
MARRAKECH – ccNSO: Internet Governance Liaison Committee
Thursday, June 27, 2019 – 15:15 to 16:45 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you for the recording. Welcome, welcome all for this first face-to-face meeting of the Internet Governance Liaison Committee of the ccNSO. I see that in the room there are people coming from another constituency and this is very good news, very happy to share our thoughts with you. I also see that in this room there are quite a lot of CC's that are not formally members of the IGLC, and we are very, very, very happy that you are here, this is the purpose of this kind of face-to-face meeting; it is not to be just talking to each other within the group, but talking with the community. And this is the first tool that we have to do some outreach to the communities throughout these kinds of meetings, so thank you all for your participation.

If we can see the agenda, there you have the agenda, I'm going through the agenda for a few minutes. So, first of all, we are going to present what is the IGLC for those of you who didn't follow all the story. Then after, we'll have a first part of the meeting that will be of substance, where we will share with you the work already done within the working group. And, the topics that we identified as a working group as relevant topics for CCs. Maybe some of you will have other IG, or would say that they are

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.

not relevant, I mean, we are very happy to have your feedback on that.

And then, the other part of the substance will be a call for information sharing, and I will come back to that, but this is one of the main reasons for this group to exist, is to gather information, put them in once place, and share it with the community. This is not a policy development process; this is not a place where we are going to try to have common wording on all common positions between the CCs regarding Internet Governance. This is this working group's aim, is to be a tool that can be used by the community to facilitate its engagement in the IG talks, no more. And this is very important; that we stick to that, I guess.

Then, of course, we will talk about the best way to interact with the community. One of the ways we identified already to interact with the community should be, or could be, to organize a session in the next ccNSO meeting in Montreal. Not only an update, but a session with substance, inviting people from the outside, sharing their views on what they expect the CC to do in the Internet Governance related talk.

We'll talk about the outreach, we identified already with the organization and other IG related activities within the ICANN environment, of course. Because there are other IG related

activities. And then, at the end, it's a little bit more internal, but I mean, this is not secret. We will talk about the next time we will meet as a group.

Just before beginning, could the IGLC members raise their hands and present themselves first? Young-Eum?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Hello everyone, my name is Young-Eum Lee, I'm from .KR.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Jordan Carter, .NZ.

FIONA ONGESO: Fiona Ongeso, I'm from .KE. KE NIC.

PIERRE BONIS: I think we have another member that is here, no? Yeah.

LAURA MARGOLIS: Good afternoon, I'm Laura Margolis, I am from Uruguay, but I am not -- I'm a ccTLD Manager. I was NomCom elected, thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Great, thank you very much. So those are the current members. Not everyone is in the room; some are in remote participation. Maybe we could call for them to virtually raise their hand and tell us who they are, if some of the members are following our talks from distance? I would like the IGLC members that are remotely participating to just give us their names and where they are coming from, if they are online, of course. But I don't see that well, my glasses are not good enough.

JOKE BRAEKEN: The remote participants, they can chat, and I'm happy to read out the things that they write on the chat on the microphone today, but they cannot speak in the room today, thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: But you know who is online? Because if you know who is online, you can spell out the names of the members of the IGLC that are participating.

JOKE BRAEKEN: So, the members of the Internet Governance Liaison Committee that are participating online are, among others, Mary Uduma, and that's it. Mary told me that she's in another meeting so

she's not able to speak, but she will participate via the chat, thank you.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you, Joke. So, with that maybe we are going to the first point of the agenda, of the second point, which is introduction to the IGLC. I'm very sorry because everyone from the group has presented himself except me, so I'm Pierre Bonis, the General Manager, or the CEO of .FR, AFNIC, and chair of this ILGC.

I'm going to go very quickly on some slides, which doesn't mean that you cannot interrupt me whenever you want, but I think that some background information is interesting, but it doesn't need to be explained too long, so the establishment of the IGLC followed the ccNSO meeting in Barcelona, in November. And it followed the discussion, and we'll come back later on that point, it followed the discussion about the position of the ccNSO towards the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance/Cross-Community Engagement Group on Internet Governance.

There was a willingness from the ccNSO to give some more energy to the talks on Internet Governance within the CC community and I guess that the idea at this time was to focus on the particular place and role of CCs in order to interest as much

CCs as possible to this discussion. So, it's not something that is here to replace, or to be in competition with the CCWGIG; it's, once again, a tool to revitalize the participation of the CCs and if the CCs are participating, which seems to be the case today, we will have a lot of things to share with the CCWG or even the board committee on Internet Governance. Young-Eum?

YOUNG-EUM LEE:

Thanks, Pierre. Just a slight type-o, it's not CCWGIG; it's Cross-Community Engagement Group, so it's CCEGIG. So, the group deals with Internet Governance issues and what it started out as, or it attempted to start out as a working group, but then, because of this charter issue by the CCs and the GGs, it tried to modify itself into an engagement group, so that's why they tried to name it CCEG, but then, now it seems as though they're going with an operational group sort of a mechanism. So, not a real, formal group that has the support of all the SOs and the ACs, but a group within ICANN that deals with Internet Governance issues facing ICANN.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you very much, and of course Young-Eum you have been participating to this group much more than all of us I think, so it's very important to have your input and feedback on that.

So, other groups, we talked about the first one and the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. And, we'll come back at the end of the meeting, if needed, to talk about the kind of interaction that we can have with these groups. Can we go to the next slide, please?

IGLC Members, you see that this is well-balanced. I'm not sure, I mean, we have to add because the slides were done before the council yesterday that added new members, so for Asia-Pacific, Jordan Carter is joining us. From, okay, from Africa, Peter Madavhu is here. And, from Italy, Adriana Lazzaroni is also added. Joke?

JOKE BRAEKEN: We have one additional member; the first member for the North American Region, that is Sean Copeland from the Virgin Islands.

PIERRE BONIS: Great. So, we have someone from North America, that's perfect. And some of you told us, arriving in the room, that they would like to join, so of course this is still open. My advice was to wait for the end of this meeting to see if you still want to join. I hope so.

Okay, and you see that there is also a pretty much balanced gender approach in this working group, so originally and also in terms of gender approach it is a balanced group, this is good. Next slide.

Now we come to the substance. The idea behind this slide was for us to try to prioritize in a way or word because you all hear that Internet Governance is a very vast topic, and we tried first of all to, we had a quick talk, it was not six months work, to see amongst ourselves what could be the relevant topic or the most relevant topic for CCs. So, we made this list; what does it mean? It just means that when we are going to share information and to do some outreach to the community, saying, you have this IG meeting at this place at this date, we will try to see if those topics are dealt with in this particular IG meeting or talk. Once again, it's not at this time, the idea is not at this time to build some position on these topics; it's just to focus on them, because we think that they are the most interesting for the CCs.

I'm not going to read out all the relevant topics, just you see that they are quite broad, when you look at technical, for instance, you can put a lot of things under that topic. But one point I would like to make at this point is that I think that some of the topics are seen in a very particular way by the CCs. When we talk about local content, or when we talk about regulation, these

topics are of importance to a lot of people, and within ICANN, for instance, a lot of constituencies, but maybe the vision of the CCs on these two topics is slightly different, because we have a day-to-day operation that we deal with local community, that we are subject directly to local regulations. So, it's not that it's an exclusivity of topics for CCs, just like we think we have something to say on that, that could add some diversity to the discussion.

So, on this first point, is there any remark, comment? Some people want to add, challenge, ask why we did that. Yes?

MOHAMMED YOUSIF: Thank you, this is Mohammed Yousif, for the record. When I see the relevant topics here of the ccTLD, and when we talk about cybersecurity for instance, and the digital divide, considering that all the members in this group are ccTLD admins, is it not going to be challenging for them to cover such broad and comprehensive topics like cybersecurity? Is it going to be cybersecurity for ccTLD, or divide for CTLD, or just technical in general? Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Does anyone want to answer? I have an answer, but from the group, does anyone want to answer this question first? Yes?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello. Well, when we got to discuss which would be the subjects we were going to talk, we will focus on the subjects but related to ccTLDs. I mean, we are not going to discuss about cybersecurity in general, but focusing on our community. The same for every topic. If not, it will be one more Internet Governance group, which are full of them. Okay, thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, that was exactly my answer. Yes?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: My name is [inaudible], and I was foreign minister of telecommunications here in Morocco, and Professor at the University. My question is, if what is related to the international list domain names, I mean if you want to have a domain name of Africa, for instance, the problem is; what is the institution who can regulate that. In the European Union you have the EU domain name, but there is an institution. But in the case of Africa, it will be the African Union or another, this is how we can imagine international authority regulations for global than one country.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you very much for this comment. You see, this is the trick. Of course, we are arriving very quickly to the substance of these topics, and that's exactly that, what you did Mr. Minister, and this group will not go too much in that, by the way. This group will give all the information for those CC wants to engage to engage more. But as you said, there is original approach, and maybe your comment could be dealt with a little bit later in the agenda when we will talk about the outreach of the group, and we have already identified regional organizations, and maybe we could add some other organizations just like African Union, for instance, is that okay? As CCs, or as Internet users, Sebastien, I make progress, or as GAC members for some of you, or as GNSO members, did you expect something else from the CCs? Are you surprised that something is missing, or on the other side, do you think that we found some topics you don't think are relevant for us?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

My name is [inaudible]. I can see capacity building there, even though we may be able to insert it under local content or digital divide. But I wanted to look at that.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, I think it's pretty obvious that CCs, you're right, are involved in capacity building usually, that's why there is network information center, by the way, and this is something we should show clearly, if the group agrees, but I think it's a good idea. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you Pierre, thank you for having us here. Just maybe a question, not to add to the relevant topic, maybe it's on somewhere else, but your role as a ccTLD Manager it could be very useful in this area, because not only you are the promoter of the local IGF, but you are very often the one who set it up, or helped to set it up, and you could be something between the end user in one country, and the global representation of end user within ICANN or within IGF, and then I don't know where it fits, but that's an important role that the CC can play all around the world.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you, Sebastien. I just want to make one point on what you said; I think that this is a very good topic for the point of the agenda when we will talk about how do we gather information on what concretely the CCs are doing in IG, and what you just

said is something that is concretely done by some of us, and it has to be dually noted. So, I fully agree. Anyone else?

IGNACIO ESTRADA: Hello, this is Ignacio Estrada from LACTLD. Just wondering if DNS abuse is listed under any of these, or if not, maybe you could...

PIERRE BONIS: I think technical is the big one under which we could find DNS abuse. Yes?

MUSTAFA SHEIK: Yes, Mustafa from [inaudible], Somalia. Just, I see some of the topics are very broad, and they can be included for everything. But according to me, as you said, you can look at every angle for the topics of the Internet Governance, for example, I think it is relevant for the ccNSO to work on the intellectual property. For example, because of the domain name [inaudible] would you say a hot issue, and I think it can be very important for them to include. And I don't know if you discuss it, or you can include anyone, as it is one of the most important things that we deal with, and through intellectual property. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: I would guess that it in a way falls under regulations. But your suggestion that will make a topic intellectual property, okay, we know that, we will discuss that. Okay, thank you. Leonid?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, may I suggest that ccTLDs are typical, at which typical they find themselves at the forefront of all these IGF related activities, would rather deal with an over-arching topic, which would envelope all these and probably some other topics, and that's awareness raising and educational activities about one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you, [inaudible], I would do the same comment as I did with Sebastien; I think awareness raising is, it's not even a topic, it's something that we do. And it's more on the second part of our talk; how do we share information about what we do concretely in IG. And, this is important that we do that. But it's not the same thing to say, "There is a topic on awareness-raising," and awareness raising is part of our job.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, it's more like a mission, let's say?

PIERRE BONIS: Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And, at the same time, an instrument.

PIERRE BONIS: If we can agree on that, and that's why you'll see just after we are going to come back to that; what do we do, and what is our added value, in a way, in this landscape. Any other comments on the relevant topics? Yeah, Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Pierre, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I'm looking at number seven here as role as the ccTLDs as promoters of the IGF dialogs; I don't know whether you're trying to establish a list that encompasses absolutely every single case of ccTLD, but there are some ccTLDs that actually go further than just promoting IGF dialogs; they deal with other forgery, whether national dialogs that take place outside of the IGF remit, or specific topics within that, so I don't know whether you wanted to add this? Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you very much, Olivier, I think you are the third to ask for a quick transition to the next point of the agenda. So, can we move forward? If it's possible, Joke, can we go directly to the sharing of information, and then after we will come back to the other slides, because a lot of people want to talk about what do we share. No...okay, so we are going to make it a point in the agenda, it was about, by the way, it was on the slide, sorry, it was on the initial slide that you were showcasing before. Before, before, before, the slide we were talking on, the previous one. Okay, just after. This one; call for information sharing, sorry.

Call for information sharing is just about that; we put it on the same slide, but in fact, it's two different parts of the agenda. One was relevant topics, the second one was information sharing about what you do, or what we do as CCs in the Internet Governance landscape. And then, we have already contributions from CCs and from members that are not CCs, and that's interesting. So, I noted awareness raising on all the relevant topics that we've seen before, this is for some of us, and for a lot of us, a mission that we have at least locally.

Sebastien mentioned another role of some CCs that we'll try to better link the local community, if I understand well, the local community with the more global talks on internet governance, which means coming back to the local community, telling them

what happens, for instance, in global IGF, or in an ITU meeting, or in something like that, or helping the local community participate to this global event.

And Olivier, you were also talking about one of the particular missions of the CCs that you expect, which is, I'm sorry?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, some CCs, I'm not saying all CCs, but I have seen some CCs being involved in dialogs that are outside the IGF, that sometimes are a national regulatory dialogs and discussions, which of course falls somehow with regulations as well.

PIERRE BONIS: Yeah, just kind of a permanent place for a notice stakeholder dialog to happen in the country and not necessarily within the local IGF, which is the case for Ethnic, for instance. Okay, is there anything else that you think you are doing?

RUDI DANIEL: Rudi Daniel, for the record, from the Caribbean. I'm just asking, there's a questionnaire about the list that you have, the relevant topics, is there any value in prioritizing that list in relation to the ccTLD community? I mean, in order to draw them in?

PIERRE BONIS: The exercise is already a prioritization, because if you look at all the topics that you can find for example typically in IGF, they are much more. And, as we are not going to elaborate on these topics as a group, so we're not going to issue a paper on local content, a paper on technical aspect, a paper on that, we didn't see really the need to prioritize within the seven topics, but more to try to focus on these topics, to give information on the people, for instance, very clearly, there are talks about digital divide in the OECD, in March 2020, you are informed if you want to come, if you want to have the better ground; just get in. This is our job; no more. But if you still see that there should be some prioritization of these topics, this is also possible. But it's difficult, it's difficult because everyone is going to see what is more important for him, so it's going to be difficult to say that cybersecurity is less important than digital divide. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe in addition to that region or rationale not prioritizing, be aware that the communities are very, very diverse, so this is probably the bare minimum for such a diverse community that needs to make it interesting and add value for that community to focus on. It is, it's a bit of a trade-off, say, because it's so diverse, and there are different interests in the community,

probably this is less, it's almost limited. At the same time, you need to focus somewhere, so this is the trade-off list between diversity and the huge range of topics.

PIERRE BONIS:

So, the first part of the information sharing was focused with information we had on what we could call the mission of some CCs in their local community; their mission. Awareness raising, etcetera. There are other types of involvements of the CCs within the IG talks. And, this is the time to share it. I'll give you some examples; organizing the local IGF, paying for it, issuing for some of us, some scholarship for our nationals for them to go to trainings on Internet Governance. I don't know, there are plenty of things that some of us are doing. I would say some of the CCs are members of the National Delegation in the ITU, for instance. This is something that we have to know.

Maybe, some others are asked by their government or their local community to issue technical paper that will help the community to participate to a particularly technical discussion in one or the other of the Internet Governance Forum, so this is this kind of information that we need to gather, because one important task of this group is to showcase the real added value of CCs in the IG. So, the first thing is to give evidence, proof of it. What are we doing concretely? Of course, we will try to go

through a survey or something like that, but as there are a lot of people in the room, if some of you want to share what they are doing concretely in their country with their CC, they are highly welcome.

I see Nigeria in the room, .NG, so as the lady here has asked, I will give you the floor first, but then after I know that Mary shared something about Nigeria and IGF, which is a good example, concrete one.

ALYSSA MOORE:

Alyssa Moore, .CA for Canada, for the record. We do a lot within Canada; we sponsor the local IGF each year. We participate in a lot of government consultations that are related to anything that could affect our operations, our management of the CC. So, anytime that legislative reviews come up, any time that legislative reviews come up, or regulatory consultations, we try to participate where possible. We also participate in domestic policy efforts, so the Internet Society North America Bureau recently organized a multi-stakeholder process on Internet of things security that we participated in, and a few other initiatives like that that crop up where we lend our expertise where possible, and try and convene the stakeholders that we can around the table. So, we're quite involved, and I recently

wrote a report about all the things that we do that I would be happy to share with the group.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you, so CIRA owes us a paper on that, thanks. It seems very exciting. NIRA?

SEGUN AKANO: Yeah, Segun Akano for the record again. I'm the ccNSO liaison officer to ALAC. In Nigeria, almost all these aspects are being touched by us. As a matter of fact, we have a foundation that 10% of our profit is certified [inaudible] for things along this line. And, the Internet Governance is like a baby of NIRA, because of now we are trying to say that the IGF can also stay on this one, but the NGS always assumes IGF is a baby of that subset, and when you talk of local content, we are DNS Academy. DNS Academy is the platform where students and colleges come together to learn about DNS functions, so for local content and training, that is taken care of.

In terms of regulations, we engage the assembly, the national assembly through IGF on amending some [inaudible] laws that are no longer relevant for online business today, so that's a very [inaudible] area, because in Africa we are still manually managed in terms of legal issues. So, when you want to give

evidence of online payment, can it be accepted in the courts, this [inaudible] defined. So, we feel that we have a role to play if we want to have an online platform as important what we did in this age as it is now. In terms of digital divide, we have an issue about woman, young woman coming up, but they are far behind compared to men. And we also have the issue of tribe; in the Eastern part of Nigeria today, you see only men catching up with software development, with IT issues. But when you go to the North, they are lagging behind.

So, these are issues that somebody talks about when he said, when you want to prioritize, you can't really do that, because in some instances, what is important to them is not as important to another country, so we have big digital divide in Nigeria which we have to work on. Cybersecurity is also a [inaudible] issue. As a matter of fact, in the last three months, some of our registrars are being taken by [inaudible] been lockup. And what happens when the domain name is registered, they use it to do hate speech or fraud, below a [inaudible] who come to arrest the registrar. Meanwhile, the registrar has no input in the website content.

So, these are issues that we are taking up with the military, with the police, and .NG is now a forefront of let them understand how this business is run, that we are the registry, we are the

registrar, we are the registrants, and each of these are different roles, but you see that in Nigeria today the security people don't understand that. They can easily check who is, and what they see is this company that the register, they come after the management, so we are having that issue in Nigeria today. The role of the ccTLD as promoter of the idea, I've said that, we are [inaudible] the idea to take off initially, and now they are getting to be on their own. Thank you, sorry I took all your time.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you very much, that was very complete, and this is exactly the kind of concrete example that we need. We are not bound to go through the seven topics, all of us, even if NIRA is doing everything, so that's totally fair that they talk about this seventh point, but other CCs want to share some concrete action they take related to Internet Governance?

MOHAMMED YOUSIF:

It's Mohammed Yousif again, .SD registry, and I'm from Sudan. I am also the Chairperson of Sudan Internet Governance Program Committee. I find the topics only have one national IGFs, we actually cover the same topics that exist here actually; I find a lot of overlaps between the technical for instance, we cover the technical part of the ccTLDs issue, consider the DNS and the

digital divide actually, we cover this topic as well. And the cybersecurity, if we take the DNS and then put it into this category, so it's part of the National IGF initiative.

The thing that I find irrelevant to the National IGF initiative and could be covered by the ccTLDs of the International Domain Names and the Regulations of International Domain Names. I think these are the two, and number 7 as well, they're out of the ccTLDs as promoters of the IGF dialogs. These I find irrelevant to the National IGF, and the regular initiatives, and they could be focused on, like, if you are talking about prioritizing the topics of this list, I think that might be of help. And, that is it --

PIERRE BONIS: But we are not talking about prioritizing.

MOHAMMED YOUSIF: No, it just comes to mind to mention.

PIERRE BONIS: Okay, because just for the recording, because I didn't understand; when you say, "It's not relevant to the National IGF," do you mean that this is not relevant as ccTLD topics? Because it's not exactly the same thing. Some things could be relevant for us, and totally irrelevant for a National IGF, and by

the way, I don't care. So, what is the irrelevance, it's linked to the National IGF? And, not to the CC.

MOHAMMED YOUSIF: Okay, can I explain this? Because I said that there are many overlaps between the National IGF initiatives, yes, so these topics could be covered by the National IGFs, and could be focused on other ccTLDs. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Okay, and you are organizing the National IGF in Sudan? Which is a concrete input of the CC to, okay, very good, thank you. Yeah?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, we are not talking here, and we will not talk about National IGFs or Global IGF, I mean, we will just talk about the topics related to ccTLDs, but not of the National IGFs now, I'm correct?

PIERRE BONIS: I would say that, I'm with you when it comes to the topics, but no, this is another part of the discussion, which is the concrete input, and major concrete input and we saw that with NIRA but also with CIRA and with Sudan, is that CCs are funding or

organizing National IGFs, so this is something that we have to know.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, okay.

PIERRE BONIS: Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: Jordan Carter, .NZ. Just a couple of examples of things that we do; we run a thing called the Parliamentary Internet for where we try to get members of Parliament to understand Internet policies issues better. We don't do it as often as we should, but sometimes that's helped technology policy debates in the Parliament be a bit better informed than they would otherwise. So, that's under the regulations title. We, under technical, we support the New Zealand operator's group conference each year, we provide some funding and some staffing support to make the logistics for that happen easily.

And as part of our community grants funding process, we provide travel attendants to technical conferences for people to be able to engage from New Zealand to that community and some of those processes. So, those are just a couple of

examples we do. Some of the other things as well that people have mentioned.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you, Jordon, very concrete input, thank you.

PETER: For the record my name is Peter [inaudible] from .ZE. I just want to agree with Pierre to say that there are some issue that are of critical importance, but I don't really say there because we can put almost everything there. And may I also add that in South Africa actually, we believe in the multistakeholder approach. It just happened that I wait for the ccTLD, and also the Chairperson of the Internet Governance Forum. That being said, it becomes much easier for us to discuss issues, including the budget, because then I'm able to say that we need to put a budget specific to this cause on issues of Internet Governance. And, I'm proud to say that we have been doing that for the previous three years. We are the custodians presently to make sure that the Internet Governance forums are happening within the country, and we shall keep on doing so throughout. I thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, Peter. Yeah, Andrea?

ANDREA BECCALLI: Thank you, this is Andrea Beccalli from ICANN. So, I'll just make a short intervention. I found this point under 7 extremely interesting, and I would like to share, can you hear me? Yes, I find this point very interesting; I would like to share my experience as engagement activities in Europe. What I see, some cases where Portugal, which is not here for this, since they've been supporting the Portuguese IGF since ten years now, Spain as well, Switzerland, France, and cases where the National Registry doesn't know, or is not, or the parent is not interested, or you know, they see the scope very limited to the operation side of things, and one idea that I just had, and I'll just present it here; I don't know how many of you are familiar with NRI Tool Kit, have you ever heard about this Tool Kit?

This Tool Kit has been developed by, for those who don't know, by the Global IGF, where the National Regional IGFs, they work together to say, "Okay, now there are members of the initiatives across the globe, they have, you know, the most different ways to be organized, and let's say to see if we can find a common partner."

And this Tool Kit is actually a collect- a collaborative work where you can see what are the requirements organized in IGF, it is to be inclusive, it has to be multi-stakeholder, it has to be transparent, it has to be all these principles are there. I think that something similar to that would be extremely useful from what I see in my activities for the ccTLDs. Because not all of them they have the same exposure, experience, understanding, and then not all of them see their role and their impact. It may seem natural for too many of you, I mean, we just heard about Canada and New Zealand and Nigeria, but it's not that evident, you know? So, adding some sort of work, a similar thing I think would be helpful. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you very much. Maybe that would be a good idea if you could share the link of the NRI material, and we will add it as an information for the CCs. We'll also try to understand why some CCs are not involved, because the purpose of the group is not to say to CCs what they should do or should not do in terms of Internet Governance. Maybe some of them have very good reason, because they say we are the natural IGFs so we don't need to fund another one, for instance. But for those we cannot get implicated in the National IGF, because of a lack of

information. That would be very, very interesting that you share this information, thank you.

RUDI DANIEL: Rudi Daniel again for the record. I just wanted to say that my local ccTLD seemed to have no interest at all in --

PIERRE BONIS: Which country, sorry? Which ccTLD?

RUDI DANIEL: .VC. So far, they have no interest in IG, most of the work at IG is done by our Internet Society, and we still have yet to form an umbilical cord or a link between the ISOC and our ccTLD. But we're trying, we're trying.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much. Yeah, Peter.

PETER KOCH: Thanks, Olivier. So Peter Koch, DE and I don't think I have much to add radically to what has been said before. Like many other ccTLDs, we support the local IGF. I'm not sure I understand the promoters of the IGF dialog. In our case, we consider us part of

the technical community to start with, and then we are in the lucky situation that we have a steering committee that consists of seven, actually, stakeholder groups, and of course they have different financial resources, so we contribute, but it is in the long run it is our idea, like, the shared idea of the steering committee that no single entity is dominating that.

So, we're definitely not the host of the IGF, we're not in charge, but we're part of the community that deals with that, and I'm just adding that because, as a matter of fact, the Global IGF is happening in Berlin. We're having our National IGF on, I think it's the 11th of September, and there are a couple of initiatives that will do things on day 0 before the end of November, Global IGF and we are participating in some outreach events as well as a path to that. And one concrete, because you asked for concrete initiatives, as DE NIC we've started the Internet Governance Radar, which is a website that explains and it touches a bit upon local content that explains Internet Governance concepts in German and English, but the German language version is the source, and then in English for everybody else.

Looking at that, yes, regulation in those discussions somebody mentioned the ITU, who, not to be named. We are actually an associate member of the ITU study group too, which dates back

to times when eNom was inspired, and also, we are part of consultations that the regulators/government holds sometimes when it comes to ITU and other circles. When we are able to contribute, I mean, we try to do that, and that also holds for information around ICANN and so on and so forth. Sometimes we wish we would be asked a bit more.

I don't think we have a role, overseer role in cybersecurity so much, and somebody, when somebody asked about DNS app use, that's definitely a topic that we are very nervous about. So, it is on our radar, but maybe from a completely different angle than that we see here in ICANN meetings, and especially as I saw that during the ALAC sessions. And I'm saving my temper here, but mostly plus one of these things, and I just use this to advertise the IGF in Berlin again, and hope to see many of you there.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you, please translate your Internet Governance [inaudible] in French. Young-Eum?

PETER KOCH: [Participant speaking in French]

PIERRE BONIS: You're perfectly capable of doing that. Young-Eum.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Thanks, Pierre. Just to add Korea's experience, we actually are going to have our 8th IGF care, IGF in July. In Korea, we have a, I guess maybe a sort of, well, every country is different, but we have a more unique situation because we have a law that mandates that the management of domain names and such is in the hands of the government. However, we have the civil society of Korea was able to form a multistakeholder user community group, we call it KIGA, Korea Internet Governance Alliance. And that group is composed of academics, people from the technical society, including KISA, and the government, and the Korea IGF is held in conjunction with all the multi-stakeholder groups and we have been, throughout the years, we have been dealing with many, most of the topics that- not all of them all the time, but most of the topics that are mentioned up there.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much, Young-Eum. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Just again, going back to the point you made, and I think you heard say, Peter, you heard Young what is happening, don't

forget on the other side you have registries, ccTLD managers, which manage 500 domain names, and they do it, their role is maybe one hour a week, don't expect them to be involved in IGF; they don't have the bandwidth or organizing, and especially in your area, there are some very, very small ccTLDs who do this just as a side job, but they are taking very much responsibility for what they do, because that's their core business, so again, going back to one of the remarks I made in the beginning around the topics, it is a very, very diverse community you're talking about. You talk about the second largest TLD in the world is included in this environment, but probably also the very, very smallest TLD in the world, and that's what's taken into account in this list and the work of this group, thank you.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you very much, Bart. And once again, this working group is not about telling the CCs what to do; it's about telling the others what the CCs do, which is slightly different. Leonid, you wanted to -- No? Okay, so just want to follow up on that, and then after, Suleiman wants to --

RUDI DANIEL:

Yes, Rudi Daniel for the record again. I do certainly take your point; it is a very diverse community. In fact, we don't even have

a ccTLD manager, okay? I mean, in fact, our ccTLD is run by Afilias to be honest with you, so there are things to be put in place, and we probably will get there sooner or later, but I'm just saying that this is the situation that we have right now, yeah. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: No comment on Afilias. Suleiman.

SULEIMAN MAHER: I am going to speak about the point 7; I think ccTLDs are very important in other countries and they can advise local actors, they can improve local contents, and also government or people who are involved in the Internet, in other countries. It's very, very important for ccTLD to promote other IGF, thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you, Suleiman. This is more on the awareness raising on the National level, and really an important topic. That's why we are network information center, by the way, most of them. Most of us. Okay, we could continue, but we're going to stop at this point on the information sharing. It gives an idea of the implication of a lot of CCs in a lot of variety of actions towards the Internet Governance, and this is really important for us, so

this is an ongoing work. We are going to try to get as much information as we can on what you are doing on the ground, because it's really a way to, in a way to advertise the specificity of the ccTLDs in Internet Governance, so thank you very much for sharing that.

Please feel free -- or, I understand that you are friendly encouraged to write us that, write to us, to me, to Joke. It will take some time for us to gather everything, we're not going to do it in two days. This is a collective effort by the group and by the secretaries, but please, send us this information. Even if it's a URL to a website that is, that we can refer to, this is very important. Thank you. Joke, you wanted to say something?

JOKE BRAEKEN:

Just one comment before we move to the next topic from Mary who is participating remotely. She has a question; is IGF important to the ccTLDs? If yes, this should be made clear to members of the ccNSO why they should get involved, particularly at National level.

PIERRE BONIS:

I would not advise that the group give advice to CCs. I would advise that the group give tools to CCs. So, for those who think it's important, there is a lot of information to share. For those

who don't care, this is that, so you tried. I'm not here- and I think the group and the ccNSO is not here to tell the CCs how to behave. But it seems that a lot of CCs are involved in IGF, which means that for the question of Mary, there is a natural involvement with CCs within local IGF, because this period of it is very similar. The multi-stakeholder approach is not only in the IGF, it's under RFC that is funding the CCs, so that's normal that we get involved in. Yes?

SEGUN AKANO:

Segun Akano once again for the records. Answering that question; you need to look at the situation in Nigeria where we have a population of around 74 million, but you have a business FMEs operating 10 million, but when you have FMEs of about 18 million, you should imagine that the attendees should be almost 1 million, but it's not so. So it's an irony, so to [inaudible] the upkeep of the ccTLD domains, you have to look out to your population. And that's where the marriage of IGF is important because knowledge sharing is very culture for you to sell to increase your numbers.

So, we've seen while numbers are not great. In one of the ICANN told us that 98% of companies in India are ICANN. If we adopt the same rule in Nigeria, the point is, I lose roughly about 20 million domains. But it's not so, for us to cross that hurdle, we

need to engage all the people. We need to do a lot of participation with the legislature, and this is why ccTLD can not just be [inaudible]. So, IGF is better position to handle all this about training, capacity building, information sharing, so that everybody will have knowledge of your products, and that's where the marriage comes in.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you, Segun. I think you touched another point that maybe an open question for next discussion, which is slightly different, which is; why do we engage? I said we engage also because we want to sell domain names. Some others would say something else, and I think this is a question for the group to think about it, after having taken stock of what we do, going back to why do we do that? And that will be interesting for the next steps, thank you. Yes, and then after we go through the slide, otherwise we'll be late.

RUDI DANIEL:

Rudi Daniel again, for the record. For the sake of correctness; I said that .VC doesn't have a -- or ccTLD manager. Well, the ccTLD manager is actually a government ministry, so actually, we have an administrative contact, okay? Just for correctness, thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Just to pursue that argument, so you got a government agency acting as ccTLD manager, so again, my diversity argument; so, effectively this, and there are more like this. Be aware, there are a lot of government agencies, governments who are the ccTLD managers, and this is exactly one of the reasons why the ccNSO or this working group is not making, or demanding, or is only about information-sharing. Because I think nobody is in the position to tell the government, or government agency, what to do with respect to Internet Governance. That is, their sovereign right, so I think that's the underlying argumentation why this working group is taking such a lightweight approach.

PIERRE BONIS: Young-Eum, and then we go to the next topic.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: I'd like to talk about a slightly different type of content that we need to, that I have, since the beginning of this group have been arguing for. And that is, where this group, or one of the reasons why this group was formed was because the CCs were initially

involved in the CCWG or CCEG, and the issues that are being discussed there are very different from the kind of issues that we are discussing here. However, and maybe the big issues with regard to UN or the ITU may not be of daily interest to many people, and more people are more interested in the IGF, but in terms of the potential for real change, we should be aware that things going on within the UN and the IT are things that have much more potential to actually bring about change, maybe even within ICANN. So, I'm not saying that we should focus our attention on it, but I mean, I would still like to suggest that we pay at least a portion of our attention to what is going on there also, thank you.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you. It's true that we have thought a lot about the IGF, because this is IGLC, and then we talk about IGF, and that. But frankly, in the sharing of information, when it comes to this relevant topic that we have listed, if they are talked about within ITU, or once again within OECD with ITAC for instance, this is an information that we have to share also, obviously. Thank you. Can we go to the next slide?

So, if I don't, if I'm not mistaken, we still have something like 15 minutes before the end of this meeting. So, how are we going to report and feedback to the community? As Bart said, we want to

start with a kind of lightweight approach, and as we say in French, [Speaking in French] you get hungry when you eat, so maybe it will end with a very heavyweight approach, but let's stick to the lightweight for now, and we will see if we have something else after.

So, the first thing is, of course, at every ccNSO meeting there will be an update; you will not escape from that. And, maybe more if we can organize some IG sessions sometime, that would be maybe interesting. Of course, the Wiki is a place where we are going to share more and more information. With information shared today, we will try to put it in the Wiki, so bear with us because we are almost in July, some people go on holidays, we have been talking about Internet Governance since 15 years, so if it takes one month to do it, that's not a problem. But this is something we are going to try to do.

And if there is something of importance that we think we really have to point us to the community, there is room for us in the ccNSO newsletter. It doesn't mean that there will be an IGLC report in each ccNSO newsletter, but it means that if there is something important, for instance, when we are talking about schedule, the next, sorry to talk about IGF once again, but the next Global IGF in Berlin, we have to give the date, give the place

to all the CC members, and maybe to ask them who is coming. Very simple thing.

I would say that this kind of format that is the opening of the group itself, because there are more people that are not part of the group that people that help out in other groups in the room, is very rich. And, we should try to go on the next item, try to have face-to-face meetings that are open to the community. From now on, this is what we see as the feedback we want to do. Is there any comments, suggestion on that, bearing in mind that every suggestion that would make us work more is not acceptable? No, no, I'm joking, but we really try to have a lightweight starting.

PETER KOCH:

Peter Koch again, so I think you mentioned that the discussion here is much different from what happens in the respective Global ICANN group so to speak. One topic that comes up there, and is your fault, because you mentioned ITU, is discussing this topic of ITUD membership, or may or may not be upcoming ITUT involvement and so on and so forth. And, some of us are, one way or another, involved, either because the ccTLD equals some government entity, or we are, like, keeping a distance or not in one way or another. But given that this topic is topic of ICANN

ITU relationship isn't going to go away lightly; is this a place to discuss this from the ccTLD perspective? Or, you don't think so.

PIERRE BONIS:

No, I don't think so for two reasons. This is the place to say that you are involved in ITUD or ITUT or study group 2, that you will be at the Plenipotentiary of course. But discussing a CC approach on that would lead us to try to find a kind of common position on that, and I can tell you that this is impossible, because the two sentences about ITU that I heard, for instance, in this room, I strongly disagree with it, and I'm one of the CCs, so it is going to take us hours and the debate is not going to be conclusive. So, I would really like to stick to sharing of information, and at this point, this group is not a group when we discuss the substance of what happens in one or the other organization.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Maybe in addition, and I see that Olivier, Sebastien, especially Young-Eum as former co-chair of the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance, say I could imagine that there is a bit of a liaison in the sense of sharing of agenda, what are the topics discussed in this group, and what are the topics discussed by the, it's now called the Engagement Group, I believe. So, by

the Engagement Group, so that is very clear for two reasons. Say, the more practical one is to avoid overlap, but also, say- or, three reasons effectively, to avoid overlap, and the second and probably most important one is, that especially CCs know what is discussed at this forum, but also know what is discussed at the engagement group. And by the engagement group, and if there is a topic where you feel strongly about by the engagement group that group is open; there is no limitation to participate, it's structured differently.

And, I think, I've forgot my third reason, but probably the second one was as important as well. Oh, I know my third reason, it's more positive, so in the sense of, because I say, from the initial discussions by the IGLC, especially the internal ones, it was already clear how to deal, say, with these two groups, but I think it's very good to just, by evolution, that people know there are different groups working on sometimes the same topics, but from a different perspective, and that you know where to go, especially for you as CC, but also the broader, because in principle, especially at the face-to-face meetings, they're open.

LEONID TODOROV:

Leonid Todorov for the record. I believe that all these activities, I mean, action points are very good. Yet, I would just, I'm a bit concerned because changing the definition of the group, liaison

on these Internet Governance related issues, so how this group would be able to serve as a kind of interface or knowledge expertise gateway between this huge Internet Governance, monumental Internet Governance agenda and ccTLDs, which at times are absolutely unaware of that agenda.

I mean, we have 172 ccNSO members, right? 172, I guess. And I would there suggest that a good third of them has no clue whatsoever, for example, if you deliver an update on Internet Governance issues, they wouldn't really have any clue what you're talking about, just because you start, let's say, from the 7th grade, while they are just still in the Kindergarten in that regard, as Bart mentioned. That means for, I mean, for quite a fraction of the potential audience, the message will be absolutely lost on them. That's number one.

I guess Wiki might be a very good tool if updated, and you know, used intensively, and that should be promoted heavily. Newsletter is a good thing, but again, if you just, well, point to whatever event, Berlin, December, what difference does it make for a Southern Pacific ccTLD of running 200 registrations? I mean, I don't think that it makes much sense.

There might be yet another channel I would think of over time, but that would require probably as, I would say, strong commitment, as strong a commitment and as well thought

through consistency as Wiki, and that's probably Webinars for members, ccNSO members, by means of which one would be able to walk them through from Adam and Eve until today. So, just one of those solutions.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you. The point taken, this is difficult within immediately to say yes to everything, but this is something that we have to discuss within the group. Maybe a kind of mentoring also could be available. Some CCs who are more involved could say that they are ready to take on board some others, and we'll publish these names or these possibilities.

Great. Joke, we are running out of time; can we go directly to the outreach? Because it's linked with -- yes, Olivier? Yes, just to remind everyone that on the cross-community engagement group, this is the last point of the agenda, so we will talk about that after the -- I mean exactly on this slide.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Then I have nothing to say, I'll wait for you to go through that, then I'll- because I wanted to -- it's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking -- I wanted to try and show the sort of flow of information and then discuss this, so perhaps you can take us through this slide, and then I'll comment.

PIERRE BONIS:

We are arriving at in 2 minutes at this point, so what I wanted to go through, directly to the outreach, it's because it's another way of looking at what we have discussed already, which just tells the outreach to all community; the ccNSO, but not only the ccNSO by the way, it can be a CC manager that are not managers of the ccNSO, we go one step further and say that maybe the group could engage and do some exchange and outreach with regional organizations.

I guess in APTLD center, AFTLD, LACTLD, there are a lot of knowledge on the Internet Governance related topics, and they could help us with getting us some information as well as we could help them. And, there is the other IG related initiative within the ICANN environment, so we are coming to this point of the agenda. The CCWGEG, and the board working group on Internet Governance. So, this is open for discussion.

The only thing, I think I said at the introduction of this session, is that I strongly believe that we need to produce and to gather information if you want to be useful in our interactions with other groups within ICANN. Otherwise, it's going to become [inaudible] all the time and we are getting bored, and I will get bored very quickly. Anyway, so this is why this is the last point of the agenda; that's not because we don't want to talk with these

other groups, it's that we consider that we have to do our homework first.

But let's assume that we are doing our homework, that we are producing content that we gather information from the CCs, know what they are doing, share information about the various places when these topics are talked about, then what do we do with the CCWGEG and what do we do with the board working group on the Internet Governance? I'm listening to you. Maybe Olivier, you wanted to elaborate on that?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Pierre. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I was going to wait for input from CCs before spurting out my views. I'll go to the back of the queue.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: *Not speaking into microphone*

PIERRE BONIS: Yeah, of course, everything. You can talk about regional organizations too.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I have just one little comment, happy to clear it with you. There are so-so, I think the three of my organization members will definitely talk about that, there's a study Carolina [inaudible], maybe some of you know her, has done in the region with the support of the CGI, NIC .BR; there's a study of an arise, and there's a lot of the ccTLDs, what the ccTLDs are doing within their local IGFs, so you can collaborate with that, you can take a lot from there. And I don't know if there is anything we can do for you, happy to do that.

PIERRE BOININ: Thank you very much. Bet on us to go back to you, you're right. We will definitely go back to you, thank you. Leonid.

LEONID TODOROV: Interestingly, Internet Governance has not been on our radar screen as long as APTLD meeting agenda is concerned for quite a while. And for now, the board is contemplating this subject matter once again for one of those upcoming meetings, and it's not just by coincidence, I must say, because I believe that, for example, across Asia Pacific, the predominant sentiment is that Internet Governance issues should be left for specific individuals; the ccTLDs to deal with on the local level, as there is no Internet Governance agenda for the region per se, it's a very

kaleidoscopic region as you know, very diverse. And for example, Pacific IGF is way different from, I don't know, Central Asian IGF.

That said, I believe that such communication and outreach efforts may yield certain results if, once again, first of all, they are consistent, second, they resonate with the audience, because we can talk a lot about abstract values, but when it comes, for example, to the issue of human rights, you would agree that to some extent, it's just impossible to preach under certain circumstances. And that the narrative should be very, very neatly crafted, may I just provide a piece of anecdotal evidence; at one of those Asia Pacific regional IGFs, there was a gentleman from the United States who was preaching the value of failure as a source of future success.

And then, one lady, I mean she couldn't stand it anymore, she stood up and said, "Who the hell are they to preach values across in Asia? Don't they understand that when we fail, we just commit hierarchy, that is it." So, that's important, because sometimes we are so preoccupied with our own concepts or misconceptions, whatever you make it, that we are lost. Sorry.

PIERRE BONIS: Okay, thank you very much, Leonid. Another regional organization online; Peter Van Roste.

JOKE BRAEKEN: We have a comment from Peter Van Roste who is participating remotely; CENTR has a dormant IG working group happy to check if it can be reactivated to act as a channel.

PIERRE BONIS: Peter, I will not chair two IG working groups.

BART BOSWINKEL: What do I need to pay you to say yes?

PIERRE BONIS: Normally, I give priority to CENTR, but on that case, I will give priority to ccNSO. Any comment on the way we could or should interact? And to narrow the question behind that is, do we need to have regular meetings with CCWGEG? As a group or as individuals, individuals in this group are already participate in to this CCWGEG, what is their role in the group, do they have to give us back information for us to share? I mean, this is this kind of question that we can, that we obviously have one minute for talking about.

BART BOSWINKEL: May I suggest again to start very lightweight, say either with staff or other means that we just share agendas as a starting point, that we start sharing agendas as a starting point, and based on that, see what happens. As soon as we know there are meetings that people could attend, maybe they will attend, without setting up a formal liaison path etcetera, because then it's again procedural and process overkill.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Another comment by Peter Van Roste, “Mr. Seppia is chairing the dormant CENTR IG working group,” smiley.

PIERRE BONIS: And he's not even in the room. Okay. Thank you, Peter. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Pierre. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, and I wanted to hear a little bit of the feedback from everyone in the room, and this is why I kind of stayed silent. So, the CCWG, what was the CCWIG is now that, it was effectively unchartered by the different chartering organizations that chartered it to start with, and that's of course one of the main reasons that things have moved on, what it was chartered for is gone as well,

so it had to really change very much. So now, it's an unchartered engagement group, so it's not even a CCWGEG as such, we'll just call it an engagement platform for the ICANN Community to be able to, and communities, sorry, to be able to discuss Internet Governance.

We had a meeting earlier this week, face-to-face meeting with the board working group on Internet Governance, and the board has reaffirmed, or in fact, strengthened its interest in it, and the governance said that there absolutely needs to be some platform for these discussions to take place, so they're not alone in the work that they do in following Internet Governance topics outside of ICANN. As you know, there's the government engagement working group on one side, the GE, sorry government engagement group, the GE group that's based primarily in Geneva, under Tarek Kamel.

There's also the global stakeholder engagement group that covers the world that also follows some of these things. There is some cross-pollination between them. Now, and in fact, there's even someone from the GE group now based in Brussels as well, so that we don't get the future surprises that the GDPR appeared to have been. Let me just be diplomatic about this. So, that's one of the things, and so they definitely would like to see something, a platform.

The first steps to this is to actually organize our work so that we don't have this avalanche of stuff that comes to us. There is a multiplication of discussions out there from the UN to the ITU to working groups of the UN to processes that the World Trade Organization, I mean, it sounds like this is the hot topic now, is to start talking about Internet Governance. And of course, with a lot of rubbish at the same time a lot of processes that seem to be taking on years and years. And so, they need to be tracked, and one of the difficulties of course is if you're tracked from one angle, you're not going to get the full picture.

So, one of the things, and this is just me speaking on behalf of no one, one of the things that I do feel is that the ccTLD operators are probably the most extensive, intelligence network that we have out there. You guys are present in all of the countries in the world. You have, in general, access to some places where the discussions actually take place. You are less, well, there's less of a tendency to bureaucracy than in government circles, where sometimes there's a huge, let's say, bureaucracy effectively. And not only that, but huge compartmentalization in huge departments where the left side of the office doesn't know what the right side of the office is doing. You're much more agile, should I say.

And so, being able to tap onto that intelligence network that you have, and for you to organize yourself to be able to feed this into the overall process, what I think and I hope make the hope venture a success. So, that's the, it's not even a starting point, I think we're looking at point 1; organize yourself, point 2; when you're ready, then start feeding. And of course, use this as an ability for you to feed from the other component parts, because as you know, so the GE department is doing a lot of work but there are also members of the GAC who are participating in the discussions, and who can also provide with some insights. We've even had some chairs of some of the working groups telling us what is next, what hasn't been published yet, and what will soon be published. So, if we can make use of this without going into the wider issues of human rights and freedom of speech and things, which are great philosophical arguments, but we can discuss philosophy elsewhere, then we hopefully can have a system that is both effective, and can react very quickly, thank you.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you very much, Olivier. On a personal note, I think that the presentation you just made may be would have been very useful that we discuss that a little bit more before Barcelona, and before the ccNSO and withdrew from the CCWG. I know for

reasons that stand that it's not formally a cross-community working group because it's an ongoing story, but I think it was very clear, and yes, the idea of doing our work, sharing with you, and then getting nurtured by the other constituencies of ICANN that matter is our primary goal. Always to give back to our CC colleagues, but not only to them of course, because we are talking about multistakeholder approach.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Pierre. One of the things actually is the chartering of such a group, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, the chartering of such a group introduces a level of formality that made quite a few people uneasy about it. Because it does open the door to the potential of the group speaking on behalf without them speaking, which is never a good idea.

But the un-chartering of the group, and the fact that it is an informal group that still has the support of the board, and has the support, the logistical support of ICANN, which is effectively 0.0001% of Nigel's time. Probably thinks about while he's running in his morning run and things. And at the same time, the ability to have the room during the ICANN meetings, so as to be able to discuss face-to-face. That has been -- the board has shown that it wants this to continue, in which case, there is no need for chartering, and at that point, it introduces the

safeguards that the group will not overstep its mark when it does things, thank you.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you very much, Olivier. With that, I think we have to conclude. We are ten minutes late, which is not too bad for an Internet Governance discussion, chaired by your French. I think we did very well, thank you very much, and see you very soon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]