
SAN JUAN – CCWG-IG Session
Monday, March 12, 2018 – 13:30 to 15:00 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...engage in processes that revolve around various initiatives that take place outside of ICANN walls, both in Geneva and New York and in many different places around the world.

We have a number of guests that are with us today to speak about various parts of the agenda. The agenda that was listed is actually slightly different to the order in which we'll be tackling issues. We've somehow listed them as challenges. They're not so much challenges but actually issues that need to be dealt with where ICANN's presence needs to be felt and where the community needs to bring its input and its feedback to ICANN staff that go and participate in these different fora.

We've got sitting at the table the chair of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance, Matthew Shears. I have to my right Tarek Kamel. Then as we go through, I'll introduce each person in turn. I think they're well-known members of the community.

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.

I hope that my co-chairs Rafik Dammak and Young-eum Lee will be joining us soon. They're probably in another session. I know a number of sessions are late.

Finally, one piece of housekeeping advice which is that when you speak, please say your name before you speak because we have interpretation in Spanish and I understand I think in French as well maybe? Maybe French? Yeah. So we have interpretation and, therefore, the interpreters need to say the name of the person. It's a lot easier.

That's where we are. Without any further ado, I think we can just start with an introduction from Tarek Kamel who is the head of government and engagement department in ICANN to really give us a background around an evolving Internet political ecosystem. Tarek, you have the floor.

TAREK KAMEL:

Thank you very much, Olivier. Good afternoon, everybody, and welcome to this session. I'm delighted to participate with the Cross-Community Working Group on IG.

I will be trying to start with more or less a few questions or observations that we could share together while we go forward about specifically the changing and evolving landscape of Internet governance on a global level as well as ICANN's role

within this changing and evolving IG landscape and how far should we really stay engaged and what are the priorities in this case for our engagement as ICANN within our technical mandate together with other technical and sister organizations, I* (I-star) organizations.

The first question that I'm starting with is related. Do we start to see some symptoms of fatigue of Internet governance issues as we have known them for the last ten years and a change or shift in handling them?

That's the first question. I'm asking this because we have seen definitely that the [UNG] government group of experts last June did not necessarily come to a conclusion. We have seen them, the CSTD of enhanced cooperation did not come to a conclusion, and other examples as well that I don't want to list at the time being.

There are questions about the amount of government participation and business participation in the global IGF, although we see definitely a booming participation on national regional IGFs. But still, the question is there. Do we see some global fatigue after the IANA transition has been handled? As such that the classical mood of handling Internet governance issues there are symptoms of fatigue.

The next question: Do we see some thematic and sectoral shift in the discussion more than global Internet governance topics? As they were cross sectoral and on a global level since if we assume that this fatigue is there and [true], I don't know. I mean, we need to think about it together. Then maybe we start to see some shifts of some of the discussions moving toward a sectoral, thematic discussion, more of Internet policies as such. WTO is an example.

I'm not saying necessarily that they are UN based. They are UN and non-UN based as such. But we see the different sectors maybe coming together and saying, "Okay, if you are not solving the overall issues in global discussion related to IG, let's go back within our consortia, within our platforms that we use to work and maybe handle some of our challenges." And probably they want us around as technical community to be there to provide our input because it is needed. The experience is needed. The input of the multi-stakeholder community is needed as such.

So we might see this shift moving more to sectoral discussions, moving more to thematic discussions in different places. As we see, the [GCS] was one of the examples. The Internet and Jurisdiction movement of Bertrand de La Chapelle is another example. [There are several] examples that relate to the whole discussion: G20 and G7 discussion. I'm throwing questions. I'm not necessarily claiming that there are [answers].

In this case, how far should we as ICANN community put our priorities for participation to be there providing our technical input and know-how within these new evolving discussions that are of relevance? Again, I'm saying they probably are welcoming our input even in the different fora, not necessarily rejecting.

One of the examples that I have just seen and wanted to share with you was in the last couple or ten days when I was with Göran at the GSMA that there are evolving discussions related to the technical evolution of the 5G and Internet of Things that are happening on a wide scale within the Internet service providers and the mobile providers as such within the GSMA.

The question becomes how this would affect the future of the overall technical Internet ecosystem [and enhance] the DNS as such. How far should we be engaged with these mobile providers that are investing now a lot of investment in the 5G and think they are going to shape the technical evolution of not only the mobile communication but the Internet communication and broadband communication because they are providing the new platform? Do we need to be there as a technical community to provide them with our input within GSMA platforms? They are quite well enabled community. Again, we have seen signals that they are welcoming our input.

So I wanted to put this in front of the CCWG for the discussions today and going forward so that while we continue to be active at ITU fora related to issues and related to naming and addressing and interests of the technical community while we would continue to be supportive of the global and national regional IGFs, but we also need to be cognizant of what's happening in front of us globally in the different fora as I mentioned, including the cybersecurity processes of The Hague and others and to think wisely together where to prioritize our engagement, our resources.

Because from another point of view, we can't be everywhere. So we need to prioritize for ourselves. And we get feedback where should the staff also and ICANN org put our priorities while we go forward with these things.

So I wanted to start by this introduction. Back to you, Olivier. And thank you very much for having me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tarek. Thank you for kicking the ball into play. You've touched onto quite a few topics. We have an agenda which will take us through some of those topics so that we have a little bit of a structure as to what to address first.

You've spoken about the IP addressing resources. I think the first part of our discussion would be about the coordination and distribution of Internet identifiers. So not only the IP addresses, but we're talking about top-level domains and the discussions that are taking place at the ITU-WTSA, the Plenipotentiary and the ITU. There are discussions happening on the World Trade Organization e-commerce agenda. Of course, there's a big discussion here regarding geographical names at the top level.

For this, we have Pablo Hinojosa from APNIC, Nigel Hickson from ICANN staff, and Marilyn Cade is a well-known participation in ICANN and from the Business Constituency (BC). I'm trying to reduce the number of acronyms being used here.

This is quite a loose discussion. I'd also like to make it interactive with the audience. So if anybody wishes to also speak on these issues, could they please make themselves known. I think we should have a flying mic for people that are behind us. But those people who are on the table can then point to me and I'll put them in the queue.

I've seen Marilyn Cade throwing things around, so let's start with Marilyn please.

MARILYN CADE:

I guess that could have been the black flag of defeat but as you guys all know, I don't believe in defeat. Tarek, I'm going to respond. Some of you know that I like to speak in parables and use pictures as illustration. I see where we are as a new cycle. I have the benefit of looking backward because I've lived through previous cycles.

What I'm seeing myself and experiencing is every few years, innovation and technology and new ideas begin to drive new opportunities in the uses and applications of technology. But also, the uses of technology begin to affect the scope and scale of the present policy situation or issues that are in front of us.

In 2009, I was a principle in a project called the G20 ICT Policy Project which was about convincing the G20 heads of state that ICT should become part of the G20 and the G8 agenda. I saw at that time – up until that time, believe me, heads of state except for President Bill Clinton because I told him to (I'm joking) up until that time heads of state were not so much talking about ICTs or the Internet.

I look at where we are now. When you ask, are the questions dramatically changing, I think to some extent they're maturing. As some issues mature and evolve, we begin to find some solutions but then we find that complexity. The more integrated technology and the Internet is into our daily lives or as new

capabilities of technology, then all of a sudden we have lots of unanswered questions because citizens' daily lives are affected. And when that happens, that means we elevate the concern of elected and appointed political leaders.

The other comment I'm just going to make is I've spent most of my technical career at AT&T and working in the computer sector and the Internet sector and working at most of the UN expert agencies: WIPO, ITU, WTO, ILO, the entire alphabet, OECD. One of the challenges is how those institutions and organization train their staff to keep up with the kinds of changes that are going on. And particularly because in many of those organizations if the senior officials are elected, and this is true of policy makers as well, they're not necessarily elected because of their in-depth understanding of the implications of technology.

I think that the engagement of ICANN and of the I*s and of this community here in those working activities at that long alphabetical list of agencies, intergovernmental and regional, is absolutely essential to help to be even an expert advisor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Marilyn. I've seen Jim Prendergast earlier put his hand up so, Jim, you have the floor.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Thanks. Good afternoon. Jim Prendergast, Galway Strategy Group. I guess, Tarek, you covered a heck of a lot of ground there to the point where I couldn't even keep up with it.

I'm going to put a question back to you since you put many to us. What direction have you gotten from the board as far as the scope of the engagement activities that you and your team and others that have responsibility in this area? How far should you be going and how thin should you be spreading yourself? Because you can't cover everything that's out there.

TAREK KAMEL: No. Thank you for asking this question. We are fortunate to have a Board Working Group on Internet Governance that is looking into these issues while we go forward.

It is clear that the Board Working Group on Internet Governance – and maybe we invite Matthew also to say a few words about that – that they recognize that there are priorities. And when it comes to issues related to naming and addressing if they come up in ITU forum or other, definitely ICANN needs to be very visible and very vocal because that's directly our remit.

Otherwise, we are talking about a collaborative engagement and about a more or less selective engagement based on thematic issues. The board is also looking for community input

in these different thematic priorities as such, whether they are jurisdiction, cybersecurity, human rights, [trade], or data protection and privacy.

But I just wanted to describe that we are witnessing the shift and, as Marilyn has said, to organizations that are looking forward to our expertise as a community not necessarily only as ICANN org but as I* community. So we need to engage in a dialogue together because I don't have the answer necessarily about the prioritization so that we maybe have this prioritization as a technical community together while we move forward.

Matthew, please maybe you want to comment?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Matthew Shears, chair of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Olivier, Tarek. That's a great question. What the Board Working Group on Internet Governance is doing is going through a process with Tarek and his team and with Theresa in trying to bring what I would characterize as a slightly more strategic and prioritized approach to some of the Internet governance issues that the board is particularly interested in. Obviously, that

would reflect what Tarek is doing and others and what the community's interested in.

So that process underway. What we're trying to do is we're trying to ensure that we have a feel for what's coming. Not only what do we have to deal with immediately but what's coming down the road. In that sense, that's a very important task and issue for the board to know about. What are we facing or potentially facing in terms of an Internet governance challenge.

Our immediate priorities, I think Tarek has shared with us where his team is engaging. It comprises a lot of the traditional places that you might imagine. But as he said, we have to recognize and adapt to an evolving Internet governance space.

I would just reinforce what he said. It's not that the challenge of Internet governance has gone away and the challenges are just as pressing. It's just that we're finding them in a more distributed environment, if you will. And that poses challenges, as Tarek said, in terms of resourcing and other things. So that is an important part of the conversation that we're having at the moment with government engagement and MSSI. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, and I welcome Rafik Dammak to the table, the co-chair from the GNSO for this working group.

Now next we have Steve DelBianco.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Olivier. Tarek, you spoke a little bit about ICANN's engagement at places like IGF. I was there this year on day zero when ICANN helped to populate a panel on alternative identifiers, handles in digital object architecture (DOA). ICANN was well represented and it was well organized, but at the end it got just a tad too defensive about domain names and a tad too aggressive about criticizing DOA.

So I'm finetuning it here, but let's continue and engage on that topic because that topic is a confrontation not an intersection. That's a confrontational topic, so we need to handle it with technical people, with diplomacy skills, and definitely state the shortcomings of a half-baked approach and talk about the evolving needs. But in the end, I think we want to be careful to embrace the evolution of technology.

It could be that domain name and numbers could evolve into something else, and I think this community would be right there to take it up in a multi-stakeholder way as opposed to having that flip over to a multilateral environment. So if we indicate too much disregard or animosity for alternatives to names and numbers, then it won't find a home with us, will it?

Then I wanted to segue to your point about businesses not being abundantly [attendant] in Geneva, and you're right. But I don't think it will be a problem next year because I was at the IGF in Geneva, and most of the sessions were civil society. And half of those that I attended we very aggressively expressing concerns that the Global South and maybe academics have grave concerns about platforms, what they call "parasitic platforms."

You wonder what I'm talking about: Lyft and Uber. A parasitic platform that exploits the fact that people in some lesser developed cities can earn income driving. The concern about data. Data is the new oil and American and North American and European companies are sucking the data out of these countries. There were complaints about Airbnb and HomeAway because it might impact the stock of affordable housing. Even Amazon and Etsy took shots.

I've just named all the members of NetChoice, so you can bet that we will be at every IGF attempting to understand what the concerns are and responding when appropriate. I think part of the response is to highlight that there's a lot of upside and economic opportunity that's created for people and that the data can feed an ecosystem of economic opportunity and income that isn't available otherwise.

I think that the conversation could steer that way. [inaudible] Andrew Mack, for instance, is exploring some new ventures on new platforms for agricultural improvements in opportunity. So whenever possible, the business community needs to engage but not just to defend but to explain and explore the opportunities we bring.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steve. Andrew, was that a follow up to Steve? Okay, a quick follow up from Andrew Mack.

ANDREW MACK:

Quickly. I was just in Colombia and talking about these kinds of new business models and about the opportunity that they bring. I think we want to take a look at this in a much less static way. The idea that we have that there are great big data sucking companies from the Global North and that there are victims in the Global South, this is changing. This is putting it on its head.

I was meeting three or four days ago just before coming here with Diego Molano who was the former ICT minister of Colombia who hosted us when we went to Cartagena. We were talking about a project that we're working on called Agromovil, which is kind of an Uber for crops linking up producers with markets and

transporters. He was also talking about a group called Rapi which is a you can order anything basically in Bogota.

The thing that strikes me is two. Number one is that we shouldn't think of this debate as being between north and south and that we definitely want to see and we want to encourage the openness for these new business models because they're being developed not just in the Global North but also in the Global South. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Andrew. A quick comment from Tarek, and I think that [he'll] have to leave at some point shortly.

TAREK KAMEL: I will be back, but to respond to Steve, ICANN will never definitely stand against any evolution of new technology. This has been the position very clearly of the management as well as the board as well as even David Conrad and his team were very early engaged in the discussion. Okay, fine, sometimes we sound defensive. That's natural. That's human.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, we don't!

[laughter]

TAREK KAMEL: But it will be never the case. We have to embrace every technology, whatever it is, wherever it is coming from, and be part of the discussion and try to encourage them to be active within the multi-stakeholder platforms. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tarek. Now Steve has alluded to DOA, DONA, the perceived threats and challenges. Are these threats and challenges? Pablo Hinojosa?

PABLO HINOJOSA: I was a little bit surprised about the agenda here that refers to challenges to the distribution of Internet identifiers. Then it talks about discussions, mostly at the global level, related to IP addresses or top-level domains, for example, at the ITU.

So perhaps I prefer to frame the discussion in a more positive way and talk more about opportunities rather than challenges. I cannot speak on behalf of others, but from APNIC's perspective we try to engage positively and constructively and try to maximize areas of collaboration.

This has surely been the case of the ITU, for example. Even if there are different ideas or approaches to issues at the ITU or there are many different voices as well there from member states, we think that there is indeed some level of shared objectives, particularly in the development sector.

We in APNIC, for example, have a very good collaboration at the regional level with the regional ITU office with an annual workshop on IPv6 and direct country assistance. It happens that many ITU members are also APNIC members. They are interested to learn more about how to deploy IPv6.

So this has been a very good collaboration to the degree that last year at the WTDC in Buenos Aires after many very difficult discussions and negotiations and texts about resolutions, for example Resolution 63 on IPv6, and for the first time if you see the result of it, there was a direct mention in the results of that resolution of cooperation between the ITU and the regional Internet registries, which a long time they were referred generically on a footnote and not directly. So I think that's a very positive thing.

It is also very much because of the work that ICANN and the RIRs and the organizations present there engaged positively in this. So more than challenges, I think it depends on how we like to engage with these processes, as Steve said.

Can I speak more, or shall I leave it there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, unless somebody kicks you out, you can speak a little more if you wish, if you have more to say.

PABLO HINOJOSA: Yeah, a couple of more things to say. Tarek mentioned a long list [indeed] of processes and organizations, mostly intergovernmental multilateral at the international arena. But I think that for us, most of our engagements are in the regional space, of course, in the case of APNIC Asia Pacific. After the IANA stewardship transition, there has been a shift in our commitments mostly because our most important engagements are happening less in the global intergovernmental arena and more at the regional level with the technical community.

The way we think about this is that somehow we achieved some security on our governance system with the transition. It doesn't mean that we need to leave those behind. We really cannot take the eye off of those, of course. But the most important engagements at the end are with the technical community building capacity and supporting infrastructure and development.

However, I don't see that fatigue that Tarek was saying. I see also a shift, less about governance issues, about who does what and how and more about, for example, security. Security is a challenge. Security is, indeed, a challenge. I think there is an opportunity to collaborate with other organizations in that arena in a positive and constructive way.

I will leave it there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Pablo. What about these recurring proposals from some member countries about country Internet registries and the allocation of IP addresses being provided through different channels rather than the current channels? Is that still on the table somehow?

PABLO HINOJOSA: I think that will continue to be the case, of course. I really hope that more and more within the governmental arena those can be compensative as the trend of the discussions have been which is toward more recognition, collaboration, and acceptance of the importance of technical community in this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Pablo. Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. I want to make a quick observation and follow up before Nigel speaks if I might.

I too expect those proposals to continue from certain member states. But I have spent many, many of my days in some of those working groups at the ITU and elsewhere, and I want to make an observation. In 1998, 11 countries accounted for the majority of the 147 million Internet users. Between 2001 and 2005 when we grew to 1.4 billion users, we found that we had a much higher growing awareness and participation of governments.

At one point what I saw, Pablo, was we would be in a room and 60-70% of the governments representatives would be cautious if not negative. Today, I think I can count the shift to their being only five or six or seven that are still particularly focused on a shift in participation and oversight. I think one of the reasons that's happening is because of the work and the educational exchanges and the awareness that is growing up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. The regional Internet registries have been doing a lot of work. I'll turn it over to Nigel Hickson for the amount of work that ICANN has done in these fora to explain and somehow communicate with.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you very much, Olivier. Nigel Hickson, government and engagement. I just wanted to be very brief. As various people have already said and as Matthew Shears has alluded to, ICANN continues to watch developments across a number of arena. The Plenipotentiary in 2018 is taking place in November. The regional preparation process for that has already started.

Different regions put forward different proposals and, fortunately, the regional Internet registries, ISOC, ICANN, and others are involved in those regional preparations where we're invited. We're not invited to all the regional preparations. Some are just purely member states, but the majority do welcome stakeholders in and, therefore, we're able to understand the proposals that are being put forward and perhaps influence in some way, provide information, etc.

I think it's fair to say that we probably will see some proposals relating to geographic names, perhaps country names, at the Plenipotentiary. We might see proposals relating to IPv6, for example. But that, as Pablo has rightly said, is an opportunity as much as anything else to be able to promote the adoption of IPv6 in the value chain.

In terms of the work that the ITU might do on geographical names or country names or other types of names, well, we'll just

have to discuss that. Clearly, we think that we have quite a good locus here discussing it in ICANN, but thanks for the opportunity.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. Now what about the identifiers and the World Trade Organization e-commerce agenda? That's a bit of a new forum, new opening. How is ICANN dealing with this? In fact, I'm giving an open question here. Is anyone else following this, and how are they getting involved? Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Clearly as Tarek said, there are lots of dynamics in terms of discussion of Internet issues. Here we're seeing in a number of different international fora discussion of Internet issues. Not necessarily discussion of Internet governance issues, although under the WSIS umbrella there are still Internet governance issues.

For instance, at the WTO Ministerial e-commerce was discussed and whether in particular the WTO ought to, if you like, reenergize a discussion on e-commerce. As such, then the states didn't agree to have a work track on e-commerce and a number of countries have got together and having plurilateral discussions based in Geneva. We have no access to them. I'm not

saying we necessarily should. But they are discussing e-commerce.

Part of those discussions of e-commerce touch on the domain name system. So it will be interesting to see what might come out of those discussions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. Marilyn, is the business community involved in the World Trade Organization discussions?

MARILYN CADE: Of course, and we may even have somebody in the business community in the audience that might be able to speak more to what is going on. Do I see a volunteer? Otherwise, I'll make a – I see a volunteer.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Not necessarily a volunteer, but there's a question that has been posted in the chat. So maybe that might address what you were trying to raise.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible] read the chat.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's from Bill Drake. "What evidence is there that the WTO is doing something about identifiers? That's hardly the main focus."

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not quite sure that's the answer to the question, but it's another question which requires an answer. Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: Let me make a very high-level comment about the work of the WTO and businesses overall engagement at the WTO. And I have worked at the WTO in the past, but it has been quite a long time ago. Generally, this is a trade organization and there has always been an effort on the part of business to encourage the adherence to the core mission at WTO. Because business also doesn't want to see a lot of freelancing going on in these highly specialized agencies. That just adds additional work and burden for everybody to bring additional experts over and over.

But when you look at the underlying elements to support e-commerce, it is natural that there will be questions about the role of what some people will think of as platform elements. And unique identifiers will fall into that discussion.

I have not seen any formalized examination of the issues, but I think that there are some suggestions from some of the member

states of WTO that are asking whether there are elements related to trade. I admit I've seen no formal agreement to move forward one way or the other. So to Bill's point, where's the evidence?

Now it is always true that member states in an ITU organization can get together bilaterally or plurilaterally and talk among themselves. That doesn't mean a topic makes it to the agenda. It deserves watching, I would say, but just because there's a discussion doesn't always mean a topic then becomes a formal part in an agenda.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. I'm going to turn to people who are sitting behind me because I don't have an eye behind. But if anybody wishes to comment, is there any commenting specifically on the Internet identifiers discussion? There is a flying mic. If you do, please make yourself known.

The last part on this is the geographical names. I'm going to be provocative and ask whether it's for the United Nations to deal with these. I have one "no" in the room at the moment. Any "yeses"? Okay, well, that pretty much resolves the issue.

Right, so let's move on to the next thing, and that's the tension between the multilateral and multi-stakeholder fora. Of course,

we are all well aware of what multi-stakeholder is, at least in the ICANN context. Many of us take part in the Internet Government Forum, which is another part of multi-stakeholder fora.

But some are saying, of course, that the multi-stakeholder system is not particularly efficient. It doesn't really reach any decisions. It's a talk shop in the IGF. It's a cabal or whatever you would call it in ICANN. Insert your favorite word. So where does this tension come from, and is this getting worse or is this easing?

We have a number of names on here. I have Marilyn, Jimson Olufuye, Jorge Cancio who I think was here but he might have popped out perhaps, and also Tatiana. You're also [in for] this. Who wishes to speak to this. Oh, so we'll start with Martin Buttermann.

MARTIN BUTTERMAN: Thanks, Olivier. Just making very clear from my perspective, I do have a government background from some time ago. Multilateral doesn't exclude multi-stakeholder. I think whatever we do in the multi-stakeholder model, it's great that there's multilateral backing of that. So we just should make sure that is supported. On the other hand, what we also see is that sometimes from governments getting together [aside] there is

an assumption of multi-stakeholderism which isn't the same as ours.

Now we can do two things. One is say, "Hey, this is not correct. We stay away from it." The other thing is let's get involved and let's get it moving. So from both sides with [an] understanding of [what] multi-stakeholderism can be, let's get closer together. I'm very much in favor of the latter. That's why I do participate to those as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Martin. [Tatiana], did you wish to speak?

TATIANA TROPINA: I can.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: First I'll turn it over to Nigel Hickson because part of the sub-question in there is, how do governments engage in ICANN processes and also in other processes outside of ICANN? So, Nigel, just for a quick rundown in what the main difference is.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, Olivier, I think most people can engage so to speak on this question. What we do see is in the ICANN multi-stakeholder model, of course, the governments have a direct input into the

decision making process. Where in other multilateral settings stakeholders may well have an engagement but not so much an engagement in the decision making process.

This has been the subject of a number of debates and a number of papers in recent times. The Internet Society has done some important work on this, and Larry Strickling the former head of NTIA wrote a paper on the multi-stakeholder model and how different people engage.

But I think what it comes down to in ICANN, and people like Marilyn have got the extensive experience in this, where we can engage as stakeholders in the technical community we do engage. We engage as part of the technical community. The business community engage. The civil society engage as well. And we engage to the maximum ability we have, whether it's at the ITU, whether it's at the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) – which perhaps we might touch on in terms of the work they're doing on geographical names, etc. – or whether it be at the UN. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Nigel. I've Jimson Olufuye here at the table who has been involved quite extensively with the CSTD enhanced cooperation. Has there really been a lot of enhanced cooperation?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Thank you, Olivier. Good afternoon, everyone. Enhanced cooperation, I think what we're doing here is enhanced cooperation. We are all collaborating to discuss a very important issue. So let's take it that face value. That's where I will begin because that's how I see it.

The last time we met, I was full of optimism that there would be resolution. The Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, the United Nations Commission on Science and Technology for Development Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, on international public policy matters pertaining to the Internet [that was on then]. We've concluded the work now. I was fully optimistic that we would have some consensus recommendation because that was what the General Assembly wanted the group to come up with.

But let me just take us back a little for the sake of those that do not know what we are talking about really. After the 2005 WSIS, there were two important outcomes. That is, Internet Governance Forum has one track and then Enhanced Cooperation, the second track to enable governments on an equal footing to make policy with regard to the Internet and, of course, in collaboration with other stakeholders.

At that time, of course this had to do with the real remit of ICANN, that is the management of critical Internet resources, that is the IP names, numbers, and protocol parameters. By 2016, we knew that that has been quite handled in a way that management of the critical Internet resources is now in the hands of the community. But back then, it was USG that was doing the sole oversight of that.

That led to the consultation in 2012, open consultation by the United Nations and [inaudible] expressed opinion on what it is that we achieved. Then the GA later recommended that a working group should be set up by the chair of the CSTD. The first working group started in 2014 and ended 2016. They could not come up with a consensus position recommendation.

But one vital outcome was evident, and it was that there was a [inaudible] group that investigated has there been enhanced cooperation at all since 2005? It came out that there has been enhanced cooperation in many places actually. [inaudible] regard to cybercrime when you have the Budapest convention. It's even in other places. There has been a lot of collaboration on many issues on cybersecurity.

So that was clear evidence that there has been some form of enhanced cooperation. The output of that went back to the General Assembly. So, okay, since there has been progress, how

can we further enhance cooperation? That is why the second track was set up in 2016. I have been seeing Ambassador Fonseca. I don't know if he's in the hall.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: He's right in the corner watching you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Oh, great. Our distinguished ambassador was the chair, and he did an excellent job. In fact, that was like the toughest job I've really seen someone do because there was extreme tension in the house [inaudible] discussion.

It was clear progress has been made earlier when it comes to enhanced cooperation. But a [inaudible] issue is how do we enable government itself to really do Internet policy, international [inaudible] policy. Yes, we all agree governments should. Why not? Should be able to admit. But should we set up a new mechanism? That was the problem. Should there be a new mechanism? Maybe like ITU. Maybe like Unesco and big stuff like that.

Well, business feels that we don't need such a regime or structure to tackle international public policy issues. In fact, the very nature of the Internet – distributive, structural, mechanism just like here, everybody is involved – that is the nature of the

Internet itself. So if we want to really address the issue of policy, then it has to follow the same underlying structure. That is the whole idea.

So over time, we have made progress in the sense that the majority now have moved to decide, yes, we agree enhanced cooperation has been going on and we could use [assisted] mechanism. So there are a lot of [assisted] mechanisms like the CSTD itself.

If a CSTD [inaudible] government [inaudible] the private sector, they also have the right to be able to speak. If [inaudible] in the working group as one of the members, one of the representatives of business, it was like I also have the status like the states. So I recognize my own rights representing business, [inaudible] member. So we have the liberty to speak and our opinion is always heard. So it would just be a natural [assisted] mechanism to handle that.

There are many countries that have really come to that point and many countries that have said, “Yes, actually that should be a compromise.” CSTD can do that. If you look at the mandate of the CSTD, it has the mandate to advise the GA on public policy. So it’s already there.

So that was it, and just one or two countries said, “No, we just want another institution like the ITU.” Where is the fund going to

come from? We're business. We're going to be engaging. We don't a lot of – like we're saying, "Should ICANN be involved?" ICANN should be involved in all these things. But if you [set up] a new one now, there will be another bureaucracy again and this and that. So why not let it flow naturally?

So we got a lot of people by the side of let us use [assisted] mechanism, but only one or two countries intractable [inaudible]. "If you don't agree that we should have a new institution mechanism, then there is no recommendation." Whereas, there has been fantastic recommendation based on effective coordination of the chair on characteristics of enhanced cooperation: inclusivity, collaborative, international, it should be respective of all stakeholders. It was good [inaudible].

So there has been some progress. From my perspective, it didn't really fail because [inaudible] opinion that, "Oh, you failed. Good riddance." No. A lot of stakeholders have moved to the side that, yes, it enhanced cooperation has already taken place all over the place. Then we can use the existing mechanism that we have. That's where the overwhelming majority, I can say 99% of people, they have moved to that point that we should use existing mechanism. So we have made a lot of progress, and I think ICANN needs to engage.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Does the process require unanimous approval?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Absolutely. Not the kind of consensus that we do in ICANN where we say, “Okay, rough consensus.”

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There’s no rough consensus or anything.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: As long as just one person says, “I object to this,” then everything is [inaudible]. I’m sure the chair is here. I’m happy to – he will be able to talk more about it. But I really must commend, not because he’s here, I really commend the chair. He did everything possible to really moderate to get a consensus, and everybody saw the effort he made and it was well appreciated.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Jimson. And, yes, it does sound like quite a hard task to have unanimous approval on absolutely everything in a process that has taken several years to complete.

Are there any questions or comments on this process? Yes, please. If you could introduce yourself and make your comment.

ISRAEL ROSAS:

Israel Rosas, I'm working for the government of Mexico, but I'm here in my personal capacity. I agree with Martin. We can have both multilateral and multi-stakeholder efforts. However, the governments who promote the multi-stakeholder model have [the big] opportunity to [show and share] in multilateral spaces and mechanisms the results and outcomes of multi-stakeholder spaces, namely the [areas] of outcomes I mean the [BPS], the dynamic coalitions, the connecting [inaudible] efforts, [or the] ICANN discussions and processes when related. So I think that should be the main compromise from our side. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this contribution. I do have a question actually. In all these discussions that take place in those fora, is ICANN sometimes taken as an example of a properly working multi-stakeholder system? Especially with regards to the government engagement through the Government Advisory Committee. Jimson?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Excellent question, Olivier. Actually, I cited the ecosystem in ICANN as one of the places whereby enhanced cooperation is already happening really. But I also listened to other sides. Some people say, “No. It’s not happening here because government is only advisory.” Government is only advisory. They don’t really take their decision. But I still believe that enhanced cooperation is happening here because things are evolving.

We are talking about the Internet. It’s distributive. It [involves] stakeholders. Everybody has the right to be listened to, and you get the best moving forward. So on that basis, governments are there effectively very active and engaging. So I see ICANN as a model in a way. If we had something like ICANN in ITU, I would definitely say, “Okay, why not? We can [inaudible].”

But that is not possible. Then to the points raised on multilateral and multi-stakeholder, there was once a definition given. I think it was Ambassador Fonseca as well that said it. That in Brazil, multilateral actually means everyone. All stakeholders are involved. So it is a different notion than we have [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jimson. Steve DelBianco?

STEVE DELBIANCO:

ICANN's [CEO] said exercising the multi-stakeholder is mixed. We do well on some things. We take too long on others. But I really believe that a multilateral advocate would choose ICANN to judge it by its outcomes, not just its processes. ICANN is about to create an excuse for the ire of the multilateral world in that we're making significant adjustments to WHOIS. You should never underestimate the opportunity that creates for governments to claim that ICANN has abrogated its responsibility.

I realize the DPAs from Europe and DPAs from many countries are advocating the very same adjustments that we're making. But we should understand the governments don't speak with one voice. There are data protection authorities in the government, but there are also consumer protection authorities in the same government. So I ask you, which of those branches of government dominate at the United Nations and the ITU? I don't think it's the privacy folks.

We should look ahead a little bit that as we're adjusting WHOIS in ways that will reduce the visibility of websites that could or could not contribute to consumer protection concerns of fraud and abuse that it is going to become a bit of a problem for ICANN with that crowd. It might be fantastic with DPAs, but it will be a problem with the multilateral crowd at the United Nations.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Steve. I think we are jumping ahead a little bit in our agenda with regards to WHOIS. We'll come back to this topic, actually. It's a good input. Greg Shatan?

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I just wanted to mention first that the Internet Society has actually now begun a collaborative governance project which is being headed up by Larry Strickling. It is in very, very early days. Right now it's basically looking just for people to join the group of people who will be part of the mass. I'll put the link in the chat. If you just go to that page, you can see what is being planned. This is hopefully going to be a significant contribution by ISOC to the discussion and strength of the multi-stakeholder model.

Second thing to note as I've been in a working group which had quite a lot of government participation, while the issue was never really discussed, there were a few times when references were made to the Tunis Agenda and its application to ICANN working groups. We never really discussed it.

Clearly, the idea here is that we're on completely equal footing and no people being put into corners or whatever you might think the Tunis Agenda does. But I thought it was interesting

that at least it came up in lengthy e-mails where I don't think anybody else chose to engage one way or the other with that point that was being made. But it did not escape my attention that it was raised a something that they thought would be a good idea in terms of ICANN interactions. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Greg. Now Young-eum Lee, go ahead.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Just a quick reminder that back in 2010 none of the ITU documents had mentioned ICANN. I think it was in 2010 that ICANN appeared in one of the ITU documents as a footnote.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Young-eum, for this fact. Matthew Shears? If I could just say, ma'am, welcome also. Sorry I didn't introduce you. Young-eum Lee, the co-chair of the working group from the ccNSO. Matthew?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Olivier. I wanted just to take this discussion about enhanced cooperation out of the ICANN space just for a moment and talk about where it is happening, and where it's happening is in some surprising places.

For example, in the development of national cybersecurity strategies, there are engagements between stakeholders in doing that. And those are very sensitive areas. It happened in Ghana, for example. I also believe it has happened in Mexico, but I'm sure the gentleman can correct me if that's not true.

So these are things that when we talk about multi-stakeholder fatigue or we talk about enhanced cooperation not actually occurring, we just have to be very careful about how we talk about that because there are very good examples that are outside our space where this is occurring, and there are many other ones as well. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Matthew.

Now cybersecurity has traditionally been the remit of government agencies and very much centered on work done behind closed doors by governments and law enforcement. Some are saying that this is opening up and there are initiatives for multi-stakeholder processes to enter those fields and for private sector and even civil society to take part in these processes. How real is this? Tatiana Tropina?

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Olivier. This is a very interesting question that I would have expected to be asked five years ago. Now I rather expected to be asked the question, Is the multi-stakeholder notion behind cybersecurity or enhanced cooperation in the multi-stakeholder manner behind cybersecurity dying now?

You know, yesterday I went to my room after a glass of wine and I was going to bed. What prevented me from sleep is [push up] notification from The Guardian. The news said – I’m going to cite, I’m sorry – they referred to Tim Berners-Lee. You know Tim Berners-Lee, right? One of the inventors of the Internet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, web.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, web. Sorry. One of the inventors of the World Wide Web.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tell Vint Cerf about this.

TATIANA TROPINA: I’m sorry. Complain about me to Vint Cerf. So he said, and I’m citing, “We must regulate tech firms to prevent weaponized web.” Can you imagine someone like Tim Berners-Lee saying

this 10 or 15 years ago? Who thought about this kind of regulation? Why are things turning like this? And what kind of influence it has to ICANN?

Unfortunately, Martin Buttermann, he left the room a few minutes ago, right? I really wanted to disagree with him about multi-stakeholder being nicely backed by multilateral. On the one hand, I'm always supporting the ideas that when you talk about multi-stakeholder and cybersecurity, just admit – admit, [face] the truth – some of the fora will always be multilateral. Leave governments alone and let them do their own business, right? Right.

But on the other hand, I do not believe that in cybersecurity multilateral does not represent any threat to multi-stakeholder. It does. Things do not flip like a coin overnight. It's rather when you put the frog into a very hot water, it will jump out. But if you put the frog into lukewarm water and start heating it, you will have a nice soup at the end and no one will escape.

I'm sorry if I'm making this analogy, but this is what is going on right now. If you look at multilateral in cybersecurity, I'm really sorry for these cruel comparisons, if you look at the multilateral – it was to wake you up guys. If you look at multilateral fora in cybersecurity, do we see any real outcome? We have been so scared of the United Nations at ICANN. The United Nations failed

big time. A global group of intergovernmental experts couldn't produce even the third report. There is no substance really in what UN is doing multilaterally on cybersecurity, so forget about the threat of the UN.

At the same time, they can use cybersecurity to regulate whatever they want. But if you look at another multilateral fora like, for example, the European Union which committed to collaboration and cooperation with the industry and which says multi-stakeholder 10 times in 15 minutes when they talk about cybersecurity, look what they are doing. And look at other discussions that are saying multi-stakeholder but with the governments in a leading role.

It is incredible how this debate is shifting now. Look at the multi-stakeholder committee which is talking about multi-stakeholder cooperation in cybersecurity and it's called public core of the Internet. Using the words "public core" in the group which is going to be multi-stakeholder is like a red rug for a bull because there is so much confusion in this.

So I do believe that why it is important for ICANN – I'm ending my intervention right now – things are not flipping overnight. They are getting mixed. They are getting blurred. They are getting confused. At some point, we might not even notice but

we'll all be in a completely different environment. ICANN is a big player.

When Tim Berners-Lee, when European Union, when public core of the Internet are looking at things, they will see this elephant in the room after all. We have to keep our eye on this.

I believe when Cherine at the opening ceremony was talking about security and resilience and ICANN's unique mission in this and ICANN's unique mission in preserving multi-stakeholder model, I believe that it is very important to keep an eye on what is going on in IG because ICANN and its security mission does not exist in a vacuum. This is it from me. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tatiana, for this robust intervention. As a frog or a Frenchman, I feel a bit targeted with regards to the heat.

TATIANA TROPINA: Sorry. That was an abusive comment against you, you're right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to turn to Pablo with regards to the regional Internet registries and certainly in APNIC do you feel the heat of cybersecurity?

PABLO HINOJOSA: Yeah, most definitely. One of our engagements recently has a lot to do with bringing together the network operators and the CERT community. Here I just had a thought about what Tatiana just said because, indeed, cybersecurity is a shared concern or responsibility, and I don't think there are elements that you can leave the multilateral to discuss alone.

For example, the UN government group of experts, the 2015 report, they agreed on nonbinding norms for responsible state behavior. These norms included, for example, that there should not be activities to harm CERTs or using CERTs to engage in malicious international activities.

This is a good idea, but it was discussed in an exclusively multilateral arena. But there is indeed very little awareness about the governmental group of experts and their normative processes within the CERT community. So how any of these efforts can be implemented, how these norms can [inaudible] if there is no dialogue connection between the multilateral arena and the technical community?

So it is something that I think we need to reflect deeper when we prioritize, as Matthew said, our engagements and our approach to these engagements.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Pablo. I'm going to turn to Nigel Hickson when it comes down to ICANN and cybersecurity and we've heard about the threats to the DNS, the denial of service attacks and so on. First, sorry, just before that and I'm sorry, Siva, I totally forgot. Sivasubramanian Muthusamy, apologies.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Okay, Sivasubramanian from ISOC India Chennai. Security has been kind of a sacred area which kept every other stakeholder out. There was a blanket exclusion of all other stakeholders from any security policy matters so far. This is changing and that's a good thing to do.

With security in the multilateral forum, the whole world was driven paranoid to some extent. That could change with new ideas from the multi-stakeholder forum. So I think ICANN should push it forward and push for the security to be brought to the multi-stakeholder forum.

There are some areas that are top secret that need to be closed door. Such sensitive matters or sensitive strategic matters could still be discussed in a limited way. But the broader policy aspects and whatever [inaudible] that could be consulted could be brought to the multi-stakeholder forum. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Siva. Now I'll turn to Nigel Hickson on ICANN's work with cybersecurity.

NIGEL HICKSON: Well, I'll be very brief indeed because I think you ought to move on and discuss other things. Only to say in the same way with other aspects, ICANN contributes to these discussions where we're able to, to provide factual evidence and to provide views. We obviously have a locus on cybersecurity, a fairly narrow locus in terms of DNSSEC.

As was mentioned earlier by Tarek Kamel, this year at the Mobile World Congress we were able to engage with a number of government players and a number of business players that perhaps we don't normally see and talk about such issues as DNSSEC and we'll continue to do so.

I think what Tatiana said was very relevant. I think it's incontrovertible, that it just makes no logical sense at all for governments to get around a table and talk about technical security issues without the experts present. I think this is now accepted by most rational thought processes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. That actually [segues] into the next section, which is how ICANN interacts with other organizations. I

understand that ICANN has signed an MoU with the GSM Association. Tarek Kamel, would you?

TAREK KAMEL:

Thank you. I referred to that at the beginning of my remarks at the introduction. As I have mentioned, we are trying to look around together with you and with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance about where efforts are happening related to evolution of technology as well as evolution of policies related to different aspects of the Internet.

We have been seeing that the GSMA is becoming quite active in putting standards. That's fine. This has been a part of their classical role. But in addition to that, in the evolution of the 5G and we have been witnessing with David Conrad and the office of the CTO at ICANN that the discussions on 5G and the investments in 5G going forward could have effects on the DNS and we need definitely to be looking into this in a positive, constructive, non-defensive manner so that so that Steve DelBianco is satisfied with our approach.

So I think we found also from their side quite a positive attitude how to involve ICANN and maybe the ICANN community and the ICANN players in a cross fertilization and a discussion about this happening forward.

Göran was very interested to foster this dialogue because when we look – I mean, I’m not an expert, at least anymore – when we look about routing and the discussions about routing and slicing of technologies and the new ideas that they are bringing in the 5G, would this maintain for us an open, secure, resilient Internet on a global level is a question that is fairly to be put at. Fine, okay, as Cherine said this morning ICANN is not in the center of the world or ICANN is not in the center of the Internet as such, but we also ought not overlook that.

So this MoU is put so that we have this dialogue for the benefit of both sides, and I think we ought to report to you regularly about the deliberations that are happening between the office of the CTO and about them. If there are opportunities to have some outreach together there in the private sector led organization as such, it would not harm after we really crystalize where do we stand and what are the areas of partnership going forward.

So that’s one of the examples that I was alluding to at the beginning. We need to look around, not everywhere, but where things are happening and try to position ourselves and keep our role of relevance there as much as we can. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tarek. Yes, Christopher Wilkinson? You’ll have to lean over. Oh, there’s a microphone coming to you. Great.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, and thank you very much for bringing our attention to the MoU. I read it carefully. There are in fact rather a lot of caveats in it, and it's not quite clear exactly what you will be doing positively because it does say quite a few things that you're not going to be doing. But that being said, I would recommend after six to nine months of experience seeing if you can update it to include rather more concrete and well-defined areas of mutual cooperation.

And particularly currently my judgment is that mobile telephone technology is moving rather faster than Internet technology. This may be a phase, won't be permanent. But the scope for 5th generation and the shift in international balance of power technologically in this area are going to be substantial so that I think you will find that mutual cooperation with the GSM Association, whatever it's official name is, will be a moving target. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Christopher. Tarek?

TAREK KAMEL: Thank you, Christopher. You know, two legal departments in such two organizations, ICANN and the GSMA, when they draft an MoU how much they want to keep it generic as much as

possible and not putting a lot of specifics. So what I was talking about was a real target or the real intention behind what we are doing, not necessarily what is being put on papers. So it's being kept generic, but that's what we have started to in the dialogue between our CEO and the CEO of the GSMA as such and the OCTO team.

And as I said, we will be definitely reporting about any progress that would be of significance to ICANN and ICANN community going forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tarek. Coming to the I* organizations, is the collaboration, I guess, that ICANN is doing with the I* organizations ongoing? Is it developing? What's the status on this? I might turn to Nigel for that. Or Tarek? And then Pablo? This sounds like an interesting question. Pablo, you did say, "I don't want to talk for the I*s," but you can speak certainly for the APNIC.

PABLO HINOJOSA: I think the question was how ICANN collaborates with other organizations on the Internet ecosystem. I can only say that collaboration has always been very positive, very constructive. There has been a lot of work there with many different staff of

many different areas, the technical, government, stakeholder engagement. With all offices of ICANN, Geneva, DC, Los Angeles, and for us in APNIC particularly a very good relationship with the office in Singapore.

That is very good. Coordination is obviously not always easy and requires a lot of effort, and I think we have managed to find ways in which we put and invest those energies that are required for the coordination.

For us in particular, something that is very important is for this collaboration to help support and save resources in order to avoid duplication and in order for the collaboration to actually support each other's effort in a way that we can scale that up or that we can engage in a way that is neither counterproductive nor duplicative nor with lack of certain coordination. So in general, I think it has been very positive.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Pablo. Tarek?

TAREK KAMEL: Yeah, I might add and maybe Matthew also wants to talk about what we are discussing in the Board Working Group on Internet Governance in this aspect about this [inaudible] model that we

have been discussing. But we work with the I*s very closely with our sister organizations as such.

But we categorize our cooperation as sometimes we have together a leadership role when it comes to naming and addressing. Whether it was at WTSA or one of the ITU events, fine. Then we need to become vocal with the community and work closely together.

Sometimes we are more a little bit in the backseat role working together coordinating while being at third-party organizations as such discussing issues related to jurisdiction, discussing issues related to human rights, discussing issues related to privacy and data protection more on a thematic approach.

So it differs as such, but I think that the mechanisms for working together and collaborating has been well established and going through several stress tests and proved really that they are well established and quite efficient.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Tarek. I was actually going to turn to Steve regarding the GDPR circling back into this GDPR topic. I don't know whether you wanted to speak about this topic first.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, GDPR.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, right.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Glad we're doing Puerto Rico. GDPR.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We've spoken about it to some extent, but the question is, is that really an issue that is all about ICANN, or is it a wider issue, a more global political issue, this GDPR thing?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Two things. There are global efforts to increase privacy protection, so Europe happens to be the tip of the spear but it's a global entity. But it comes from privacy advocates and privacy authorities primarily. I believe that will clash and already is clashing even in Europe with other elements within the very same governments who view certain aspects of WHOIS as essentially for the job they do in protecting consumers. So that clash will not play well for ICANN within the multilateral environments which [I] spoke of at the UN. That's the only thing of relevance I think to this discussion, that I don't believe this will improve ICANN's position vis-à-vis that rivalry.

And then if you have any time left, we're running out of time now, but I wanted to share a little bit about the way that the IGF USA is organizing our program for this year. I see Marilyn here. Andrew Mack is here. Dustin Phillips from ICANNWiki. There's Judith Hellerstein and Lori Schulman, Greg Shatan. We've organized a heck of a program this year, and in it we are trying to make it so clear that governments do protect their citizens from content and conduct, whether it happens on the telephone, in the mail, or on the Internet. There's never been a place that Internet is somehow outside of the realm of governance.

So just to give you a few of the topics that we're going to cover at this year's IGF USA are:

The Future of Work in the New Economy, the future of work.

Internet's Impact on Our Social, Cultural, and Democratic Values. Think about interference in elections.

Balancing Privacy Concerns With Security, Connectivity, and Innovation. There's the GDPR [inaudible].

Competition. Should the government regulate online platforms when they achieve market dominance? Taking into account competition, innovation, and civil rights.

Platform, Content, Moderation, and Liability. Another "boil the frog" problem like Tatiana discussed in that we're forcing more

and more platforms to have liability for the words and conduct of people that post on those platforms.

And finally – you’ll love this one – Balancing the Fight against Fake News Against the Right of Free Expression and Privacy.

So I can share those in writing with anyone else, but these are the kinds of things we’re doing in IGF USA, and with this global audience I encourage you in your own regional and national IGFs to tackle these hard topics. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steve. I’ll turn to Tatiana Tropina quickly, and we will soon have to close as well.

TATIANA TROPINA: One-minute, two-minute intervention. Steve, I totally support what you say. You know what really bothers me here about all this fake news, content regulation, platform responsibility is that it is all going under the umbrella of cybersecurity. They stopped considering cybersecurity as a technical threat only. Now it’s [all over] threat: fake news, misinformation, whatever you can imagine. And even people who used to say that cybersecurity includes no content and whatever are now changing their opinions. I believe this is the issue which we have to monitor

closely because it expands the mission of any tech company.
Anyone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tatiana. Anja Gengo please.

ANJA GENGO: Thank you, Olivier. Very quickly, I actually wanted to keep silent but Tarek at the beginning triggered me to say a few words and now Steve definitely invited me to say a few words.

What Steve said with this list of what the IGF USA is discussing, I could probably speak three days on what the countries and regions that have established their IGFs are discussing and the things that you would hear would be very different. I think that's very important to say.

Also, I do understand that our discussion was focused mostly on the intergovernmental organizations and that global level which of our interest, especially speaking about the final decision makers. I do support Jimson's comment when he said that those are long processes. So we're waiting for those decisions and if one person decides to say no, then we don't have a decision and it's a waste of time, right?

But I think what's very important to say is that in the meantime during that waiting period there are so many of those communities that are self-organizing and making a change. They are not the final decision makers, but they've found a way to influence those decision makers.

If you ask the national IGF in Nigeria, they're going to tell you how the cybersecurity strategy was changed. Also, if you go to the Netherlands and you see a wonderful model of how the government cooperates with other stakeholders through the national IGF, and that's very encouraging.

Very importantly, if you see so many youth communities that are now growing and organizing their own multi-stakeholder processes to discuss the topics that are of interest and influence others, then that's also encouraging.

In the context of ICANN, this is actually why I wanted to take the floor, what Tarek said at the beginning, is there any kind of fatigue when it comes about discussing about the process how something is being discussed and then what we're discussing, I would say that hundreds of countries and regions now that are having their own IGFs, so multi-stakeholder processes, are actually telling us that there's no fatigue. That there is new energy and that maybe Marilyn what said that we're entering the new phase is very encouraging.

And very much I would like just very quickly – I know that we are overtime – to thank ICANN. Because if you look at who are the sponsors and [diehard] supporters of these processes, then you would see ICANN at the top of those lists that are in-kind supporters but also concretely financial supporters. At the end of the day, ICANN is one of the dearest friends to the IGF and biggest supporters, and for that thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Anja. Praise for ICANN. Tarek.

TAREK KAMEL:

Thank you, Anja. But I just want maybe to correct a misunderstanding that you have mentioned. I was talking about fatigue not on a national and regional level in handling issues. But I was talking about fatigue in trying to solve global issues of Internet governance and the lack of [non-consensus] as such when it comes to decision making. This is what I meant, and I gave two examples of processes that I don't want to repeat that have been already mentioned. So this is what I was meaning.

The national and regional IGFs are booming. That's clear. The global IGF continues to have its role. But when it comes to really a consensus on recommendation going forward in different

platforms on global issues again as such related to Internet governance, I have there still my questions of fatigue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tarek. So clearly, the debates and discussions are ongoing. Clearly, ICANN has to continue being engaged in those discussions and in its immediate overall ecosystem. And clearly, we're running out of time. So I think I'll close it now.

I'd like to thank all of our panelists and everyone who has taken part in this discussion and debate. Thank you, everyone.

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, could I just thank you as ever for moderating and spearheading this initiative?

This is a session of the Cross-Community Working Group in case there was any doubt and you thought you were coming to a GDPR discussion, you're really disappointed. But if this is the first meeting you've been to or the first face-to-face session you've been to and you want to go on the list and you're not on the list for the Cross-Community Working Group, then come and see us and we'll put you on the list.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]