGLC which is very nice for our working force, first of all, because we are a very concrete group. We try to deliver some thoughts and some ideas to share it with the ccNSO community, and also because it gives a better representation and balance of the different regions within the IGLC itself.

So, I will not go through the welcoming of all the new members because they are numerous but they know, as we had the opportunity to discuss before, that we are all very happy that they are now members of the

---

IGLC. I see that some of them are participating to this session and this is very great news.

And I see that there is our first question. Is the IGLC open to NomCom-selected ccNSO councilors? I think this is the case because I think we already have some NomCom-selected ccNSO councilors. But I will let maybe Joke to... Yeah, okay. Joke has confirmed. Yes, of course, this is open.

So what have we done since the last time we met? And what have we worked on? The last time we met, I mean, the last time we met in this format of an open IGLC during ICANN 69, we had a session about digital sovereignty because it seemed to us that at this time, this topic was rising. As if you remember, for those of you who are participating to all the IGLC meetings during the ICANN meeting, the one before that, we talked about training and the transfer of competence from the ccTLDs to their community and especially online training because it was also a hot topic and especially in the first months of the crisis.

And this question of digital sovereignty seemed to us so [prevalent] and the feedback we had from this session was so interesting that we decided to deepen the work on that and have a second session about this main topic today.

So I will go very quickly in the proposal that we make to the ccNSO and we want to share with you, reminding us that the proposals issued from the IGLC are never about positions or political statements or how could or should the ccTLD react to that or that debate within the Internet Governance Forum or context. It's always to give some clues or some

---

methods or some tools to help ccTLD manager identify topics of interest and maybe dig in themselves, for themselves to build a position. And this is very important because we cannot do this job of trying to have a common position. This is not our mandate. And by the way, that would be in itself very complex for us.

So, Claudia, could you go to the next slide, please?

Okay, so before going to sovereignty, let's remind that we, from the beginning, have tried to share with you what the group thinks and sometimes even larger than the group because we do sometimes surveys to all ccNSO members. What are the highly relevant topics for ccTLD managers? Local content, digital divide, IDN, cyber security, regulations, role of the ccTLDs as promoters of the IGF dialogues, technical topics, capacity building.

We have talked about capacity building some months ago. I think we have talked about local content also. And for now, and this is just talking about what we are going to do later, it seems that within the group—that was what we discussed at the last IGLC meeting online that we had a few days ago—cyber security is getting a more and more important attention from all the members of the group. Let's remind that these topics are always seen as topics within the Internet Governance context. A good way to see if our job is in line with our mandate is to check when we find a topic that is of interest, if it is of interest in other Internet governance fora. If it's not the case, it's not in our mandate. If it's the case, then it was [inaudible].

---

But cyber security will be for later. Let's come back to digital sovereignty and maybe go to the next slide please, Claudia.

Okay, so most of the results of the one that we have done together was trying to categorize the different possibilities to talk about digital sovereignty and sometimes to find examples to illustrate these different categories. Why did we do that? Not only for the pleasures of doing categories, but to give a tool to all our fellow ccTLD managers to, when they are aware of a debate within their country or within their region, if they want to use this kind of table and if this debate, they can relate it to one of these categories, maybe they can relate it to the digital sovereignty topic. And if they can relate it to the digital sovereignty topic, maybe it's of interest for their ccTLD because sometimes as ccTLDs, we have something to say about sovereignty. Most of us are seen as the national registry, which means that most of us have or are seen as a [tool] for the digital sovereignty locally.

I hear someone's trying to speak, or is it just something else? No. Okay, I will finish very quickly anyway, this presentation. I think I have 15 minutes, so I still have to.

So, you look at the categories, international platforms and social media regulations, hosting local data locally, measures to keep local traffic local while maintaining an open Internet, legislative package to regulate the digital economy, public policies to enhance the local industry, protections of citizens' rights at national or regional level, regulation of big digital players at national or regional level.

---

With that, any example that we found and that we shared within the group, we found that it fell into one of these categories. I give you very, very quick examples. For instance, speaking from Europe, if we are talking about the Digital Service Act in Europe, the DSA, it's [obviously] coming into legislative package to regulate the digital economy.

If we talk about Gaia-X, the program to foster the hosting of data by European players in Europe, it's more in public policies to enhance the local industry. If we are talking about policies aiming to foster the establishment of IXPs, for instance, which is something that is still very important in some countries, especially in Africa and some members from Senegal, from the Ivory Coast confirm that, it will fall under "keep local traffic local while maintaining an open Internet".

And of course, there are plenty of other examples. When we talk about local traffic, we can also talk about the copies of the root servers. When we talk about public policies to enhance the local industry, we have found examples about artificial intelligence sovereignty program. When we talk about protection of citizens' rights at national level, it becomes obvious that we could have examples about the personal data protection laws. And of course, you have plenty of other examples of our hosting data locally. We had some examples from a member from Turkey, Abdullah, who gave us examples of new obligations to store registration data locally.

And for the first category, international platforms and social media regulations, as the regulations are mostly taken at the national level usually because there are very few international regulations, most of

---

the attempts to regulate the international platforms, I think a lot of people here do know that [the items] almost everywhere in the world can form into this category that is related to digital sovereignty.

So, that was the presentation I wanted to give, not as a comprehensive and definitive categorization of the different approaches to digital sovereignty, but just to try to illustrate as much as we can, the methodology that we followed and the aim of this tool which is to cover as much as possible the different faces of digital sovereignty to help us as ccTLD managers pick those that are interesting for us and work on it at the national level, maybe sometimes, or even at the international level when we go to the Internet Governance Forum, for instance.

For the rest of the session, the idea first of all is for you to discuss this presentation, this approach, ask as much questions as you want, and some members of the IGLC are here and will answer it. I'm not the only one to be able to answer that. Maybe share examples—and I think that would be very nice—of the action of your ccTLD locally on one of those topics or one of those categories, or the fact that, for instance, your governance is asking you something about something that is falling under this category. If you are adding a category, and I think with that, we will try to wrap up at the end of the session and try to make this categorization better and then give it out to the ccTLD managers, first of all.

And if some of the categories are to you, the main one or the most important, maybe dig further in it and try to have an exercise of trying to explain how this category is at the heart of the ccTLD model and how

---

we can make an argument about that and talk to our stakeholders about the importance of our action relating to that, or that, or that category.

I see our first comment or question by Joerg. What about adequate choice of a category? And I'm sorry, Joerg, but I'm not sure I understand what is the question.

JOERG SCHWEIGER: [I may add if I may have the mic, which I hopefully do have, right?]

PIERRE BONIS: Yeah, we can hear you, Joerg.

JOERG SCHWEIGER: Okay. So, first of all, thanks very much for the presentation, Pierre. I'm thinking about choice in the way that digital sovereignty is, from my perspective, dependent on choice. So, for example, if we take a look at the European situation where Gaia-X is currently very prominently being promoted, then it's all about choice in the cloud field. So, what sovereignty for me is, not to say all about but at least with a strong aspect, it's about choice. Do I have a choice to select equally functioning platform instead of Google, instead of Facebook, instead of Microsoft Azure, to name clouds, and so forth?

So, this is what I meant by putting up choice as a category. For me, sovereignty is defined by the choices I do have in an adequate way. Does it make that a little bit more clear?



---

PIERRE BONIS: Well, yeah, thank you very much, Joerg. Thank you very much. It's very clear now. I thought you were talking about how do we choose the category, but this is not adding a category as giving the choice to the people, which is at the same time, choice and diversity of solutions. I think that you make a very good point. This is at the heart of a lot of the debate, clearly.

And maybe that could be an even greater category because I think under this choice category falls some sub-categories that we have, trying to show.

So, thank you very much for that, Joerg.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Pierre, I see that there is one hand up.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, Joke. Yeah. Okay, there is Leonid who has his hand up. Leonid, you have the floor.

LEONID TODOROV: Right, Pierre. Hi. Can you hear me? Hello. Can you hear me?

PIERRE BONIS: Loud and clear.

---

LEONID TODOROV:

Right. Thank you. Well, good time of the day, everyone. Well, how could I refrain? Being a Russian, how could I refrain from trying to give some input as my country and my government, of course, promotes very vigorously the concept of sovereignty, digital sovereignty. And I believe that there is yet another...

Well, first of all, I am in full agreement with these categories. Yet, I believe that there is an overarching super-category, if you will, which probably should be also taken into account given that unique situation in which many ccTLDs in the world have already found themselves. And that's politicization of all these categories by which I mean not just international platform and attempts to regulate them locally.

But let's say under certain circumstances, U.S.-based platforms which should be regulated or Chinese platforms which should be banned, or Chinese applications which should be banned and vice-versa. And even in the United States, for example, with that TikTok, we do understand that it was a purely political decision. So we should factor into these very important aspects because that's what we have to deal with in our daily operation and what we have to consider when we deal with our governments. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you very much, Leonid, for that. You remind us all that—and that's I think what we said during the last session a few months ago, that when we talk about these categories and we talk about digital sovereignty, it's with the hypothesis that for us, digital sovereignty is something that is not closing something, but at the same time, as Joerg

---

said, given the choice, supporting local industry while maintaining an open Internet, and what we talk about open Internet is international relations and exchanges between the people thanks to the Internet we know.

And I think with that, we avoid the political trap that we can have because I'm very sure that no one is against the local industry, local [inaudible], and I'm pretty sure that around this virtual table, no one also is against international exchange and the opportunity to work with all the countries that we want to work with.

LEONID TODOROV:

If I may just, I believe there is a subtle, yet very important, distinction I have to draw here between Joerg and your stance, and what I can see so far in Russia and in some other countries.

It's great to have a choice, an unrestricted choice, however, at times when it comes to end users and even businesses, there is no choice but rather, coercion into a certain framework or model or whatever, or even platform. So, that's the big difference between, I would call it the western discourse and non-western one. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you, Leonid. For the record, [Amazon] is neither German nor French. So, when we talk about choice, it's also because we want to make sure that the end users in our respective countries have the choice, have the opportunity to choose national or local solutions.

---

I see that there is... Joerg raises his hand, so Joerg, I give you back the floor. And there are some comments or questions in the chat, so please, Claudia, just remind me how we do it. Do we read it out loud? Do we give the floor to the people who have written?

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

However you like. We can give the floor to those who comment or I can read it out loud, whatever you wish. And we do have Javier with his hand up. He wrote the comments, so I think he would like to take the floor. Javier?

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET:

Yeah, sure. It's not really about the comment. Maybe it can be read. But in general, it's a question. Is there a distinction here between the concept of digital sovereignty and some other formulation of similar concepts like cyber sovereignty? Is there a distinction there or is it the same?

I've heard the term "cyber sovereignty" used attached to very top-down approaches, like perhaps China's approach towards it is kind of like China's great firewall and constant vigilance internally and then its approach is towards kind of international organizations, governmentalizing the Internet instead of it being a bottom-up approach that is kind of like public/private. Is there a distinction there? That's the question.

---

PIERRE BONIS: I don't know if anyone from the IGLC wants to answer Javier's question. This is not a question that we asked ourselves during our debate, so I would say that for us, there is no discussed position about that. It seems to me that every time we talk about cyber something, we talk a little bit more about security but that may be a personal point of view.

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: That's interesting. I would like to hear Leonid's point of view on this because yeah, the word "cyber" is so attached to security and then very strong governmental, top-down approaches towards sovereignty have to do with security. Maybe the concept "cyber sovereignty" is more attached to application of police power by the state versus digital sovereignty. It seems to be something that's within that. It's softer and it's an aspect of it. It would be a way to approach things, but it seems to be a sub-category of the broader concept. Leonid?

LEONID TODOROV: Pierre, may I?

PIERRE BONIS: Yeah, go ahead, Leonid and then after, I will give back the floor to Joerg.

LEONID TODOROV: Thank you. I will just try to be brief. Well, it's a big question, Javier, and I believe that basically, you are right. I think that the underlying fundamental distinction, it's just all about the institutions behind these concepts.

---

I mean, for now, as far as I can see, digital sovereignty for many means some purely technical or administrative matters which do not hamper the basic freedoms including the freedom of choice and whatever of the Internet.

Meanwhile, cyber sovereignty means something different, which you quite accurately labeled as “top-down authoritarian”. I would say police-led, in very broad terms, and process and also arrangements, and also a quite natural strive for a self ... I wouldn't say isolation because there is always a gateway to the global Internet. But still, squeezing that gateway to the minimal degree and heavy control over data and information flows, something like that. So you are absolutely right.

And I believe that, yes, we know at least a couple of examples and they are most telling. We can see that in addition to that, these particular parties also propose the role of Internal organizations as opposed to the multistakeholder-driven process. And they believe that although for now, they admit that there is room for some other stakeholders to discuss certain things, but there is no possibility for those stakeholders to take part in a decision-shaping process.

I was witness and was present in those rooms where there were discussions on these issues, and quite symbolically, I would say that for example, in the World Internet Conference in Wuzhen, unless you're invited for a dialogue on cyber sovereignty, then you are not allowed into that particular room. So that's how it works. Thank you.

---

JAVIER RÚA-JOVET: If I can quickly... Yeah, thanks for that, Leonid. And this also brings the point of the tensions between multilateralism and multistakeholderism. Like you say, multilateralism, if they're going to hear a nongovernmental voice, you have to fight for a spot and fight to be heard versus, and it's just a favor the government is doing to you versus multistakeholderism. We are an equal party to everyone else, so that's very important. Thanks for that, Leonid. Thanks to all.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, Javier, for this discussion. And by the way, this is interesting because we are the heart of the kind of discussion that usually we have related to the Internet governance topic at broadly, multilateral versus stakeholder, etc. Just to remind us all that in that particular exercise that we have launched within the IGLC, we launched it at a time when sovereignty was discussed all over the place and not especially in the digital era. That's almost one year ago when we started these discussions and we were talking about medical sovereignty, pharmaceutical sovereignty, alimentary sovereignty because all the countries were under lockdown with closed borders and were thinking about their interdependency with the others.

So while I totally recognize this importance of the cyber sovereignty, as you said, which is more about cyber security, law enforcement, etc., in this particular exercise, we didn't start from that. We started from what happens in the digital economy that happens in other parts of the economy following the closing of the borders. I don't know if it's clear why we started this discussion.

---

I saw that Marie-Noémie has raised her hand.

MARIE-NOÉMIE MARQUES: Yeah. Good afternoon. I would like to say something about the measurements to keep local traffic local while maintaining an open Internet.

In this area, well, as you may already know, the discussions around the world, WTO [naturally,] are about authorizing traffic of data all around the world and across the countries. So, in general, the way we see it is that the measures that allow that national level in that area are only relative to security of public order measures. So, if the states have the right to define specific rules locally for that, normally they should be limited to security or public order measures.

So, I just wanted to specify this because the way it is presented in this category may be wrong because, in fact, the measures to keep local traffic should be normally limited. Yeah, because the objective in general is more to authorize the cross-border data flows and limiting them to security or public order measures. So, this was to be, to assert the limits of the discussion. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, Marie-Noémie. I think this is a very fair point when we are talking about categories of governmental action towards digital sovereignty, but this is not what we are talking about. We are not only talking about the intervention of governments here. We are talking about the initiatives, sometimes governmental, sometimes not, that



---

are presented to enhance digital sovereignty and when, for instance, we give the example of Internet exchange points. The reason why it can be established is not a reason falling under security measures or what is authorized to a government to take some action. It's reasons that can be of local performance of the traffic, of economic performance for the local ISPs.

So, we are not only talking about regulations here. We are talking about the initiatives that are discussed locally. So, I think this is you make a very important point when you say that in a way, when it comes to transforming that in regulation, laws, etc., there should be a limit to... And also, I don't know if you're right or wrong, but this is a point of view that is totally fair, to try to fix limits to the interventions of the governments. But not only the governments can talk about that.

MARIE-NOÉMIE MARQUES: Business, companies as well. This is very much, they're very important for them.

PIERRE BONIS: Yeah, but you know, you have also... We are in a multistakeholder world, so you can also have some users who have something to say about that. I don't know if, for instance, some other members of the IGLC could share their experience of IXPs but the idea of implementing it is not only a business or a governmental approach. It can be a user-centric approach also.

---

So, I fully agree with you but that was just to make the point that we are not only discussing the intervention of government while it's very important also.

MARIE-NOÉMIE MARQUES: Thanks.

PIERRE BONIS: So, I see there is a question from Desiree about something that I don't know. So I cannot answer. About an institute of digital sovereignty. There is an Institute of Digital Sovereignty, L'Institut Francais de la Souveraineté Numérique, but it's not a governmental initiative, so it's not established in a way. It's a think tank as much as I know. So, I don't know if you are talking about that or if you are talking about something else.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Pierre, we also have Pablo with his hand up.

PIERRE BONIS: Yeah. Paula, go ahead. No, Pablo, not Paula. Sorry.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: No problem. I just wanted to add to the discussion on the Internet Exchange points. Departing from the stance that Internet Exchange points are necessary from the user's point of view. For example, I had experience in Puerto Rico where we had found traffic going as far as

---

Brazil before reaching a destination here in Puerto Rico, a local destination. Or going as far to San Francisco and coming back to Puerto Rico. So, it is important to keep the local traffic local in order to behave as good net citizens.

Now, it is sometimes the case that private companies, ISPs, are not so willing to participate and create an Internet Exchange Point in some cases, in some parts of the world, including Puerto Rico. So, just for argument's sake, it would be interesting to see from the government side, how in some instances in which on behalf of the end user, to promote certain regulations that would promote all ISPs to participate in an Internet Exchange Point, where the government has hands off. Where the government is not putting any type of rules, regulations, just on behalf of the end users and local end users to make all the ISPs to participate in an Internet Exchange Point in order to maintain the local traffic local. Any thoughts?

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you very much, Pablo. This is maybe, Marie-Noémie, again, this is a good example of ... Is it possible that the government has something to do with that kind of things because sometimes the business itself is not ready to put in place these kind of ISPs?

MARIE-NOÉMIE MARQUES:

Sorry, I have no views on that. Sorry.

---

PIERRE BONIS: Okay, maybe Alex. Alex, you had this experience in Senegal, I think. I don't know if you hear us. Alex Corenthin.

ALEX CORENTHIN: I'm still here. I have moved. I just come and I heard my name [inaudible].

PIERRE BONIS: The question was about the ISPs. We had this debate about when it comes to keeping local the local traffic, should it be done by regulation with intervention of the government or should it be, let's say, a bottom-up approach? And the intervention from Puerto Rico was very clear that sometimes the bottom-up approach itself is not sufficient because the people do not want to work together.

And the question was, do we have some experience to share about that and at what point the regulation can be a good weapon for the end users when the business or the technical committee is not getting together quickly enough or something like that?

So, I thought I just wanted to ask you to intervene next on that because I know that you have worked not only in Senegal but in a lot of countries on this IXP topic.

ALEX CORENTHIN: Perfect. I want just to share with you my experience, I think, on that. We find that ... we try both approaches, one from the regulatory bodies and the others with a bottom approach. And it seems that no one of them

---

have succeeded and mainly because I think it's working on [inaudible] business executives that want—people that want [to be] rich. Many, it seems that is not to say something coming from the members of the [ISP.] But it needs to have a policy, let's say a big involvement of the policymakers about that and to put it [on the right.]

In order to decrease the cost of the local bandwidth, I think that's mainly our understanding about what happened in Senegal because we have ten years before we have this [IXP] on the floor, but this time we don't have any exchange. We have an exchange between the telco operators, but no returns on the market. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS:

Yeah, thank you very much, Alex, and thank you very much, Pablo, to have brought that idea that sometimes regulation can speed up obvious things that are not done by the business itself and maybe, by the way, this is something that could be thought of as examples when ccTLDs are getting involved to put everyone around the table.

Okay. More than ten minutes ago, Joerg had his hand raised and I think I never gave him back the floor.

JOERG SCHWEIGER:

I get the floor back because you're desperate, Pierre? No.

PIERRE BONIS:

No, not at all.

---

JOERG SCHWEIGER: Certainly, the flow of the discussion went on, so I have nothing to add here.

PIERRE BONIS: Okay. So, I see Leonid still has his hand raised. So, I will give him the floor just after telling Desiree that the report issued by Afnic about the Internet of Things and digital sovereignty is worth reading but has not a lot to do with the talk today and would fall into this category which is public policies to enhance the local industry if it had to be put in a category. Leonid?

LEONID TODOROV: Thank you, Pierre. I'm sorry for usurping so much of this session's time, but I believe that it's important once again to understand that, well, I'm afraid that we have an aberration. Many in this virtual room and we believe that there always is that group of countries that adhere to best practices and are multistakeholder-driven and whatever. But most of non-western countries—I'm trying to be politically and socially correct—so most of non-western countries, their governments and their ccTLDs have long found themselves in a very particular situation in which it is only the government that has vision, at least some funds, and political will to get the show on the road whether an IXP or any other technical or administrative or regulatory initiative.

So, it's just not because the business is unwilling, but the business is way too small. Not that civil society is, well, distances itself from this

---

task, but there is no civil society or it's just nascent. So, under such circumstances, many countries resort to governments as the only player in this game.

And, indeed, while governments have that task to improve and upgrade a country's infrastructure, so much or even more than that, they are keen now to develop their Internet infrastructure. So, as long as they are taking on this job, I guess their efforts should be commended.

Another thing is that when governments realize that they are the only player in the field and they just try to do whatever it takes to restrict or constrain other stakeholders' participation in these and other processes, that we should get really concerned.

So, again, as Wolfgang Kleinwachter put it, this Internet governance thing is a kind of spaghetti bowl. So, you cannot effectively go into that and take just one spaghetti and say, "Well, this is perfectly cooked," because everything is so confusingly...

PIERRE BONIS:

Okay, thank you very much, Leonid. I think this is the conclusion we could make every time we are talking about IG, obviously. I'm very sorry to cut, but it remains five minutes for us. I would like those of you who want to just share quickly initiatives, products, publications that you are doing within your ccTLD and that you think could be linked to one of these categories.

I have a lot in mind and not about Afnic itself, .fr, but I think that is the beginning of the usefulness of our work. If you talk about your

---

initiatives and say, “Okay, this thing from DENIC or NIC Sénégal or from Orange falls into this category,” then we start to build something that is interesting because it’s advocating ourselves.

So, if someone wants just in a few words to say, “We are doing that,” or “We have this research program and it’s seen as or it could be seen as a tool for digital sovereignty,” that would be perfect. And this is, of course, a thing that we can keep on doing by mail later. Sorry to come back to you always, Joerg. That’s because I love you, of course. But don’t talk about ID4me, for instance. And I see Peter. Peter, you have the floor.

PETER VAN ROSTE:

Thanks, Pierre. Hi, everyone. I’m not going to talk about ID4me, but it’s close. I think one of the initiatives that fits into the categories that you’ve been discussing is the effort that a couple of European ccTLDs have engaged in jointly to make digital identities work across borders. It’s under the umbrella of a European research initiative and they’re basically ready to launch their communication campaign, so I assume that they will be targeting the ccNSO members in this as well since one of the purposes of the project is actually to engage and share knowledge and understanding of cross-border identification tools based on national IDs in particular.

So that was it and I think that definitely falls into the plan to keep local data local rather than have large platforms feed their identification tools across the whole world. That’s it. Thanks.



---

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, Peter. That's a very, very, very good example. Is there anyone who would like to share an example of this kind? And of course, when it comes to identification on itself, it's very important. Allan?

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Thank you, Pierre. Actually, I just want to come back to the subject of IXPs, which I know we've already talked about. But here in Canada, we, as the national ccTLD, played a catalyst role in the establishment of new IXPs in Canada. I think before we started about eight years ago, we estimated 25-30% of all local traffic, Canada traffic, was going through the U.S. and now we feel that that number has been substantially reduced. We now have new IXPs all across the country and we played a former facilitator role or catalyst in the establishment of these and this is actually well documented on our website. But it's something that we can do as ccTLDs because you have the technical expertise. In our case, we're a not-for-profit, so it gave us a little bit of financial ability to help out at the start as well, and it's something I encourage other ccTLDs to do as well. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, Allan, for that. Of course, it's always frustrating. It's 4:00 P.M. I apologize, not to be the best Chair ever because we have to end this session at the very moment when it comes more and more concrete. So, we have two examples shared already. We can go on with

---

this discussion online. I hope so. I think this is very important that we have these examples to share together of the role of the ccTLD within this digital sovereignty. So, thank you all for your participation. I hope that it has been... I think that it has been a nice talk and I hope that it refreshes our ideas on that topic.

And we will find a way to reach out to you, to continue this discussion online one way or another. So thank you all. Thank you. A big thank you to the IGLC members and a bigger thank you even to Joke who is working endlessly, tirelessly for us all year, and all the team, Bart and Claudia. Thank you for your involvement and your excellent work.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Thank you, Pierre. This meeting is now adjourned. You can now stop the recording.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**