
MONTREAL – ccNSO: Members Meeting Day 2 (3 of 3)
Wednesday, November 6, 2019 – 15:15 to 16:45 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

PIERRE BONIS: Give us a view from the ICANN Organization. What are they doing when it comes to Internet governance? Give us an important example, concrete example, of what ICANN can bring to us and maybe what we can bring to ICANN Organization to have a clearer view in these matters.

So, Mandy, I give you the floor to give us the view of the ICANN Organization. If you want to walk, you can or if you want to stay seated, you can also. You do it the way you want.

LAURA MARGOLIS: To just briefly introduce Mandy, there was this cross-community working group on Internet governance within the ICANN community. But us CCs decided not to sponsor that group but instead decided to form our own Internet governance liaison committee, and this committee was launched in the first quarter. But we still need to know what's going on within the general ICANN community, and so Mandy is going to introduce us to that.

MANDY CARVER: Given both my eyesight and the ability to read things if I'm walking around, I may sit for this if that's all right, although it would be better for my general health to get up and walk around, and I'd probably be a

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.

little easier for you all to see me. I'm not that tall, so even when I stand up it doesn't mean that you can see me necessarily.

What I'm here to talk to you about, Young-eum Lee has referenced that we have been active on the same cross-community working group that talks about Internet governance broadly defined, and that's a whole host of things. That's the national and regional IGFs and various tracking mechanisms.

What I'd like to talk to you about is a relatively new initiative, which is the legislative and regulatory tracking initiative that ICANN Org has begun. I want to briefly touch on why are we doing this, and then what is it that we're doing, and why am I here asking for your support and participation and really your expertise is the reason we're here. So, who's driving slides? Okay.

So why are we doing this? The legislative and regulatory tracking initiative is something that was proposed in large extent because of GDPR. I think there was a perception both within parts of the community and parts of ICANN Org that these data protection regulations kind of took people by surprise.

Now for those folks that are operating ccTLDs, and particularly those that were within the space, you're not surprised by national legislation and regulatory changes, and for that matter regional ones because you're the people who are physically within those jurisdictions. So, what may seem old hat to you or ... I think people tend to discount their specialized knowledge, and what may be standard operating procedure for you is specialized knowledge for others.

So, GDPR was sort of a triggering event, I think, on a larger scale for the organization. There is growing awareness that there's a lot of legislative and regulatory activity that happens that can have a direct impact on ICANN's mission and remit. We understand the pressure that governments are under. They have challenges and they want to protect the interests. Well, we're not going to hear then about the collaborative effort in France because [Lamont's] been called back to the GAC.

ICANN Org, in many ways, like individual ccTLDs, face similar challenges. You are managing the DNS and the work of a TLD within a specific jurisdiction. Governments, in an effort to respond to challenges and concerns they have for their constituents may at times react without actually having the benefit of a technical impact analysis. This can lead to unintended consequences. So, even with the best of intentions you can end up with an action that then has an impact even on the ability of that same regulatory or governmental body to act. I think the way GDPR is now playing out and the issues between DPA's analysis and understanding and other aspects even in those national governments is an example of that.

So, what we are trying to do is have a sufficient awareness of where these discussions are taking place so that we have the opportunity to provide a neutral technical resource so that there's a better understanding really about how the DNS operates. So that is why we're trying to do this.

What we're doing. What we're doing is called the legislative and regulatory tracking initiative. This was first proposed ... It was a dialog with the Board discussed and endorsed at the January 2019 board meeting. And the charter is essentially a description. This is not a document that is going to lead to the formation of policy. This is not about ...

If you think about ICANN Org, it has three legs to the stool, if you will. It has the convening capacity to bring you all together for the making of policy. It controls aspects of the DNS. It also has a technical remit. This was an effort to identify what the field staff would be doing.

The charter is aimed at those things that will directly impact the DNS, anything that directly impacts the security, stability, and resilience of the unique identifier systems, and then anything that might impact the capacity of the ICANN community as broadly defined to make policy. So, for instance WIPO's work around geographic identifiers has the potential to directly impact the discussions that are taking place within the EPDP about geographic identifiers. So, that's the what.

And then, "Why am I here?" You all are, in fact, the experts. You're the ... I would say, of all the ICANN constituencies, this group is the most uniquely qualified to speak to national regularity and legislative initiatives. And if you go back to the results of your own survey, regulation is high up on your interest level. Technical aspects, capacity building certainly, but this is something you all have already identified as an interest level.

What the larger invitation or ask is in that charter that was proposed, ICANN Org is committing to the communities at large, all of you, that we will be attending to this sphere and that when there is legislation or a resolution or something that is believed to pass those gating mechanisms that is going to have an impact, we would then be informing all of you that this is a space we're going to act in. But, there's also an ask which is that what we need is a mechanism for dialogue.

Now, Young-eum Lee referenced the cross-community working group which has morphed into an engagement group and is being proposed as a discussion platform. That whole set of decisions is up to all of you. That is for the constituencies to decide, but what we are seeking as ICANN Org is an interface. And so, part of that is what do you all think? What is the mechanism? If it isn't that engagement group, then what would be the mechanism? So, partly the hope is that this is a discussion. I have come to hear from you and to learn from you, not to talk at you. So, happy to take questions but really looking forward to the feedback.

LAURA MARGOLIS:

Thank you. Now we are going to have a short question and answer session, so we hope this not to be just a one-way presentation, but to sort of have you involved more actively. And Laura and Pierre are going to pace around the room to moderate the Q&A session.

PIERRE BONIS: We'd love to moderate if there questions. Otherwise, we'll have some questions, of course. Are there any questions or comments in the room at this stage yet? Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Nick Wenban-Smith, Nominet, DotUK. Very nice to meet you. Thank you for coming to talk to us. Just specifically, I think it is nice that ICANN is getting a bit more interested in regulation and to be ahead of the curve, and that's a positive step.

But it requires ICANN to have a certain degree of humility and also to listen because I specifically told Goran a year before GDPR was coming in GDPR is coming in. It's going to make a difference. You need to be ahead of the curve and to perhaps make changes maybe six months before GDPR so everyone has time to adapt and all the rest of it, instead of the week before, as we actually experienced and are still dealing with it.

So, it's very nice that we are. I'm sorry. I'm the Data Protection Officer for a European ccTLD, so it's very nice there's more of an aspiration to be more of a learning organization in terms of there was a crisis that causes a solution. So, that's positive. But it does require ICANN to actually listen to the advice when it is given by subject-matter experts in good faith. That's my only comment. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Yes, please, those of you who want to intervene, just do it. Go to the mic.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Hi, good afternoon. My name is Peter Van Roste. I'm the general manager of CENTR. Thanks for the presentation. One of the reasons why we would have this matrix is to help inform the regulatory discussions, if I understood correctly on one of the slides. Can you confirm that?

MANDY CARVER: Yes, in the sense that what we want is to be able to put the right information in the space to understand what is the problem they're trying to solve for and therefore ... So, we're not a lobbying organization that is taking a position that something is bad or good. We're trying to drive what a national jurisdiction thinks it needs to do. What we want is to have appropriate information in the space so that the regulators or the legislators understand the potential impact, broadly defined, of what they are doing. And also that we can understand what they think the problem is because sometimes in the right settings, that can be an exchange of information that either mitigates a potential unattended consequence or advances and improves the intent. So, that is the goal.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Thanks for that clarification, which I think I fully support. Not just me, but also all the CENTR members. But I think it's crucial that these initiatives happen in close synchronization and collaboration with the local ccTLD, whether it's on a national level or even on a regional level.

In Brussels, we have an excellent working relationship with your colleagues there and even with RIPE, so we truly make that a multi-stakeholder effort. But synchronization there is crucial. We need to avoid at all costs that regulators get informed two or three times with the neutral technical information without that synchronization help. But, thanks. Great initiative.

MANDY CARER:

There are those who say you have to repeat something seven times for people to absorb it, so we do want to synchronize. We don't want conflicting information.

PETER VAN ROSTE:

Just as a practical example, I've seen regulators get two or three times neutral information about DoH from different parts of our organizations that is completely inconsistent with each other. So, while claim to be neutral and they might have a point there, that does not mean that there is a consistent message.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

My name is Sandra Hoferichter. I'm from EuroDIG European Dialogue on Internet Governance. I'm not sure if I'm allowed to speak here because I'm not a member of this group. Thank you.

I hear that you are looking for a platform or for an opportunity to get this exchange in order to avoid unintended side effects through national legislation. I would suggest and urge you, basically, to use the

platforms that are already there, which are the national and regional IGFs and also the global IGF. Most of those—and in a particular in Europe—we have the biggest concentration on national IGFs where the GDPR issue arose. Most of those are open in their program agenda setting. I can speak for EuroDIG. We would be happy— more than happy— if we get such critical input in our agenda setting from the parties concerned.

For instance, ICANN is an institutional partner of EuroDIG since many years, and we are very happy that this commitment is there. But this commitment should not only involve financial contribution and participating in the meetings, but we would actually like to hear what you would like to discuss on those meetings because there you have the chance to meet regulator, to meet the legislator. We are not yet there. I know there is space for improvement and getting the parliamentarians and all that, but we are working on it. And it needs resources, which we at the moment, not all have. I'm speaking here for national and regional and general and also for the global. You know that.

But I would really suggest to look in those foras because these are basically the platforms where you could have such discussion and where you could submit your early warnings about the technical implementation this legislation might have. And instead of forming another platform which keeps the resources from the same people that are going from one platform to the other to discuss basically the same issues, strengthen the ones that are already existing.

LAURA MARGOLIS: Thank you, Sandra. Please, Leonid, go ahead.

LEONID TODOROV: Thank you. Well, as general manager of APTLD, I operate across the region with perhaps the most challenging legal and legislative environment and my impression is that many of our members, at least—I'm not saying for the whole region, but many of our members—have poor or no knowledge whatsoever about Internet governance. Of course, it's a huge room for all of us to collaborate in the most effective way, but here is my biggest concern.

Let's say in 90% of instances, whenever I hear ICANN staff speak communications and engagement, my sense is that they are underperforming. I would echo Sandra's words, underperforming. And I would label their performance as pathetic. I already thought about that a couple of times to the ICANN senior management because it seems to me that some formal exercises—and I cannot just tag those attempts to present, for example, on ICANN's multi-stakeholder model. Those formal exercises do not add to ICANN's legitimacy and do not enrich the local audiences on the sending of the concept of Internet governance. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: We will have to close this part of the session. We have invited Mandy for her to explain one piece of what ICANN is doing. And we all had a lot of stories about the past, and I have a very concrete question.

Where can I find the information? Where can I see the kind of repository that ICANN may do about the regulation shifts or the news? I already have a very, very good work done by CENTR, so I think as far as we are talking about Europe, we'll not learn a lot of things. But other parts of the world may be of interest. And if I have something in my country that I want to share with ICANN because I think that it can be a kind of precedent, who am I talking to? Where do I send this information?

MANDY CARVER:

So, there were a series of public extracts that is a subset of the information that has been internally discussed and those were posted. And we were asking for community feedback. Was it useful in any way? Did it provide the information you wanted? What was the contextualization that you wanted? Up until about Kobe, we weren't really getting a response. We got a large set of communications in Kobe about deficits, both with the way the material was presented, and for most people, they understood what was there but they didn't understand why it was there.

So, we had a number of requests for changing what we were doing, how we were doing it, and how we were reporting it, so we paused the public reporting.

We had, from the beginning, an email where there could be response to the specific things that were published or submission of materials that were missing. That avenue was not used. It only had been spam. I get it, and it's not coming from anybody. So, that's why we stopped

and said, "Okay, clearly, the mechanism isn't working. The reports are not considered sufficiently of interest for people to want to interact, and that's why we started the targeted conversations.

So, who you'd be talking to would be Government Engagement, which is my department, or the field staff in the Global Stakeholder eEngagement. And I think you know a lot of your regional VPs because they have the portfolio to deal with what is going on in the capitols. Government engagement has the global engagement strategy. GSE is delivering that on a national and regional level. So, that's who you'd be talking with.

How you'd come back—and I appreciate Sandra's comment about making use of the national and regional IGFs or the global IGF. Well, we're also looking for something which is a faster turnaround that is internal to the ICANN communities. We don't want to create a new platform. We're not creating a new set of events or anything else, and in many ways that's why we were looking at the Cross-Community Engagement Group because that was already a group of self-identified individuals who were concerned in this space. But for a variety of reasons some constituencies have ceased to engage in that space.

So, what we're looking for is all of your feedback. If that didn't work for you, then how do you want to feed that information in? And these are some good feedbacks.

You'd be talking to us. Your regional VP should be talking to Government Engagement. We're in LA, New York, Brussels and Geneva, primarily as physical locations, but we're always at the ICANN

meetings as well. We are the people who are working with the GAC on the capacity building workshops, and we'll also be partnering through ITUD and their regional centers of excellence. We do capacity building in those settings. I don't have the URL where the previous reports were posted, but that is also being restructured. So, the existing documents would be made available.

And again, this is a subset that went through a gating mechanism. There are lots and lots of things that people are tracking that either don't rise to the level of the three categories that we're looking at or are so far down the road that it's a proposed piece of legislation and it doesn't get out of committee and rather than continuously reporting because we park it.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you very much, Mandy, for that, and I think everyone has heard the goal for synchronization, more exchange of information going through the Government Engagement and maybe one day have a feedback from ICANN giving us the information about the stock taking of the regulation evolution that you make yourself. And that would be very interesting for us to read. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mandy.

LAURA MARGOLIS:

As I said, we have a full schedule. We started five minutes late, but now we are 15 minutes. We're running 15 minutes late. So, for the other presenters, if you could sort of shorten your presentations by two

minutes that would help. Now we're going to have two presentations on what Internet governance events are actually happening. The first presentation is going to focus on the global Internet governance events, and Jorg is going to present.

PIERRE BONIS: While Jorg is preparing ... So we started 10 minutes late first. And second, this is not exactly global to regional to national but of course Jorg being in the country that he's organizing the global IGF, we'll talk a little bit about that. In any case, all the presenters will start from their own CC and what's in it for them to get involved in IG. Okay.

JORG SCHWEIGER: I'm happy to give your presentation from Russia.

PIERRE BONIS: Yeah. There is very good coordination in CENTR. Maybe you want to tell us something about the Internet governance [inaudible] from Russia.

JORG SCHWEIGER: I'll try to entertain the audience while we are preparing. First let me say that feel compelled to roam round. Thanks, Pierre. Thanks, Pierre, once again for having me to take stock of what DENIC is doing with respect to Internet governance activities.

Before I do that, it jumps my mind that actually we do not even have a definition of what Internet governance really is and most of us will probably have a different idea about it. So, when I'm talking our Internet governance activities, I would use a rather broad term or a rather broad definition and my definition for Internet governance would be how the Internet is run and used today and how it's going to evolve in the future. So, that is my view on Internet governance.

So, what are we doing? Well, that is pretty good indicated by the different colors of those circles. We are attending and presenting at a variety of national Internet governance events. We are participating in international bodies and associations like CENTR, for example. So over there we work with other colleagues together to draft position papers on, say, DoH or on Internet abuse and contents. So, that is what we do in there. But we may even be involved and we actually with regional ITU workshops as long as they threaten to deal with the Internet in any sense.

We actually do participate in the IGF, and that is global IGF. We do that by workshops, for example. As many of you will know, the next IGF will take place in Berlin. But at that event, very interestingly so, we are not a major part of that. So, we're just having a booth over there, but everything else with the national and with the global IGF, that has been done by the German government and it's organized by the [MAG] so we are not involved in any way. And for sure, attending and presenting ICANN, yes. Business and Internet governance activity, as well.

A little bit further down the line what we're doing as well is we are sponsoring and steering activities, so we are a very active part of the Internet Governance Forum in Germany. We are part of the steering committee setting up annual meetings, designing in the program for that. So, we're currently part of the drivers that force the regional Internet governance process. We're sponsoring the EuroDIG. And please take a note in your schedule, ICANN 69 in Hamburg is going to take place, and we are on of the hosts over there.

And finally, even more engagement, I think we [instigating] the European summer school on Internet governance together with Wolfgang Kleinwaechter, so we were very active in capacity building and trying to build the next Internet governance leaders. We even set up what we call the IG, so Internet governance radar. That is a website where you can gather very basic information about Internet governance and what the definition is, what the history about Internet governance really is, up to what are the participants that are involved, and what is the current state of play of these participants.

So, we cover what is going on in, say G7, what is going in G20, what is going on at European level, at the high-level panel on Digital Corporation and those kinds of actors. We are covering that with reports that show what is going on on a quarterly basis. Could we show that? Just to give you an impression. Okay. That was rather fast. So, over there you can just browse through it and see what it's showing there. So, we organize information around governments, economy, civil society, and technical community. Just go to IG Radar and figure it out for yourself. Okay, thanks.

And finally, about taking stock. What are we doing, as well, we set up an organization that is meant to define standards, and those standards to be adhered to comply with the Cybersecurity Act. So, that is another activity we are doing. We are involved in the process of defining what regulation should really mean when it comes down to cybersecurity. That was fast again, good.

So, why are we involved? Well, we are involved because we want to foster our vision, and our vision, for sure, in that is even laid down in our strategy is that we want an open, free, and secure Internet. And that is because we are tasked by our membership to fulfill and to try to reach and open and free and secure Internet. So, this is why we are involved in Internet governance. And for sure, if we do have an open and free secure Internet, that is a basic part of the building block for our business, for a CC business.

Over there you see my definition of Internet governance. Once again, we are involved because we do want to influence the way the Internet is run today and how it will be shaped tomorrow.

How do we do so? Well, we want to build up ourselves a reputation of renowned player of Internet governance on and off the Internet. And we try to develop networks and set up coalitions so in case if there would be some discussions about regulation, then we already have a coalition in place. We already have people we can talk to where we can advocate our position.

So, have we been successful? Well, first let me say it's time-consuming, it's a long-term business, and it's very, very hard to measure, even

though I feel there are already some success stories. But I would like to refrain to tell them in public. So, thanks. That's it for me.

LAURA MARGOLIS: Okay, thank you so much. Do we have any questions?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Laura, we will have the session after Eduardo's presentation on regional Internet governance.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Thank you very much. Thank you and good afternoon for everyone. I was invited to share with you one of the motivations I have or our CC has in order to be involved in regional IGF or regional Internet governance discussions. I want to share with you that I found at least three big motivators to be part of this process.

For the first one as a member of LACTLD. We have in our regional organization a plan where we decide to be active part on these discussions in the region because we want to make the people know that we are there. We are working with the Internet community in the region in order to build a way on how Internet could be a better instrument for everyone in order to look for the human development as is proposed in the discussions.

So, there is my first motivation to participate. As a member of LAC TLD, we don't rely that obligation just in the staff. We participate as members of LAC TLD trying to work with them with the staff in the

other CCs who share this sense of responsibility to work together on that.

And probably second motivation is as a member of Colombian Internet Governance Group. Then, we have in Colombia since almost six years ago, a very active group talking about Internet governance topics, and we decided to participate as a group in the regional or in the global Internet governance forums. And in the regional forums, sometimes we propose panels from our side from Colombia, and sometimes I'm being part of the panel as a representative of the Colombian Internet Community, or in other occasions, just being of the group making the presence of our country in that discussion and just to share with all the other attendants our concerns or our examples or views on these different topics that have been discussed during these regional meetings.

And the third motivation I have is as ccTLD monitor. I want to be there just to share with other Internet community responsible leaders of the region in order to find what can we do. What do they expect from us? What are the role that we should play in order to have a better performance of our responsibilities and to achieve those goals of human development for 2030.

Those three basic motivators are the main topics I can share with you, and of course, happy to answers questions. I have three minutes, one minute for each. Thank you, Pierre.

LAURA MARGOLIS: Thank you. Pierre?

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you both. Now this is a time for interaction. I don't know if it's a little bit artificial to have this interaction now or to have a global interaction at the end. It depends if someone wants to ask a question or make a comment at this stage. No?

LAURA MARGOLIS: Sounds very good. It is going to save us time.

PIERRE BONIS: Not really because we'll have more questions at the end, but yes. So now, I give the floor back to the chair for presenting the next presenters.

LAURA MARGOLIS: Okay. So, now we even more specific, and we're going to talk about two cases of Internet governance activities at the national level. The first presenter is going to be Liana.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Hi everyone. My name is Lianna Galstyan. I'm with the Armenian ccTLD Registry and I will share the local perspective of the national perspective what we do, and how we interact with the Internet Governance Forum.

So, I will start with the specification that we have in our country. That is the permanently working body, which is the Internet governance council, and it's a multi stakeholder body. And the head of it is the Deputy Minister, which is defined by the charter itself. The Deputy Minister which was at the point of when it was developed called [inaudible] transport and communications, and now that's been transformed into the high-tech industry. And the work of the secretariat is being carried out by us, the registry, and we deal with that for already five years now.

So, the other thing that I'd like to mention is how we [inaudible] in the IGFs that we do in our country, the program itself and the topics. So, we get that it is a bottom-up process which is really in line with the Internet governance principles, that it should be inclusive and transparent and to have all those topics that are interested for the community.

So, we get all those topics specifically from the community and then we look at them and even have, at some point, from our first use of experience, we've been giving the voting of those topics to the whole community, so everyone was voting them and we bring those topics that are favorable to most of the community members participating to the agenda.

Then, we changed that system now but still we gather all those proposals from the community of topics and then the Council itself approves the things that are relevant for that particular year and it goes for the discussion.

So, the topics that you've seen in this survey as a result, I would say that we really have all those topics also being discussed throughout the five years that we already run IGF and the absolute champion among those topics is the cybersecurity unit which we discussed almost all the years. But having that from different perspectives. And each year we discuss it in different angles as it's a cross-cutting issue of different things.

The other specific thing that we really have and prefer to discuss in different details is the IDN. Many of you might know that Armenia is running the IDN TLD. We do have our own script, Armenian script, which is a unique one. And we struggle the challenges of it. We also run the IDN ccTLD of Armenia and we [inaudible] the challenges of its popularization, etc. So, we try to discuss those topics and convey this theme throughout the community and bringing all the issues that could happen.

The other topics which is of our interest, in the scope of our interest, is the local content. Unfortunately, we do not have that much resources as we would like to have on the local content being there but we want to spread that and make a capacity within a country so that we will develop it, eventually will come into that. For instance, for this year, we discuss it, not only the text local content but the video of it, which you know that the community itself is transforming all the text things going to the video and the visual of it. So, we discuss all those things. Thank you for bringing the topics on the screen. Exactly.

We do not have a digital divide but it doesn't matter. From the national ... I'm just now speaking about it from an Armenian perspective, but for the national perspective of talking about a general, there are so many countries that have this topic in their agenda. They do have a digital divide and these topics are really unique for the national ones and being on the focus of their attention and the topics, the agenda.

What we also do is the capacity development, capacity building. This is really very important. We consider it significant importance for the country itself. And we run the School of Internet Governance, this idea. We thought that this is necessary for us to build that for the three years that it was already run. For the first two, it was for the students, for the youth, actually. So, we wanted to have a very literate youth, those who use Internet—they've been born with Internet—but they do not know about Internet governance. They do not share that ... They can bring their voice in its governance, actually. So, we are doing the courses and telling them all the players, all the layers of Internet, and we saw that it resulted a very good feedback. I would say that the students, the alumni of that school, actually, they established the youth IGF this year. So, I would say that I personally run that school and I feel so happy and proud that those alumni brought their voice to the global IG sphere and now they're going to have their messages to different IGF forums, etc. So, I'm really proud for the work that's been done.

For that school, actually, I'd like to touch upon the collaboration also that we do in parallel with our colleagues within the region. So, we

share the speakers from our countries. For instance, we have a speaker from Russia. We invited APTLD to share the experiences, etc.

So, since we are short in time, I would just go with the materials. Unfortunately, the language, the materials we do not have in Armenian. So, that is another challenging point that we are trying to create. So, one of the examples [inaudible] Internet governance book, edition 5, we [inaudible] into Armenian and we shared that knowledge with all our participants. I think that's really important what we did and if, just to go for the question why we participate for the Internet governance, I would say because we care and because we can. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much.

LAURA MARGOLIS: So, we just heard from Armenia. Now we are going to hear from Russia. Irina?

PIERRE BONIS: I'm sure we have a presentation from Russia. I think I've seen it.

IRINA DANIELA: Wonderful. Thank you. So, coming from Russia, which has ... So, Russia does not really have a long history and long tradition in democracy. Even for me, having spent here ten years in ICANN

atmosphere and having learned to repeat multi-stakeholder model, etc. These terms when translated into Russian, they still sound a little bit foreign and a little unusual from our language and from our heirs.

However, we want to bring this concept to Russia and we want to spread the understanding and the concept of Internet governance and as dialect and as an opportunity into our country.

And by the way, it's fully within our mission as a registry because both our charter and our agreement with the Ministry of Telecommunication says that our goal—and by the way, in the [inaudible], this is the goal number one which has mentioned—is to expand the use of the global Internet and to promote the self-regulation of Russian Internet community. So, definitely all the issues are and all the Internet governance activities are fully within our mission.

First, Russian IGF. The idea itself came more than ten years ago when preparing the launch the IDN for Russia which was the first-ever IDN in the world—well, one of the four very first. We ... And when I say “we” I mean not myself but mostly my colleagues who were working for the coordination center at that moment, realized that we really have a need of the bigger event. We need some remarkable big event to be associated with the IDN launch that would bring visibility and awareness and would help us to involve not only registry and registrars but all the other stakeholders and categories into this happening. And this is how the idea of Russian IGF came. But as one of my colleagues said, what started as a joke proved to be quite a serious

business later, because as of today, we have done ten Internet Governance Forums not only in Russia but going outside to the city [Kazan] and to the cities in [Petersburg] bringing together maybe 500 participants. But still being, as a registry, the main driving force for this event. Definitely we have multi-stakeholder organizing community. Definitely we have very good partners.

And by the way, thank you to I see here many people who supported us from the very beginning coming to Russia, presenting at our IGF, helping us. And by the way, ICANN helped us a lot with also giving us the financial possibility to arrange other people from our neighbor countries come and visit our event.

But we are not only taking care of logistics. We are not only building the agenda. We are not only inviting our people, but also this particular event as a possibility to make many [inaudible] events, like [inaudible] expert who come to Russian IGF, they not only give keynote at the event itself but also we invite them to speak at the universities for the youth, for the students. And among those, as a keynote, we have had many, many leaders.

The recent focus of Russian IGF is moving to the youth and to the student. It's definitely a good idea to teach everybody but it makes much more [sense] to tell probably those who are younger because they will probably have more possibility to use this knowledge and to spread these ideas worldwide.

Also, even imagine our own ... I don't know we cannot see the picture but we have invented our own award which we give to those who had

made on our particular decision the biggest contribution into the Internet governance development idea.

But IGF itself is just a part of our activities because a lot of our other things we do aim to educate and to raise the awareness of Internet governance as idea and as a concept.

For example, the Internet governance book by Jovan Kurbalija has been translated into Russian and we translated the third edition and a few years later, we did translation of the seventh edition and it was printed and it was sent to universities and to the libraries and it is available definitely as a PDF version on our website. Also, we were happy that our colleagues from [inaudible], which also there are many people who speak Russian, took this translation and used that for their local—to distribute in their country.

Their educational activities that were [inaudible], for example, include contest for students of legal school, and if you look at the titles of the writings which were [inaudible] in 2019, this is all about Internet governance. The topics these young people choose, they are strictly related to Internet governance issues.

Also, running the journalism award, which is an award for those journalists who write about domain names on the Internet addressing systems, we this year introduced a special category and this is category Internet governance.

Even more, the project we run for school students has [inaudible]. And by the way, I realize just when preparing for this presentation, but

anyway, this is an online game and also competition associated with [inaudible] which aims to increase digital competence of the use but name is, again, about Internet governance.

Also, we do participate the European summer school which Jorg has mentioned, and we not only come there as an expert but also arrange again people from Russia coming there. We have sponsored several people to attend this. And luckily, this space [inaudible] and hopefully we will have success. But we just cannot quit anymore. Having started that, we already can't stop. There is no [chance]. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS;

Thank you very much, Irina.

LAURA MARGOLIS:

Thank you, Irina. So now we have heard from the various sort of level of Internet governance perspectives. If you have any questions, Pierre will lead the—

PIERRE BONIS:

Yeah. We still have 15 minutes to be on time. So, questions or remarks or even experience that you want to share? Because if the panelists can be inspiring, one of the inspirations they can give us is to say, “Hey, I do something else and I would like to share it.” Laura and I, we have some questions we will maybe wait for you to intervene and end with the question if they have not arised in the room.

JORDAN CARTER:

Okay. Jordan Carter, DotNZ. We had our national IGF called NetHui in October, start of October. Had about 400 people and we had our Prime Minister, Jacinda Ardern, come and talk to us about the Christchurch call and the government's response to the terrorist attacks in Christchurch in March. We talked about that with you in the ccNSO in June, wherever that meeting was. I can't remember.

I gave a keynote speech starting the conference and one of the things I said is that Internet governance is broken and we need to change it, that the whole Internet that we've got today is kind of—was riffing from Paul Vixie's comment a few months ago. The small academic network that was created in a trusted environment is not the Internet that we need today.

Our Internet governance system doesn't give us the Internet that we need today. This little bit of it—this tiny bubble of ICANN and the technical coordination of names and numbers—that seems to all work all right. But the discussion we had about DNS abuse, these discussions are getting bigger and they're not going away and it's no longer enough for us to say that's someone else's problem. And we're not saying that here, right?

But it's very difficult, given the huge restrictions, as an example, we've placed around ICANN for ICANN to ever help with some of those problems. And we've made damn sure that all of the forums where you can discuss those problems cannot do anything about them. The IGF was designed exactly that way, to never be able to do anything about the problem but to cross-fertilize ideas and stuff.

So, an argument that I'm starting to make that I made there—and I just want to make a remark here—is that our Internet governance system as a whole is broken because I does not provide the inputs from communities like ours into governments that they need and that they don't know that they need when they're making critical Internet policy. And I don't know if that's something that we can solve on a global level. It might be something that you feel you've got a good model in your country that you're dealing with. I know we don't currently have a good model in our country. We've got the discussion forum at the national IGF. We've got our role and influence as a ccTLD manager where we take a very broad approach to the policy issues we get involved with. Sometimes, we have policy fights with governments but, within the next couple of months, there's going to be DNS filtering, blocking laws coming up before the [inaudible] industry. A big change. I don't think we can win that argument politically, though it's yet to be exactly clear.

So, I think we've got a problem and one of the things that we can all do from our role as ccTLD managers is help think through a new mode of Internet governance. I don't know if needs the institutions, a new forum, but a thing that helps solve the problems that this open Internet that we've built and are custodians of throws into the world. So, I just wanted to say that. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. [Pablo]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry. You want to comment on that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just a quick comment on Jordan. Well, I think you're absolutely right and if we look at the IGF as the premier or paramount forum to discuss Internet governance issues, then certainly there are, to say the least, some drawbacks.

But if you take a look at the results of the high-level panel on digital cooperation, then there has been something proposed like the IGF-Plus taking into account all the drawbacks and try to bring up something new that hopefully is more promising than the formats we have now and I would encourage everyone to read the recommendations of the high-level panel on digital cooperation.

PIERRE BONIS: Lianna, you wanted to comment and then Pablo.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Thank you very much. Just a quick remark as is relevant or necessary or [inaudible], I would say what we have resulted is a result of our discussions in our Armenian IGF. So, I would bring you a couple of examples, one of them being the online gambling laws that was going to be on the legislation put forward by some of the ministers, by some of the initiators. So, we used, as the Internet Governance Council, we discussed these issues among the Council itself and [inaudible] been invited, etc.

So, as a result of those discussions, that law didn't, haven't happened. So, it doesn't go to the law. And I would say that this is a real result of those discussions that we had.

And another example would—

PIERRE BONUS: Sorry. Just because we really have to have a discussion with all the panelists.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: I want to say that this platform is really [inaudible] and that could be [offered] to all the countries but still it has some relevance in there. So, [it makes] some changes and, as we say in Internet governance, that's a decision shaping.

PIERRE BONIS: Okay, thank you. Eduardo?

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Thank you. And thank you, Jordan. We share with you the same concerns about regional—for instance, in the regional level. What about the Internet governance discussions because we said we are not conducting for anywhere. Probably this is a forum that will be calling to [inaudible] because the feeling—generalized feeling—is that we are not getting too much results.

But then we start doing [inaudible] because LACNIC had the initiative and they hired a consultancy process to review the LAC IGF process discussions.

So, first result was that most of the people in the region considered that we should do many things in order to preserve the forum. And then, of course, we need to introduce some modifications.

And to do that long story very short, we started the process with the participation in the community in Latin America in order to review the process because we believe that we need to keep it alive because there are many things that come in good way for that. And we are right now in the process, too.

PIERRE BONIS: Pablo?

PABLO: Thank you, all. I just want to commend you for the fascinating presentations that each one of you have shared with us and I want to ask you—I'm very interested in the methods that you're using to teach students about the Internet and different platforms. Can you tell me a little bit more about that program and the video game type of method that you're using to teach students? Thank you.

IRINA DANIELA: Actually, I had even a chance to present it once at the ccNSO meeting a few years ago. It's very similar to one of ... The idea was stolen from

a TV show where you have questions which have different values and answers. Then you have just to provide answers and get money. But we developed these questions around different topics about Internet, starting from the infrastructure and ending in Internet governance and also we have block on personal data protection, for example. So, this was a piece just to go through to learn. And there is a contest to participate personally or as a team, and eventually to win one of the prizes. If you are interested, I can just later show you pictures of how it looks like.

LEONID TODOROV:

I'll be very quick. I believe I would certainly agree with Jordan but I think that there are also some things which we tend to underestimate in our activities. There is room for improvement.

Well, first of all, we do understand that ccTLDs are—well, in a very organic way—are promoters and proponents of Internet governance because, well, Internet governance is a very expensive thing and we know it. And who else could do it if not ccTLDs with their focus on serving public interest?

Secondly, I just noticed the title of this session. The ccTLD Perspective on Internet Governance Panel Discussion. So, what I want to say is that, at times, we underestimate the importance of some words. So, we have a panel but we have no discussion. And that's exactly the kind of disease which is very contagious for many Internet Governance Forums. We have no discussion. We excellent panel.

So, we could do a great discussion here but there is no discussion. There was a string of presentations and Q&A which is now ending. The time is expiring for us and we need to get out of the room.

So, that's a very bad thing and I think that we should somehow remedy it by giving people a chance to talk because everybody has a story to tell when it comes to Internet governance.

Thirdly I would site a very particular example, although it's very costly, but still an example when a genuinely collaborative effort led to a very exciting outcome and that's Asia-Pacific Academy on Internet Governance. When it was dragging for several years and it was panel and students and they were sleeping, because in Asia-Pacific when people are not interested, they usually fall asleep. So, 90% of them would fall asleep.

But, then it took us an enormous effort to step over our—I mean, to change our mindset to build a consistent curriculum which would be exciting for young people, and then, geez, everybody was awake and everybody was participating very actively.

So, I guess the curriculum is still there and it's available so you can check what we done but it's really hard to imagine how we did that. So, a lot of preparatory work because in this community, also—and it's partly our fault—we believe that if there are great technical experts, they are also equally great at diplomacy, teaching, whatever. But these are very specific areas. We are not trained to deliver some tangible outcomes. So, we would probably need more time and better

panels to learn from each other and to build some very sustainable events. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you, Leonid. I think it's a conclusion, even if it's not a good one, of course, but it's a conclusion. And let me have the opportunity to wrap-up. And first of all, wrap up answering you, Leonid, about the panel. I'm just reminding you that there is an [IGLC] face-to-face meeting that happened. I mean, you participated to it, by the way. I would have loved that we have three hours. I'm not a member of the committee. But that's why you have face-to-face meeting of the [IGLC]. Yes, it's a panel but I think it's a little bit easy to say that, "Oh, that's just a panel." This panel is dedicated to showcase the involvement of CCs.

If at the end of this panel there is a huge frustration in the room because 90% of the CCs presenting in the room wanted to share their involvement in IG, this is a very good news. We are going to advertise this outside. We are going to say, "Hey, all the CCs are very much involved in IG." So, if there is some frustration, let's make it something good out of it.

And I think that this will be my conclusion, just asking you all if you have something to share, experiences like the one that has been shared today and if you want a special place to share it, ask it. Ask it to us. Ask it to the Council. If you think that it's a better way to share it directly with the IGF, whether they are regional or global or national, but this can be a good way, too. The only aim of this group, the [IGLC],

once again is to advertise the role of the ccTLDs, not to organize discussions and substance. I mean, this is not the mandate that you get us, but if you want to change the mandate, I'm open.

So, with that, thank you very much. Thank you, all. Thank you to the panelists. Thank you to the room for your attention and your participation. Sorry for those who wanted to share something and couldn't do that. Please send Joke and me anything, any material that you would like us to share with the broader ccNSO community. We would be very happy to do that. And I think we are exactly on time. Thank you very much.

LAURA MARGOLIS:

Thank you, everyone. This brings us to the close of the members meetings. I also wanted to share information but since I cut everybody short, I'm going to be silent and just invite Katrina up here.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much to our distinguished panel. Thanks a lot to those fantastic people in the audience who stayed until the very end. Thanks a lot to everyone who contributed, who participated, who asked questions, who have suggestions how to improve the members meeting. And for that we'll have surveys. Please do not forget to fill them in. Even when you're happy, let us know.

That's the issue. Sometimes people are happy. "Oh, then I don't have to tell anything." They speak only when they are not happy. But we want to hear even from those who are happy because that would help

us to identify those areas where we're good and where we should continue doing same things. Maybe not same but things better.

I also would like to thank very much our local host, CIRA, for the fantastic Canada night that we all experienced. Thank you very much. If Montreal was the birthplace of ccNSO, then here we definitely gain second breath and now we will be even stronger and continue to be even better.

Again, thanks a lot. I'll see you in Cancun. When you want to have or if you have any specific wishes, ideas, for discussions for topics to be discussed, please contact our members meeting program committee. Actually, probably I'll have to tell you that we'll have a new chair in an hour. In an hour, the Council will approve the new chair of the members program committee.

I'd like to thank Alejandra for everything, new ideas, new setup that she brought to the meetings. Thank you very much. And our new chair, Barbara. Barbara, please stand up, so everybody can see you. Barbara will bring even more new things. That's inevitable. Every chair brings something new. Yes, please, Leonid, you have ...? You can join the meeting program working group.

LEONID TODOROV:

No. I just want to say very quickly, for those of you who are unsure whether it's worth going to Cancun, here is Mr. [Jorge Asaro] and he is the CEO of DotMX for those who don't know him. Ask him any

questions you have in mind and he is our generous host for Cancun.
Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Thanks, Leonid and Jorge. Yes, we will definitely use the opportunity and we'll definitely go to Cancun and we'll definitely have another good members meeting, great discussions, and everything that you wish for. So, thank you very much and see you soon. Members meeting is closed.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]