
ICANN74 | Policy Forum – Joint Session: GAC and ALAC
Wednesday, June 15, 2022 – 09:00 to 10:00 AMS

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Hello and welcome to the ICANN74 GAC joint meeting with the ALAC. This session is being recorded and governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behaviour of during the session questions and comments submitted will be read aloud. If you are remote wait until called upon and in Zoom unmute your Zoom microphone. For those of you in the GAC room please raise your hand in Zoom and when called upon unmute the table microphone. State your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. You may access all available features for the session in the Zoom tool bar. With that I will hand the floor over to the GAC Chair, Manal Ismail. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Julia, and good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone in the GAC room and on Zoom. Welcome to the ALAC GAC bilateral and this meeting is scheduled for an hour. I would like to start by welcoming Maureen and all ALAC members who have joined us in person or on-line. We have quite a number of speakers on-line today.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

I would also like to thank Joanna and Shi Young for inter-sessional efforts to compile an agenda of on your meeting today and to identify topic leads from both constituencies. The agenda highlights public policy matters of common interest to both governments and Internet users but before getting into substance I would like to give the floor to Maureen for any opening remarks from your side. Maureen, please, thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you so much, Manal, and for once again like giving us this opportunity to participate in your schedule of meetings. We know you have a very busy time anyway.

But I think as we're finding you know when we -- the more -- the more contact that we make with each other as advisory committees within ICANN we are uncovering a wider range of topics, you know that we are aligned with, and as far as common interests as end users, and we really appreciate the opportunity to be able to participate in your discussions.

And I'm looking forward to the conversations that we will have today from our in person as well as our remote participants today and both sides of the discussion, so you know I don't want to take up too much more of your time and I will pass back to you, Manal, so we can get started. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, Maureen, and I'm going to follow your steps and pass it directly to our moderators please. Shi Young, go ahead.

SHI YOUNG CHANG, VICE CHAIR: Thank you, Manal and Maureen, and thank you for all these participating for this meeting. And I'm so happy to meet you all in person so I hope through this session we are going to have a deep discussion for the issues and I hope this will be a great chance to deepen our collaboration between each committee. Thank you so much, and as we said I think we are ready to start with the first substance which is the Universal Acceptance and IDN. I am happy to take -- I am happy to give you the floor for Satish, could you take the floor?

SATISH: Thank you for the opportunity to speak at the GAC ALAC joint session. I'm Satish, the ALAC liaison to the UASG. I think we agree on the importance of IDN and universal acceptance as they enable choice and enhance digital inclusion. Not just for the current 4.5 billion end users but perhaps for the next billion who are expected to join by 2023.

In order to be impactful you has to be truly universal and secure. In addition UA and IDN should provide a consistent interface and experience in order to enhance the trust of the Internet. ALAC on its part is committed to the lookups of the UASG and the ongoing work of the EPDP on IDN which an attempt to a recommend these goals. Although we usually talk about IDN and UA together we need to nutrition in an IDN provide the policy and infrastructure that makes it possible to create working non-Latin domain labels.

We have made significant progress in this journey. And the work that is still pending mainly relates to IDN variants currently being addressed by the US, relates to a set of technical changes required in applications regarding languages libraries and frameworks and largely outside ICANN.

In order to ensure all domain names and e-mail addresses work the same way. This is potential for the GAC and ALAC to work together to achieve the overall objectives of IDN. By such action we would be table create synergy in a may positively influence the outcome. We would like to talk about a few initiatives.

First, we may want ICANN to become an exemplar for the UAD enterprise. This is not just about website but also for its internal and external processes including e-mails. Achieving this

milestone is not symbolic but also a concrete demonstration it is possible to be fully UA compliant.

Second, we may want to explore coordinated or synchronized ... and UA and IDN including joint sessions at global forums to reinforce the message and make it more visible and actionable. Third the proposal to celebrate an annual UAD starting February 2023 is gaining traction to bring together all stakeholders including industry and tech companies, businesses, governments, language and communities and the Internet governance community at the global regional and national levels.

By acting in tandem GAC and ALAC can use the opportunity provided by the UAD not just for next year but also years ahead to project the need for UA. Finally, there are 2 initiatives that are presently different stages of implementation. That may be relevant to highlight here, the first of these is a survey on end user perceptions on IDNs that ALAC is currently in the process of administering in India with the Hindi/... language/script communities.

When completed this would provide valuable insights in the way these communities think about IDNs. The second is actually a set of 3 surveys the UA tech working group is planning with the objective of identifying enablers or inhibitors of UA readiness

and we are looking at developers who write the code. The management of tech companies which take a busy call and governments that provide an enabling policy framework for UA.

When completed these can provide insights as well as action items for GAC and ALAC that take us closer towards closing the UA gap. On above of ALAC I look forward to continued interactions and these or other initiatives to GAC and ALAC may consider taking up for joint action. Thank you once again.

SHI YOUNG CHANG, VICE CHAIR: Thank you so much for your great remarks for the Universal Acceptance for the ALAC side.

Now I think I hand the floor to the Nigel Hickson for the U.K. Nigal, could you take the floor?

UNITED KINGDOM: Yes, thank you very much, and good morning to everyone, and thank you so much for thanks to ALAC for you know allowing us to be part of this dialogue. It's just so important, I mean we've all talked about you know Universal Acceptance before a multilingual Internet, and I think it, it's one of these issues which is difficult in the sense that we all agree, you know we all agree that there needs to be a multilingual Internet.

We all agree it makes sense for people to be able to communicate and to access services, public services or access other types of information in their own languages, and in their own scripts but actually, getting to that step is quite challenging we've seen.

And it's enormously impressive, the work that you know has been done by the universal acceptance working group and other initiatives. But clearly, there is still work to be done. There's still work to be done to convince governments, to convince platforms, to convince other companies that they must take this step, and so I think the, you know the initiatives that are being talked about here are enormously welcome, having a Universal Acceptance readiness day.

I think that's -- you know, being able to sort of reach out and try and convince those people that haven't taken this step to take this step, and ICANN clearly needs to be an exemplar. They need to say, we've done it. We can change the software. We've spent the dollars or whatever. You know institutions, bodies need to be able to stand up at the table to be able to put their you know, to be able to put their flag up and say yes we've done this and we've done this because we think it's important.

So, yeah, and you know really, really pleased that these initiatives are taking place. ICANN of course does so much work on this, on this front in terms of international domain names, as many of us will know, many of us in the government advisory committee of course are looking forward to the SubPro, the next round on generic top-level domains and within that of course we want to ensure that international domain names play their part, but they're a key element of this work.

I just wanted to very briefly refer to the expedited policy development process that is taking place on international domain names. It's a policy development process which, if you like, isn't causing controversy in the way that perhaps you know, some PDPs cause controversy in policy terms.

This is a very technical exercise. It's very necessary exercise. We're very fortunate in this PDP process to have real expertise amongst the ICANN community, and this actually brings home another message which I think you know sometimes we, we forget, and that you know ICANN really does rely on expertise, not just the expertise of the staff, which is immense and the experience of the people working in the ICANN organization on these issues, but also, people in business and software companies. Registrars and registrants that understand this

process backwards and are able to provide their resources and their help and their expertise in terms of taking this work forward.

Some of you will have woken up this morning hopefully -- well, hopefully most of you will have woken up this morning -- but hopefully you will have seen the announcements from ICANN you know every day they tell us what we should be doing for the day, and in the announcement this morning there was a reference to the latest announcement in terms of Rootzone generation initiative, and again the work that's being done in terms of the different panels, to work out what exactly what scripts can take place in terms of international domain names, what scripts are applicable. The variance on those scripts and that work has been enormously useful.

The PDP is ongoing. I mean the PDP is -- has an objective. We've been trying to enhance the use of international domain names ensuring that there's maximum opportunity for variance on names to be recognized areas within the constraints of the rule generation process, within the policy constraints also of the subsequent procedures, the new gTLD process, the policy development process that we ensure that while there's maximum opportunity for script variance that we also ensure that the rules are adhered to so we don't have name clashes and we don't have sort of situations where names are duplicative or other problems.

Clearly, this work is relevant to gTLDs and ccTLDs as well, and indeed, as I've said some of these initiatives need to be bedded down before the launch of the next process. So, I don't think I need to say too much more. I mean, it would be great if other contributions can be made from the floor for those involved in this exercise and want to share their expertise. This is a cross-community exercise and really as I said, we benefit from the expertise that many people are able to demonstrate on this. Thank you, thank you Maureen, thank you, Manal.

SHI YOUNG CHANG, VICE CHAIR: Thank you, Nigel, for the great input about the collaboration between the IDM and the universal ... I think this will be helpful for showing each other's points and the status about the item. As we have a limited time I would like to get the discussion session at the end of the session so for the next agenda I will ask Johanna to take the floor. Could you?

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Shi Young, and Manal for supporting to session for the opportunity for the 2 advisory committees to meet again face-to-face and work and tightening the collaboration. Our next agenda item reflects the steps that have been taken thus far.

During previous meetings we thought it might be useful for us to review good practice examples where on the ground presence of the 2 advisory committees and the communities behind them works well, and that example might serve others.

The case example that we would like to share today is the Finnish one with 2 Finnish speakers briefly discussing how on the ground co-operation between the ALS and the GAC representation works in that region and that specific country and then we will follow up with a brief summary from the GAC lead on that topic, and that would be my friend and colleague, Shi Young.

Again, with due regards to our full agenda without further ado I'm going to hand the floor over to Julf Helsingius who will be discussing this specific case example as the ISOC chair for Finland. Julf, thank you for joining us the floor is yours.

JULF HELSINGIUS:

Thank you and good morning. So, yes, Julf Helsingius and many of you probably remember me from my years as a GNSO liaison to the GAC but today I'm here at the chair of the Finnish chapter of the Internet society. Actually, the right person to talk about this would be ... the very long time was the ALAC liaison to the GAC. He's been central in co-operation and Finland. He has a background in government but has been the chair previously of

the Finnish ISOC chapter. Done a lot of very good things. Unfortunately, he's in a NonCom meeting in an unspecified location. We don't have him here today.

If I get anything wrong I'm sure ... foreign affairs can correct me as he's been very active in driving a joint activities in Finland. So just as a background reminder that Finland is a small country with a population of only 5.5 million. So it's reasonably easy for people involved to know each other on the organizes and this helps a lot. So when looking at other countries during this of course it's slightly more difficult in a bigger country.

Finland is also a very technologically advanced country. We all heard about Nokia and angry birds. I think the lone... conductors sitting at a computer writing code. In the 1980's and 1990 ACs Finland was in the process of becoming an information society driven by technology like Nokia. But there was a lot of a lot of policy decisions and establishment of... I remember endless meetings in the 90's PTT was driving for a Finnish version of France's Minitel.

Of course, now made my Nokia. And I and others were trying to say there was an open non-proprietary thing called the Internet coming and they saw the light. So the basis for the current corporation so I have to move forward to what's going and recent

days is actually when the world summit on information society in Geneva meetings established the Internet governance forum.

As a result of this there was a Finnish national follow up group formed. Mostly worked as an e-mail list hosted by the ministry for foreign affairs with participants from government, industry, civil society, everyone. ISOC chapter was very strongly represented there.

I'll try to speak a little bit slower, yeah. That's a problem of mine. So this group discussed a lot about the Finnish positions whenever there was an IGF meeting coming up and discussed the different matters and in 2010 this group together had an initiative to organize an annual event called a Finnish Internet forum.

That is usually hosted by the Finnish Parliament in the Parliament building in Helsinki and many members of the Parliament as well as the staff do attend these meetings. As a result the original WSIS follow-up group has been formalized under the Finnish Internet forum umbrella and we have many participating organizations such as ministry of foreign fares. Ministry of transport. Of course ISOC in a leading role. The Internet exchanges, companies like Nokia, the local... children organizations so a very broad multistakeholder background.

And we just recently had one Finnish Internet forum event on the topic of war and the Internet. Of course, that's what everybody is talking about right now. And ISOC Finland provided the speakers for that event and one of the speakers was MIKO of hipsecure which you probably heard about. So the corporation is very active. My only concern is that it is focussed on things such as IGF and ICANN. That are already multistakeholder forums and civil society is already represented there. I think this process should be extended to things like ITU where the voice of civil society only gets heard through governments.

So that's trying to keep this short. That's kind of my contribution. Thank you. And, of course, I'm happy to answer questions. I will actually get to The Hague in person this afternoon, so please come and talk to me if you have any questions. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you, Julf, and thank you for noting the active participation of Yjro which is the spirit of,-- he is here in spirit, but not in the meeting itself. As Julf noted the Finnish example is not accidentally on our agenda. It is due to the work that is being done on the ground. And just to recognize the governmental input into that collaboration we are thrilled to welcome USO... the GAC representative of the Finnish ministry of foreign affairs to

give us the governmental perspective to best have such a fruitful event. I'm happy to hand you the floor. Thank you for being here.

JUUSO MOISANDER: Thank you, Joanna. Good morning. I hope you hear me well.

I personally have been involved with the Finnish multistakeholder community for over a decade. And as Julf mentioned the follow-up group is the core of where we discuss Internet governance issues. But there are more. As he said it's mostly a mailing list but we do hold regular meetings at this time I guess it's relevant to say that we held regular face-to-face meetings and we will get back to those. We have been holding ad hoc meetings on topics that we consider hot for the time, most recently I'd like to point out the meeting that we held on discussing the improving the IGT plus coordination meeting in March.

I raise 2 perspectives on this co-operation. Solely ICANN issues and broader IG issues. Especially on ICANN I've considered the ALAC co-operation fruitful when discussing new gTLDs and also the IANA transition. We have been discussing the topics at times frequently to help stakeholders, including myself, better understand where we are and sort of compare notes on this.

ALAC in Finland has done really important work and awareness raising for the public.

On broader IGT the Finnish Internet forum is the Crown jewel of this co-operation. We started this co-operation with the Parliament in 2010. The Finnish Parliament has a particular feature. It has a committee for the future. It is a committee that discusses issues but it's not a legislative body. Basically, it is only there with the antenna up to see what's happening in the world. What is sort of the raising issues, and they got interested in the process being involved in the WSIS as well.

Now we are in a really comfortable position. We host the face-to-face meeting annually with the Parliament and there's also the Parliament committee for communications now in. We are discussing with 2 Parliament committees and preparing the event. It's really amazing but I have to tell you that the Parliament committee members now, when they attend the meeting it's actually counts for them as participating in an actual committee meeting so they really consider this multistakeholder discussions of value to them.

In the end I guess it's all about efficient use of resources, as Julf said we are a small government, a small country. We aren't that

many but we have to co-operate to be able to punch above our weight. We can't afford to do it any other way.

One comment to Julf's intervention on other topics or discussion on this multistakeholder, in multistakeholder forum of different issues, the ITU... conference is also prepared in a multistakeholder fashion by the ministry of transport and communications but that's a separate body so it's not sort of under the WSIS umbrella but it's still a multistakeholder, multistakeholder preparatory process.

I think I will leave it at this, and happy to answer any questions. Unlike Julf I am not be present in The Hague this week but I will be on-line and happy to check with you guys whenever. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much. This is -- we use these in plenary bilaterals as an opportunity to exchange ideas and good experiences but this is an ongoing conversation so the task that Shi Young and myself have put for ourselves is make sure these conversations persist. This conversation persists also outside the assigned time for an ICANN meeting.

I do note 2 hand that have been raised by my ALAC colleagues and the chat room. They come from Jonathan and Sebastien. We will take comments and questions in the dedicated Q and A session and we do encourage feedback, comments, and questions and that will be duly attended to in had due course in the session, or throughout inter-sessional meetings that will happen hopefully between the 2ACs as we progress.

With this in mind more of a review of action items that we have been deliberating inter-sessionally, I hand the floor to my GAC counterpart Shi Young to raise certain issues, questions, pending items that might be addressed during those inter-sessional meetings as well and again the active participation is appreciated, and the Q and A session will allow you to post your comments and questions to our speakers, with sincere thanks to both Julf and Juuso.

SHI YOUNG CHANG, VICE CHAIR: Thank you. As one of the example of the South Korean case of the multistakeholder governance in policy making. Can you go to the next slide.

So could you go to the next slide, please? So I'm going to talk about the policy making process and related law in South Korea and then I'm going to give the short example about the what the

multistakeholder process during the role making process and finally I just want to make the main points about the... of the -- in South Korea. Can you go to the next slide, please?

So for the brief introduction the South Korea has the... Internet so through the act we all like we all have to manage with the IP address, AS numbers and domain names. So through law we have made the policy making with the Internet resources. So when you see the policy-making process it's going to be a bottom-up process. So we start to receive the complaints or suggestion from the bottom up, and we try to review and organize items, and we get opinion about the ICANNs and then we try to get a public opinion through a hearing and then finally through those process we try to get a review by the Internet or policy committee which is composed of the multistakeholder governance group, so after then we obtain the minister's approve and employ the policy in South Korea. Next slide, please.

So as you have seen the slide we have the Internet or the policy deliberation committee under the Article 6 of the Act on Internet address resources. So we say that all the policy making should be deliberate by these committee so the committee shall deliberate following matters such as the formulate and the implementation of basic plans of Internet resource and they should approve the entrustment of duties of the Internet address management

organizations and also they should... about the management of the Internet addresses and then they should make the major policies for the settlement of the disputes related to Internet addresses.

And then they should try to co-operate for the internationally and then they should make the other policy matters relate to all the matters by chair so they have to basically many laws for make public policy making in the Internet resources in South Korea. So this committee is very important for the public policy making in South Korean case. Next slide, please.

What we want to address for the exemplar of the multistakeholder corporation is that we listen to the revise the act through strengthening the multistakeholder participation and authority of the different stakeholders for making the public policy. So the name has changed from the Internet or policy deliberation to the Internet policy committee because not only for the deliberation. They also have the power and authority to make resolution so they would like you know to be strengthened and then the number of participants has enlarged from 10 people to 20 people so they make the capacity in numbers and powers increased.

And finally, for the qualification of the member the previous was defined by public... but we try to expand the scope to multistakeholder including... end users, so we try to co-operate and heal as many stakeholders making the public policy in South Korea. In the end the original act was approved by the National Assembly of South Korea on December 9th, 2021 so it will be implemented since July 12 of this year so through this law making we have co-operated a lot of, you know, efforts from governments sector, public sector and private sector and... sector and even end users.

So this can be one of the good example about the multistakeholder governance between the public sector and the private sector and all different between GAC and ALAC, so I hope this can be example can be shared between 2 committee to enhance the co-operation between the two committee, and thank you for giving me the chance to present.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Shi Young, for an opportunity to look at joint shared topics from different perspective. Speaking of which I will be now moving swiftly to our next agenda item which is relatively broad and flexible, we have agreed as to two advisory committees and are prepared to work to speak and geo-political

issues that should be complemented by the advancements to the multistakeholder model.

We have two speakers taking the floor and behalf of the 2 committees, with Marita Moll starting us off with the ALAC perspective on advancing the multistakeholder model. The role of community members particularly volunteers that end users are often recognized as, and that is also a shared concern with regard to the ALSs or the community members and individuals states. And then we will hand the floor over to Jorge Cancio who will speak on international geo-political advancements that address that topic as well. I will hand the floor over to Marita joining us remotely. Thank you for being here. The floor is yours.

MARITA MOLL:

Good morning, everyone. Coming to you from central Germany where the Internet is a little unstable this morning. It's a rural area and it's the same problem every where in the world rural areas are not as well served as other areas.

I'm going to be speaking about, as Joanna said, the role of governments and civil society members. Mostly on the -- on the issue of volunteers, and for at large the issue of volunteers of course is a major, major preoccupation.

ICANN, its model is dependant on volunteers of all different kinds. Our volunteers, we describe as individuals who commit time and effort to the work of ICANN with no personal connection to the domain name industry, and who pay their own costs of engagement and participation and commitment to this work, so we know that we're not the only people in ICANN who have these kind of volunteers but we can say pretty much for sure that few of us have anything to gain at all other than satisfaction of contributing to the cause we believe in.

It won't pay our bills or improve our CVs much. The question here is, how can we improve the participation of this group? It's a big question, and a very important question, and we're certainly giving considerable thought to how we can improve this, this way of governing an organization.

The participation mechanism at ICANN assumes that there is an adequate and sustainable flow, sustainable, of committed individuals, willing to spend large amount of time and energy required to participate in these complex processes, and they also needed an adequate training and support mechanisms to assist them. That's a lot to ask of people so how are we, you know -- other than bringing people in, how are we helping them to do this, and to improve their participation?

For one thing, we think we need to know a lot more about the people who get involved. Why are these getting involved? Do we have a lot of information of why people are getting involved? What's driving them? How can we support they are goals and interests? It's not an impossible task to find that out. We could use this information to think about what incentives could help attract and keep people engaged? We start building indicators. We might want to consider how the work of volunteers in ICANN can be assigned some kind of value, not monetary, but value of other kind, and some kind of -- that's something that could encourage people to stay engaged in this complex and demanding work.

Attracting and training volunteers at this level only to see them disappear in 2 years later is very very discouraging for everyone involved. So, at ICANN73 members of the at large leadership team posed questions to the Board on this topic, of establishing new ways to recognize volunteer contributions.

The ICANN governance system is based on the multistakeholder model, and we feel it's necessary to start these conversations, if the model is going to evolve and thrive. We hope that the GAC is also interested in contributing to this kind of idea of thinking about how we can improve this -- we're just beginning this conversation, and surely all communities have got something to

gain from finding out -- finding ways of better managing our volunteer resources in this governance system.

And that is pretty much all I have to say about this. We wanted to start a conversation. We've made a number of interventions, this being one of them and we just hope to go forward and hope to see the GAC as partners in this. Thank you, thank you, Joanna.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you. Thank you very much, Marita. That is an intervention that fits well with the good practice example we have just shared and with the need to advance the support of both communities members on the ground as well as within the ICANN structures themselves. But when we do discuss the advancements of the multistakeholder model there are clearly also international organizations and national regulatory processes or simply statements that target that objective as well and with that I hand the floor over to Jorge Cancio who is also joining us remotely today, and who will be speaking on that regulatory or international intergovernmental organizational aspect of the advancements of the multistakeholder model, and geo-political issues. Jorge, thank you so much for joining us. The floor is yours.

JORGE CANCIO:

Thank you, thank you so much, Joanna. I hope you hear me okay?
Thank you for nodding.

So I'm back to virtual. I was there the first 2 days physically present. Now I'm virtually there, so this is a hybrid meeting in one person in a way. So happy to be with you, and to share some, some thoughts and some information. As Joanna said, the multistakeholder model of ICANN is not living in a void but it's living within a larger ecosystem, a global ecosystem we've seen before, that there are also national examples as South Korea, or as Finland, there are many others of course, but there's also this larger global setting, and there have been a lot of developments lately.

We may say that we are living through very interesting times so it's important that the people on the ground are aware of these developments, and to the extent possible, also participate in them as far as possible, or at least do consider that there is a larger setting evolving. So for instance, at the U.N. level it's important to say that there was an office of the tech envoy established in 2021, and after some hiccoughs we have learned very recently that the envoy for technology of the U.N. Secretary-General has been appointed finally in the person of Indian diplomat, Mr. Amandip Gill, so there's this new office in the U.N. trying to co-ordinate to create synergies in the work of the

different agencies and offices in the U.N. on this larger digital field of activities.

And, of course, this includes Internet governance and includes the governance of the DNS so it's important to bear that in mind. In fact, the office of the tech envoy is launching, or is undertaking consultation, a global consultation process which I just pasted in the chat on something they are calling global digital compact, which is basically things that happen on the Internet but of course have an influence of the governance off the Internet of the infrastructure itself, so have a look, and participate, the more we participate the better, the more the voice from the grassroots from the community will be heard.

Also at the U.N. level, and related to the former we have the evolution of the Internet governance forum and Internet governance forum plus so that's a way of making the IGF more inclusive, more effective and also a bit more output oriented. That's a conversation that is on going, and this is in relation with the world summit on information society plus 20.

So it's already 20 years of the almost already 20 years of the world summit of 2003 and 2005, understand 2025 there will be a big review process where the founding international agreements of

2003 and 2005 will be reviewed, so also critical Internet resources as those managed by ICANN will be on the agenda.

So something to watch. Something to consider, and, of course, PLENIPOT, the Plenipot conference of the ITU we've benefit hearing about that will happen in September in Bucharest this year, and some of the issues discussed there of course have a bearing on ICANN. And finally, one development that has happened relatively lately which is very interested -- very interesting and focussed on the future of the Internet is the so-called declaration for the future of the Internet, which has been launched by the U.S. and also in collaboration with other governments including the European Union so for this, if you allow I will pass on the floor very briefly to my dear colleague, Susan Chalmers, from the U.S. government who would share some remarks about us.

SHI YOUNG CHANG, VICE CHAIR: Yes, go ahead.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Jorge and Shi Young. As Jorge mentioned in late April the United States joined the European Commission and 60 countries to advance a positive vision for the future of the Internet. The declaration for the future of the Internet has a set

of principles, and those principles include commitments to protect human rights and fundamental freedoms of all people, to promote a global Internet that advances the free flow of information, to advance inclusive and affordable connectivity so that all people can benefit from the digital economy, to promote trust in the global digital ecosystem including through protection of privacy. And to protect and strengthen the multistakeholder approach to governance that keeps the Internet running for the benefit of all.

So the declaration does not propose to re-invent or supplant any existing work in multistakeholder or multi-lateral body but rather to rally global partners around a shared vision. The U.S. and partners will work to promote in vision and its principles across existing fora while respecting each other's regulatory autonomy and in accordance with our respective domestic laws and international legal obligations. And I will share a link to the text of the declaration in the chat. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you, Jorge and Susan. This concludes our agreed agenda items. We did receive some feedback. I also see quite a lively discussion in the chat so I am hey happy to land the floor over to Shi Young to take us through the Q and A session. Thank you.

SHI YOUNG CHANG, VICE CHAIR: Thank you, Joanna, and thank you for having this conversation, and I think we like to start with the Q and A but as I've seen the hand from the ALAC, Jonathan and Sebastien, I would like to give them the first for the Q and A so if there is any -- I think Sebastien could you take the floor for the Q and A because I've seen you people in.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you to my colleague from Finland, and thank you for bringing your experience and your if you allow me as we have interpretation I will switch to French. Yeah, yeah it's difficult. I am bothering you with head set and so on and so forth, but if we don't use it we will lose it.

Sebastien Bachollet the chair of... I wanted to insist that the experience that were presented to you was very interesting, the one of Finland, and it existed, and the other manners in other European country and probably countries in the world. It would be interesting if we could build on this. It is -- could be a problem also to take the example of French. The change of the French representative with it comes to the country could be a problem that changes on the users, will be another difficulty and France, we are here for a long time we know that the governments change all the time, and it is -- it becomes a problem to be able to elaborate positive things and not only -- we're not only talking

about laws in one country, thank you again for all your work, and that its from at large or at GAC. Thank you.

SHI YOUNG CHANG, VICE CHAIR: Could you take the second question?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jonathan Zuck, for the record. I'm the vice chair of the ALAC for policy along with Joanna, and my question however is not in that capacity. So not based on any consensus position of the ALAC or anything but I'm interested in kind of combining a couple of the topics that were discussed. One was Universal Acceptance and the other was the declaration of values that we just heard about. Really highlighting the importance of a global Internet. A world Internet, and Universal Acceptance stands at the center of that.

And so I guess he'd like to ask a challenging question which is has consideration in this body or by individual member states been given to the idea of using, for example, procurement policy as a way to enforce values around Universal Acceptance in it's used all over the world to advance other values, you know so I wonder you know Susan whether or not the Department of Commerce would be willing to not fly and airlines that don't have fully implemented Universal Acceptance, for example?

Has there been a discussion that have and is there even a mechanism for members of the GAC to go back to the agencies they represent -- not evenly the entire government but the agencies to consider something a little bit more with a little more teeth on the issue of Universal Acceptance? And I guess and the same note should we encourage ICANN to do the same?

SHI YOUNG CHANG, VICE CHAIR: Thank you, Jonathan. Susan, go ahead, United States.
Thanks, Jonathan.

UNITED STATES: I think the, the matter of Universal Acceptance falls naturally within the principles that are lined out in the declaration. The declaration itself and the partners haven't created -- I want to clarify -- haven't created kind of a separate mechanism specifically for implementation of the DFI. That's not the model that we use, but rather, it's a political commitment to carry out the principles across existing fora. I think one way that could be realized is if the signatories would like to advance the issue of Universal Acceptance within ICANN, within the GAC, and within other fora within the Internet governance landscape.

So I hope that's responsive to your question. Thank you.

SHI YOUNG CHANG, VICE CHAIR: Thank you, Susan, and as I see the hands from Amrita. Amrita, the floor is yours.

Amrita, for the record from ... talking about the declaration for the future of Internet it is a great move but, unfortunately, as I mentioned in my chat most of the developing countries and many advanced countries have also not endorsed it.

While it is supposed to be multistakeholder in nature, there is a lack of civil society participation and many technical communities are also unrepresented while the declaration does mention that they are planning to have -- to include more people into the fold, I wonder when that's going to happen, and how things are going to change and what is going to be the action plan in actually implementing things because we've been seeing a lot of declarations happening in the past too. How is it going to be different, is something which we are all interested to know? Thank you.

SHI YOUNG CHANG, VICE CHAIR: Thank you, Amrita. And, yes, Susan.

UNITED STATES: Happy to answer that briefly and thank you, Amrita, for the intervention. I think it is absolutely the role of civil society to hold

their governments to account to ensure that they are living up to the spirit of the declaration, and according to the principles. In terms of concrete steps for engagement with civil society, I believe that there are plans in, in the future however I don't have specific information on that at this time, but you know, that being said, I think it would be great if civil society can raise the declaration to their appropriate government representatives and inquire as to what plans they may have for realizing the principles that are in the declaration. Thank you.

SHI YOUNG CHANG, VICE CHAIR: Thank you, Susan. And is there any more question from floor or -- oh, yes, I've seen it. So yes, go ahead.

INDONESIA: Thank you. Ashwin from Indonesia, for the record. Perhaps this is not only for ALAC but also for Manal, I mean several interesting issues in this session much it's very interesting and thank you for representatives from ALAC and so on. The problem I just notify several technical issues. In central Germany the Internet is unstable like what our friend mentioned so you can imagine how in other countries, in Indonesia, for example.

Now you mention also 4.5 billion end users are there ... there will be more and more and more. Then you our friend from Finland,

Finnish, talk about interesting technical development on ISOC and so on. Now my point is that since all issues need technical capability from the countries. Technical knowledge in the countries I just wonder if GAC and even ICANN together with ALAC can promote technical development in various countries.

For example in ISOC, for example, IETF, the task force for RFC -- request for tender very very frequently and just this one point. That's just one example of this can show how important is technical development. For example, that's the national standard body for ICTN get [inaudible] here? Also look at RFS and not only to ISO and IFC for example. There will be member of ISO, and ITC but does they also look after the RFC for example? That is a kind of things which is need technical capability.

So perhaps ALAC, ICANN ALAC and together with Manal and GAC can promote this. Maybe through any, any, any possible way you see through, like for example in Australia through ICANN representative in Singapore or through the local country's registry. You know, that's another system to do it. Thank you.

SHI YOUNG CHANG, VICE CHAIR: Thank you so much, and as I've seen the hand from the ... I just want to give the Velimira. Could you make it short because we are running out of time? Thank you.

VELIMIRA GRAU:

Thank you. I will be very short. I just had a follow-up to Amrita's question on the declaration. As Susan said European Commission, and European Union... to the declaration, and I think it's also important to note that the declaration by its nature it's supposed to be an inclusive process and therefore I think Amrita's question on the fact that other states maybe wanted to join and to be open to multistakeholder model ... important and I just wanted to also to remind that we believe the declaration is really important for safeguarding the open Internet, and being -- keeping it as global one, and from that perspective I also wanted to remind that ICANN has very much applauded this technical and stated in its press releases at the moment of the -- of the issuance that it was really aligned with its mission and its vision of the Internet.

So I believe that given that declaration has specific point on the multistakeholder model this is indeed something into which those GAC members that are present or attending on-line can further reflect and to see whether they subscribe to the principles and vision of the Internet that is in the declaration, and therefore think of also you know, joining those members that are already in the declaration. Thank you.

SHI YOUNG CHANG, VICE CHAIR: Thank you, Velimira, and as we are running out of time I've seen the hand from Luciana, so could you make the --

BRAZIL: Just following up on comments made by Susan, my colleague from the European Commission and my other colleague regarding the declaration of the future of the Internet these a mention to the fact that many countries from developing countries of other countries from what is called the global south have not signed up to the declaration. I just want to make a few comments that may help understand why to a certain extent this may have happened.

I think many of those countries and I include Brazil in this case share the overall vision of -- that is reflected in this declaration. But there are issues of process and issues of substance that are there and that not necessarily everyone will agree on every detail, so it has been changed. It was not a bottom-up process much, it was essentially, declaration was proposed top down. And we have a multistakeholder system in Brazil where at least you should be able to consult and have a bit of conversation, certain topics.

It was a declaration that was proposed completely ready, there was no space for contributions for the declaration so it's take it or leave it so it's something that for Brazil is not something easy to get get on Board without an opportunity to adjust or comment on issues. And also the declaration that in addition to a global vision of the Internet, which I may say we broadly agree on, talks upon specific issues that depend on political, when policy debates in different countries or even legal frameworks in different countries, might be an issue, so that's ... when we looked into this document.

And there's also a point that I'm sure the proponent of the declaration will look into the future is about what's the follow on process of the declaration because it seems to us that the way it was conceived it's not necessarily a stand-alone document. It's something that aims to generate a process, and then the request but why are you duplicating or doing some different so those sorts of questions, I think might be on the mind of many countries that probably were interested in the document, most likely shared the vision that is crystalized in the document but had doubts at this point to join in the more formal way. So thank you, thank you very much.

SHI YOUNG CHANG, VICE CHAIR: Thank you so much, Luciano, and we've passed the 3 minutes and Alisa, could you take it very short? Thank you.

NETHERLANDS: Yes, thank you. For the record, this is Alisa Heaver from the Netherlands. I had a very brief question actually on Universal Acceptance. I'm going to take this off. Would it be possible to have a slightly more in depth technical briefing or something like that or receive a paper on the issues arising with Universal Acceptance?

And also, looking into which responsibilities there are for registries, registrars and what responsibilities we as governments would have to achieve a broader Universal Acceptance because we've been talking about a few times but every time it's quite brief, and then we have to stop and I think it would be good to, to delve into it a little bit more in depth. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Shi Young, if I may very briefly, we are working on it, Alisa. We have been trying to co-ordinate a webinar on IDNs in specific and to gather all background information for GAC colleagues. We've been postponing it because of other priorities popping up but it's going to be there shortly. Thank you.

SHI YOUNG CHANG, VICE CHAIR: Thank you, Manal. And... could you take the floor for the brief--

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Hi, yeah, this is Hadia, for the record. So I wanted to briefly comment on what Indonesia said so regarding technical capacity, so I indeed think that technical capacity train something very important however this is not why Universal Acceptance adoption is not happening. It's not happening because of the will to go ahead and adopt, take the time and put the time-- and money even if it's... money to adopt a universal acceptance. So we need -- people need to see or governments need to see the value that is going to come up, to come out of universal acceptance.

Indonesia also pointed out the matter of RCs and I think this is important. We haven't thought of it as a community much. Lastly on Alisa's point, having more knowledge about what universal acceptance is about is also very important. Thank you.

SHI YOUNG CHANG, VICE CHAIR: And thank you so much for all the active discussion, and I'm so sorry for passing the 6 minute but I like to hand the floor to Manal for the comments.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you very much, everyone, and thanks Joanna and Shi Young for the solid agenda and how we can co-operate at the national level and cross borders to make sure the Internet is really for everyone, including through advancing IDNs and Universal Acceptance. Thank you very much Maureen, Joanna, Shi Young, Satish, Nigel, Juuso, Jorge and Susan and we look forward to our continued co-operation interactive discussions and friendly and constructive dialogue. So thanks everyone. Maureen, any final remarks from your side.

MAUREEN HILYARD: No, I just want to say thank you all very much, you know like I know that -- what I did want to sort of just make a comment on is just you know the depth of the discussions and the contributions that have been made on both side, and I think this hybrid thing probably has been a [inaudible] so may that reign and you know I'm really looking forward to our future meetings. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you, and GAC colleagues, please be back in the room at half past for our meeting with the Board. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]