
LONDON – ICANN Engagement Strategy for Europe
Wednesday, June 25, 2014 – 17:30 to 19:00
ICANN – London, England

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL: Good afternoon everybody. Thank you for your patience. We're going to make a start. We've got until 19:00, and I hope we'll have a good discussion up until then. My name is Jean-Jacques Sahel. I've recently arrived at ICANN, just over two months ago, to work on a Europe team. I think quite a few of you have already taken part in European engagement strategy discussions in ICANN, so hopefully you'll know what this is all about.

I'll say by way of introduction that we've been talking about it a lot, so I hope this will be the last preparatory meeting and that we can start doing some concrete actions together, going forwards. Let's see what comes out of today. What I'd suggest we do... There's quite a few of you, but at the same time not many of us know each other. I'd like to very briefly start with introductions, with your name and organization please.

[SPEAKER]: [Benji 00:13:34] registrar.

[ENRIQUE]: [Enrique], one.com, Also a registrar.

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.

THOMAS: Thomas. One.com. Also a registrar.

STEFANIA MILAN: Stefania, Non Commercial User Constituency. Netherlands.

[ALEX DEFAGE]: [Alex Defage], researcher at [cyber strategy].

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Oksana Prykhodko, European Media Platform.

ANDREA BECCALLI: Andrea Beccalli. I'm the ICANN Brussels Regional Manager.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE: Chris Buckridge. I'm at RIPE NCC.

PAUL RENDEK: My name is Paul Rendek. I'm with the RIPE NCC.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: My name is Sandra Hoferichter. I'm here with ALAC with the EURALO and doing the EURODIG... In Europe!

CHRISTOPH BRUCH: Christoph Bruch. German Civil Liberties Union.

DAN ROGERS: Dan Rogers, Paragon Internet Group, registrar.

CHRIS CHAPLOW: Chris Chaplow, [unclear.com 00:14:45] and Business Constituency.

CHRIS MASON: Chris Mason, Xlsx Solutions.

SPEAKER: [unclear], SIDN.

[MARTIN SEAMAN]: [Martin Seaman], SIDN.

DANIEL KALCHEV: Daniel Kalchev, register of .bg.

SPEAKER: [unclear 00:15:06], EURALO.

SPEAKER: [unclear], Romania.

ANNETTE MUEHLBERG: Annette Muehlberg, EURALO, ATLAS II.

SAM FRANCIS: Sam Francis, London Internet Exchange.

SHEILA SHAW: Sheila Shaw, Astutum UK registrar.

[MARID BLODIVA]: [00:15:27] from Internet Society.

JEREMY [BALE]: Jeremy [Bale], independent consultant.

BARRY [LEIBER]: Barry [Leiber], [unclear].

SPEAKER: [unclear], ICANN.

WOLF LUDWIG: Wolf Ludwig, EURALO.

SPEAKER: [unclear CENTR?]

PATRICK DODSON: Patrick Dodson, [exploring 00:16:09] and working with ICANN.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL: Okay. Thank you all very much for coming. If the air conditioning works better, please feel free to join us at the table. I'm sorry there's no coffee

or tea. There are some logistical issues, but we'll sort that out next time. If we just move on with just a quick overview of what we'd like to touch on today. I'll show missions and objectives, as ICANN, as the ICANN community in Europe. That's the overall topic.

What we thought would be useful was to give you an update on context on what's been happening recently, and some of the big ticket items for the rest of the year. Just a quick recap also on the current ICANN evolution. You'll hear a lot about it tomorrow in plenary sessions, but I thought it would be useful to give you a quick heads-up. Then we move onto talk again about the European Engagement Strategy.

This is now new for many of us. It's relatively new to me, as a newcomer to ICANN. People have been talking about a European Engagement Strategy since ICANN 47, so it's a couple of years, a year and a half. We'll recap what input we've had so far, the discussions and ideas that have come out. Then Andrea will take you through the online survey that we did on the strategy in the last two or three months. That helped go deeper into some of the ideas that were discussed at previous ICANN Meetings.

Then as fourth and fifth items I'd like to throw a couple of ideas on the table and then discuss with you all, because I'm glad to see there are representatives of all stakeholder groups around the table. We'll try and come to some more concrete ideas on how we should move forward. I'll pause for a second to see if there are any particular points, questions or ideas. Any other items that you'd suggest, or starting statement? Okay.

If we just move onto the next slide. I'll be very brief, because I think most of you are fully aware that recently we had Net Mundial, which

released a number of principles and a roadmap for wider Internet governance, of all those aspects that touch on ICANN. What was interesting in that meeting was that this was one of the first few genuine international meetings that tried to embody the multistakeholder model, a little bit like ICANN does with the various stakeholder groups represented and able to go to the microphone and either ask questions or suggest comments directly.

Then just a few weeks after that there was a High-Level Panel on Internet Governance, Chaired by the Estonian President, which reported with a number of ideas for how to evolve Internet governance. Importantly, in March, as I think you all know, the US announced it would intend to transition its oversight function of the IANA function to the global multistakeholder community.

On the back of that we also started a review of accountability for ICANN to make sure that with this transition we had the right capabilities and processes in place. Then we continued to globalize ICANN. Today's session is very much about globalizing ICANN, and we'll discuss that as we talk particularly about some of the survey results and some of the previous discussions we had about making sure ICANN is truly representative in the many meanings of the word.

Looking ahead, some big dates this week, which is pretty amazing. You might know there's around 3,500 people that have registered for this meeting, and there's 3,000 that have actually showed up at the hotel. This is the largest ICANN Meeting every, by a long shot. We had 2,400 in Beijing and we thought that record would stay for a while. No, London has done it. It looks like it's also done it with a real wide variety of

people present and a wide geographic representation. It seems to be very positive in that sense.

A few other key date – the Annual IGF, to which I hope a lot of you will come, because it's not far from our shores. It's in Istanbul in early September. The registrations are open for this one, so please go there. It should be packed. There are a huge number of workshops proposed across a huge number of issues. It's going to be one of the big next steps in taking forward the Net Mundial outcome, we hope, so a pretty good meeting.

ICANN 51 of course. Then some of us will be interested in the ITU Plenipotentiary Conference in late October in Korea, which will touch on Internet-related issues. Then we've got the end of the current contractual arrangements between ICANN and the US Government in September 2015. By the end of 2015 we'll have had a review by the UN General Assembly of the WSIS.

Generally, over the next year or so, we'll be taking forward the outcomes of the Net Mundial. That's some of the key dates ahead of us. I'll pause here for a second to see if there's any comments or questions. Okay. The great thing about not talking close to the microphone is that no one hears me so no question can be asked. Two or three slides to recap on ICANN accountability, just because although there are discussions tomorrow, it's important that people are up to date and able to contribute within a timeline.

I'm not going to read everything on here, because a lot of you have heard it already, and you'll hear much more about it tomorrow. I'll mention again that the public comment on process, terms of reference

and inventory ends on 27th of June. If you wanted to respond you've got one more day to do so. I thought it would be useful to mention it again, one last time, for a final push.

On the transition from the NTIA Stewardship, a Coordination Group will be formed in the coming days. On the accountability side it will be a Working Group formed of both community members and external SMEs. There will be probably be one person in charge of Board Liaison. I think we're talking about 27 Members of that Working Group. The Working Group will coordinate very much the community [down 00:24:07].

It will be then very much driving the whole process and coming up over the coming months with effectively a blueprint for any accountability changes and evolutions that need to happen. Now, there will be quite a number of areas that people can look at within the accountability review. You can see them listed here. it goes across a wide spectrum of issues, all the way from technical operations to economics, risk management, competition issues, innovation, etcetera.

An important thing to remember is that although there is a public comment that's closing tomorrow, this is an ongoing process, so there will be as many interactions with the Working Group over the coming months, and various points at which further input and feedback will be sought. How to join the discussion, to sum it up, tomorrow we'll have this big meeting in Plenary. Sorry, I'm getting the dates wrong.

It's Friday the public comments ends. Tomorrow is the discussion, mainly from 10:30 to 12:30 for accountability, and I believe we're touching on NTIA transition again in the afternoon. I thought it would be useful to put that up there, to make sure everyone knows what

happens. We go to a lot of meetings where all this is mentioned many times, so we might not realize who hasn't already heard it.

I'll stop here for any questions on this from you, or any thoughts. There will be a Public Forum tomorrow and an opportunity to ask questions from the people actually working on this directly. Any questions?

SPEAKER:

This is not a question, more a comment. The previous slide, with the coming up events, I think it would also be really interesting to have a parallel list of perhaps more European-focused events. RIPE NCC has a RIPE meeting later this year, which will be of interest to some stakeholders in ICANN. I'm sure there are plenty of other events as well.

Things like the Studienkries, which is a focus for Europeans on ICANN issues. I think alongside this global perspective, because this is where a lot of discussions have to lead, it's important to highlight what Forums exist for discussion among European stakeholders, not just the big ICANN or global meetings.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL:

Absolutely agree. Sounds like a planted comment. Fully agree.

SPEAKER:

These were just the big-ticket dates. I could mention, for instance, the RIPE NCC Meeting in London on the 3rd to 7th of November. There's the CENTR Legal and Regulatory Workshop on the 8th of September in Oslo I believe.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL: We can discuss that later on in the program, absolutely. That’s an AI that I hope a lot of us will be happy to help with. Any other comments, suggestions...? Peter?

PETER: I don’t think we agreed this question up front, but on the accountability, the closing of the process, just to confirm – what is closing tomorrow is a public comment period on the process, not on the list of subject matters and the scope you publish right after this one. is that correct?

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL: Yes.

CHRIS CHAPLOW: I’ve just looked back, because I like to go back and reference where we are. I just noticed on the Singapore website for this meeting it still says, “Transcript to be provided,” and the deck isn’t there. If we could attend to that? Thanks.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL: Thank you very much. We will do. Thanks for raising that. Let’s move onto looking at what’s been discussed in the context of this European story. I’m quite new to ICANN. I must admit, I hadn’t heard about the European Engagement Strategy until fairly recently, and so many of you in the room will have known much more about it.

As I come to discover it I see that some of my colleagues in other regions of the world have not only been talking about their regional engagement strategy but they've already launched it. In the Middle East, Latin America and Africa, they've been going for about a year already. I think some of you are involved with them.

It's been a story for them of working with the community on the ground, try to involve them much more actively and reach out to both the community already involved in ICANN, and try to enhance the way we work within the region as ICANN stakeholders, and also reach out beyond the existing community to make sure that ICANN, as a system, is truly representative.

You've probably heard it here and there during this week, but we are getting close to three billion users. They're obviously not all in North America and Europe. We need to be better at making sure it's truly representative, and even within Europe it's quite clear that we need to be present, to have a proper European representation from business, from civil society, etcetera. I hope that this is the sort of initiative that we can all take forward together.

That's how I see it. I hope that you can all help us shape that properly. We'll move onto what's been discussed so far. I've tried to summarize some of the discussions that have happened since ICANN 47, and some of the key ideas that have emerged, in terms of the aim of engagement, a lot of input was that we need to improve the understanding of ICANN, and more widely, Internet governance, and the multistakeholder model, when we talk to European stakeholders.

That's valid for both the existing ICANN community, but also people that one might call outsiders; people who are just not knowledgeable about ICANN. Also, there's this idea about closing the gap between people who are experts or veterans of ICANN and Internet governance, and the wider public. In terms of having an engagement strategy, and why we should do this together, was that the rationale is to increase the representation of each country in the region, in the process, and increase the representation of each stakeholder group to ensure it's based on a genuine multistakeholder model.

In terms of scope, that's debatable, but it seems people thought we should think about Europe, in a sense of the wider European region of about 47 countries. I've not listed them here, because in terms of who you talk to the 47 countries are very different. What I take from that is we're talking about broad Europe, not just the EU. I'd be happy to come back to that, but that's what I saw from transcripts of previous sessions.

In terms of approaches, some of the ideas that came up were, for instance, that we should map who the actors in the region are, and what the main issues of concern are from each country. In the next couple of slides you'll see some of the stuff that's come up already. That's one of the main ideas – this mapping of actors and issues. Again, identifying cross-European issues and the existing structures that are involved.

Then coordinating and having a regular dialogue with each other, and lots of ideas around awareness raising, capacity building and joint advocacy or lobbying in some of the local and global Internet governance issues. That's my own take, having read the transcript and

seen the previous presentations of what was discussed. I wasn't actually there.

I'll stop here a moment before Andrea takes us through the online survey, trying to dig a little deeper into what stakeholders were expecting. Any comments or questions, especially from those who were here at previous sessions? Have I missed anything important? [Renetta 00:34:09]?

[RENETTA]: Yes, we have a question from a remote participant, [Marianne] of ORF: "What is the difference between ICANN European Regional At-Large and ICANN Engagement Strategy for Europe?"

WOLF LUDWIG: There are today quite a number of our ALSes here at this meeting. We are representing the user community at ICANN, and also at ICANN Europe of course, and we're one of the various stakeholder groups here at ICANN. We consider ourselves as part and component of this regional strategy, and we've discussed this yesterday at our GA, in line with this ICANN Meeting. We're discussing, on the At-Large level, a complementary European strategy for the coming years. I'd like to suggest you understand this in a complementary way.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL: Any other questions or comments? That was the answer, being that you've got the ALAC community, the At-Large Committee for Europe, and they very much stem from the user group within the ICANN

communities. There's a diagram a bit later where the various groups are shown. It's one of the constituent communities. They'll have their own plan.

The idea is that this is not replacing their plan. This is hopefully just a joint initiative where we help each other. We feed into each other's plans. We find synergies.

Any other question? Yuliya?

YULIYA MORENETS:

I want to underline – since we had the discussion and question concerning EURALO and ALSes – maybe for capacity building activities and awareness raising here, we could cooperate with ALSes, which are part of EURALO, because a number of ALSes deliver capacity building already in this field, in the field of Internet governance and related issues. I'm pretty sure they'd be happy to assist and cooperate closer. Thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL:

Thank you. Point taken. Peter?

PETER VAN ROSTE:

Peter Van Roste from CENTR. It might be on one of the further slides, but one of the things I know ccTLDs have brought up, and related communities have brought up repeatedly, is that especially in engaging with governments or other entities on a national level, it should be underlined that this happens in cooperation with the local partners.

I know this is something that's come up in previous discussions on this, so it might be fair to add it to the input so far, that there's a request to cooperate on a national level with the local partners, but at ccTLDs, the local Internet community or the ISOC Chapter, especially when targeting governments and bringing messages to governments, on Internet governance for instance, there is that cooperation. Thanks.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL:

I think I understand, and I agree. Say for instance we're thinking of doing a workshop on DNS for government officials, we may want to touch base with Nominet, the UK registry. Is that broadly the thought? At least we could coordinate or talk to each other, basically. If that's the idea, that's very much where I'm coming from.

We all have complementary objectives and we all have limited resources, so we might as well join forces. Sorry?

SPEAKER:

Your resources are not that limited, but I see your point. We're also working as partners because I think we really can reinforce each other. We all have our strengths, and having ICANN taking us up as coordinator for that engagement should be applauded and we definitely want to be part of this.

PAUL RENDEK:

I just wanted to ask, is there a listing of any areas of concentration coming up in your presentation? Issues that are common? One of the things I wanted to say was that I was quite involved with the Middle East

strategy of ICANN, and I have to say, I'm quite proud of what they produced. I was welcomed as an observer there and I did very much give the input that I could. The great thing I think about what they did – because they have a certain way of doing their thing.

I'm not suggesting we follow that here. Here in Europe we're going to do things the way we want to do them, but one thing that came out of their discussions is that they made a set of issues that they thought were important for their region. It would be great if we could identify those for Europe, because it made it very easy for my organization to pick out what I could, and equally important could not be involved with. There are some things others need to champion or get involved in.

This is where you then see the synergies of cooperation in certain areas of where people can work with ICANN. I very much am supporting what Peter has said about getting the locals involved. I can speak with the RIPE community here in saying when we go out to the national level, they very much want us to work with the national entities there in driving this, especially with government engagement. So I do support that. Thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL:

Thank you very much Paul. That was really helpful. All good. Any other points?

ANNETTE MUEHLBERG:

Thank you. Annette from EURALO. I just want to support this idea. I think the issue is the most important thing, which we're interested in, but I'd also be curious to see your slides. My proposal would be to rush

through the slides as an overview, so we get an idea of what you want to present and then we concentrate on issues.

Then my proposal is that we end this session a little earlier, because I guess all of us have to go back to the rooms and the lifts are fully packed, stopped, you have to walk ten... You know? Proposal: rush through the slides. Only comments if there are questions, and then discuss issues. Thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL: Thank you, so this is finished. Thank you very much for agreeing, and we'll propose a strategy. Thanks. Andrea, do you want to quickly go through the survey results?

ANDREA BECCALLI: Okay. I'll go quickly through the slides. Just an introduction. We thought getting as much input as possible, we'd start with a survey. I designed a survey and it was launched five months ago. It's still out, so if you want to join and click on that, and share the link... The idea of the survey was to basically have as much feedback as possible and give some guidance. Some clear results came out – first of all some existential questions for us. Do we need to do that?

The user is not [unclear 00:43:21] we need to do that. We asked that in the survey and the answer was yes, you need to do that. Then we asked what the issues are. As Paul suggested, we should concentrate on that. I tried to indicate some in the survey but also leave room for people to propose some. While I speak I'm now thinking that [unclear 00:43:44]

make a summary of the survey and circulate it, so if you want you can dive into the details.

That's the first question: "What should an ICANN European engagement strategy be about?" Let me just make another small note on that one. When I designed the entire survey I tried to channel the participants into different tracks – those who had almost little or no knowledge of ICANN, and those I call "ICANN acquainted". We had in total around 70 survey submissions.

The large majority are the people that know ICANN, but the interesting trend I notice is that the ones who are completely out of the ICANN circle skipped all the questions. I think it's a method that tells you how much we need to do in engagement. I designed the question as easy as possible, but for outreach it is there. These charts, it's a mix of the two different tracks.

Here you can see, on the focus of what we [acronymized 00:45:22] ICANN engagement strategy for Europe. First of all, the relationship with the other ISTAR organizations. We'll work more on that level. Then what should we focus on? ICANN remit? Yes, for sure, but also look at relevant EU policies and legislative issues within the region. Don't be shy and step out.

The remit one is relevant. On the ICANN remit, on the impact on the internet ecosystem, we also had some good feedback on that. On the ICANN remit, you see the chart is still there and quite relevant. Interesting feedback from this simple question, which is, "Do you feel your stakeholder group is adequately represented in ICANN?" the large majority said no. That goes across the two groups; the ones acquainted

with ICANN and the “newbies”. There is this feeling of being under-represented.

This one is, “What do we need as Europe to go ahead with a common approach and do what?” The interesting feedback is that ICANN is going through a serious, complex, structured process of ICANN globalization, the role of Europe has to emerge into that. That’s something that makes sense, and feedback on that is quite straightforward. If you go into what will be a good outcome of the strategy, the engagement of other stakeholders and under-represented countries stands up as most relevant.

Also on the success side, “How do you define success for this strategy,” it then goes back into the participation in ICANN by all stakeholders in the under-represented groups. [unclear 00:47:28] influence those positions in Europe – in this case the European Union – that can have an effort on ICANN policies, the growth of the DNS sector, and then the capacity building program here, which we actually got some good support for.

This question is to see about our outreach, and how people define themselves. You’ll see that the [unclear 00:47:59] Internet users here, what we call the At-Large structure, is the one that gives more response in the survey. The good data here is that it’s quite evenly represented. We had a good representation of the different stakeholder groups. These are some of the common issues and interests focused on the European region.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL:

To be clear, the issues on the left were issues raised in previous discussions at ICANN meetings. The ones on the right is the survey

results. Just to be clear. All the issues you see are bullet points on the left. That was discussed at ICANN 47, 48 and 49. On the right it's some of the key issues that were mentioned in the survey.

ANDREA BECCALLI: What do you want me to read? The right side? Business interest, government mandate, public... No. Wait.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL: That's just because it's an Excel pie chart. It doesn't mean it's the top one. The ones in bold are the four more important areas that were represented. I'll do this one because I've got very good eyesight, just no hair. Business interest was mentioned as one of the important things, but the biggest one is the light blue one, which is "I want to learn more about the management of the Internet domain name system".

It was interesting, the multistakeholder model – the pink one on the left. Then interest in the Internet governance debate. That's the dark blue one. That seems to be four of the key issues. We always could have improved the questions we had in the survey. This was not an exercise in identifying the issues, this was just one of many questions, so it didn't go into as much detail as one would have liked perhaps.

I think still what comes out is that it does validate that there's interest in institutional aspects; the Internet governance debate and multistakeholder model. Then there's the more day-to-day stuff about awareness raising and capacity building around the DNS. It's not that it doesn't match the list of issues on the left, it's just that it wasn't the same question.

I think that would be useful feedback, when we've finished presenting the survey, to just have your comments and maybe start on the issues themselves, if you want to just comment on the issues gain.

ANDREA BECCALLI:

There is another one. It just wraps up. What do people want to hear about ICANN? In ICANN itself there's clearly money to explain what ICANN structures and procedures are and how it works, what's the role in the Internet governance debate, and then how to participate and to understand how ICANN policy making works.

These are the most relevant objectives in the ICANN strategic plan, which is our strategic plan. It says, "Increase industry competition, lower registration abuse, [unclear 00:51:59] new gTLD. On one side we have some plans that detail and focus on the ICANN remit, but then we're also asked to enlarge our participation structure and do some great involvement and effort. Should I pass it to you?"

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL:

I'll stop for a minute and take questions.

WOLF LUDWIG:

There is some confusion among some participants here in the room about this survey and another survey, last October. In the course of the planning process of ATLAS II, the At-Large User Summit, which was held in-line with ICANN 50 here in London. Our ATLAS II survey, addressed to our member community, addressed some similar questions to your survey, and there may have even been duplications of questions.

The results of the ATLAS II survey was the basis for the agenda setting of ATLAS II. This is what some of our members present in the room referred to. I remember when you launched your survey. I think it was Nigel at the time who asked if I could circulate the link to the ICANN survey on our list, which I actually did. I have no control. I don't know how many of our members participated in your survey, but I guess there might have been quite a number of members who might have responded to it.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL:

Thank you Wolf, and thank you for directing them to this. There wasn't a huge number of respondents, about 70. I think as you saw in the distribution it was only a strong proportion that described themselves as Internet users, so I guess that would be ALAC, but it was distributed. It was a quick, snapshot survey. It was to test some of the discussions we had. It did confirm some of the underlying assumptions.

It maybe didn't go into enough detail on the issues, but at the end of the day, when I read it as a newbie, it's quite clear that people feel that there needs to be better engagement of stakeholders, including from Europe, and from the various stakeholder groups. That's a big takeaway. If you don't mind, I'll move on, because that's what I say in the next slide.

There is an interest for, on one hand, education, capacity building, and understanding of ICANN and the Internet governance ecosystem and how it works. That seems to be true across Europe. When we go into detail, we clearly need to communicate and try and engage better as

ICANN, in Europe, both with our existing community , because people who responded to the survey were mainly from the existing community.

The vast majority said they don't feel like they're properly involved. We've got a better job to do here. Also, we need to go beyond that existing community. We need to go and reach out to more people in each of the stakeholder groups across ICANN. As effectively an opening segment for a bit more of a discussion here, I think there are many people and organizations in Europe that share our interests, our objectives, and have related activities.

We've started to hear that from Wolf, from Peter, from Paul, from the RIPE side of EURALO and others. I know that Wolf tried to take me over. I was at a EURALO meeting and he's got a really nice diagram with lots of bubbles. I've got my own diagram with lots of bubbles. There you go! You can't see anything because of my formatting!

Basically, all of us are one Internet community in Europe, and all of us are registries, registrars, the business community, governments, ISOC, EURALO, ICANN, RIPE, CENTR, whatever, you name it. the point is, many of us have got very similar objectives, and many of us have at least got parallel activities. Certainly we have synergies that can be found. That's how I look at it.

I'd be very happy if someone designed a better diagram. I know Wolf designed a pretty good diagram. I got another one from Sebastian Bachollet the other day that had about 200 names on it. I will try and find a good way to do this diagram in the future, when I have time during my holidays. I'll leave it at that, with maybe a final slide. These ideas come from previous suggestions.

I think we should try and share each other's programs of activities that we're planning in Europe and seek synergies to help each other, simply. We should see how much we can share or help each other with external communications, simple things. We've got a new [EMUM 00:57:33] newsletter, which is going to be out any second actually, and I hope that maybe it'll be redistributed to the EURALO membership and vice versa. I'd be happy to flag your activities, etcetera.

I think we should think about things like that. A very important thing I'd like to discuss today, in the next few minutes – it would be good to have a quick chat about issues – if you've got things you want to flag up that you think are really important issues, or we can gel European stakeholders' pool of interests and resources. Importantly, I'd like to discuss how we can communicate.

We could have regular calls. We could certainly have face-to-face meetings at the ICANN meetings, a bit like today, but also at things like EURODIG, at the IGF, etcetera, where we can touch base and again just share each other's programs of activities and see, for instance, can Peter be a speaker in one of the ICANN events somewhere, or would it be helpful to have an ICANN presentation at a EURALO meeting? Etcetera.

We can coordinate all that, share each other's plans and basically have a joint program of activities, maybe... I head in the EURALO meeting yesterday someone talk about speakers' lists. I'd love to know who we think, in the community, is a very good speaker on this or that subject, etcetera.

There's a number of ways of working that I'd love to have input from people on. I think a lot of this exists informally. I don't want to make it

that formal either, but I think we should just have some sort of coordinated plan. An informal plan, but we are doing a lot of activities around Europe. Apart from the CENTR Board, we don't have unlimited funds. That was a joke.

We all have limited resources and we should all work together. I'll leave it at that. I'd like some comments and suggestions, both on the mapping of issues, but more importantly on ways of working. I'd just like to start. I'd like to start, as of this summer, getting things done. Any reactions, comments?

CHRIS CHAPLOW:

Just want to clarify – are we heading towards the report? Is that the aim of this? Even if it's some sort of document that the larger community can comment on? Not necessarily going to the Board or whatever, but otherwise it just seems to me it's the whole going around in circles with ideas and PowerPoints and all this sort of thing. That was my first question.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL:

That's a good point. I'd be happy for others to comment. My view is that I'd rather have, as an outcome, a shared calendar of events, and some joint planning of events. Yes, out of that we can report to the Board or others about how we engage in Europe, but my personal view is that we should action things.

Of course, that can take form on paper on how we're going to do it, but really I'm much more interested in action on the ground. That's just me

maybe. I don't know if one of us thinks... If you think a report would be useful, sure.

CHRIS CHAPLOW: Maybe the word "report" was too heavy, but at least some sort of document where everything's in one place. Give it another name, not a "work project" because this has gone around and around in circles since 47. There's an advantage to that. We can look and see what the other groups are doing, and some people over there, and come back with good ideas, I suggest.

SPEAKER: Hi there. Europe@icann.org, what mailing list is this? is that a mailing list you'd like us to subscribe to, or is that you?

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL: That's us. We could create a mailing list. This is just us to say if you want to reach us...

SPEAKER: Okay. I have a few suggestions I'd like to throw on the table to get us rolling here. First, I like your ideas here. I think that something concrete we can do is have a mailing list for those that would like to participate. What I also think would be good is that it's great to have a committee of people and everybody can bring forward their point, but I think that designing by committee would be a little difficult.

I looked at the lovely bubbles of light pastels that you put up on the other slide, and I think what you can do is probably call on each one of these groups to provide you with one or two individuals, to maybe come together and have an offsite telephone conference call, Skype call, whatever, to bring down some of these issues, clearly, from each one of those groups.

Then you can have a set that you can publish to a list, that everybody can then comment on. I think this is probably the quickest way you'll get the kind of feedback that you're looking for. Otherwise, I think designing by committee, when we only come together at a meeting, I think we'll lose a lot of time. It would be great in the in between if you had that. Then when we came to a meeting like this we could actually touch upon those issues.

Now, I know not every single issue would be able to be pointed out, and I'd imagine that at some stage it wouldn't be interesting for the RIPE NCC to get involved in some of the pieces, but these things are topical. Things come on the plate and get off the plate, so not every group would be topical at any one given time. I think we need to digest that. Then I think that once you do that you can see what kind of commitment you can get from each group, organizations or individuals from the Internet that can contribute.

SPEAKER:

Just to say that in the survey, mailing lists came out that 80% of preferences, so we're going to do that.

SPEAKER: [unclear 01:03:18] from [ABDI], a member of EURALO. Three concrete issues. One, you talk about mapping the stakeholders. There are already some good initiatives in this respect. Oksana, sitting next to you, has made a great map that she shared on the EURALO mailing list with who's who on the European level. It might not be perfect, but it's certainly perfectible, so you can work on that.

Also, there is a map of actors made by our colleagues from The Diplo Foundation. Two, on engagement of stakeholders, I'm not sure if I saw it completely, or if it wasn't on the list, but I think we need to somehow include the academia sector. There are a lot of activities going on in this respect. In a number of European countries there is a European project that also aims to talk about Internet governance, called "Mapping". There is plenty of room there.

Also, I'm not sure if you mentioned about governments, or that's part of GAC, or it needs to be separate. This is a sensitive discussion, and maybe it's not a good place to discuss it right now, but it's something that you need to look into. The third point, related to the issues, I think there will be two parts. One, our [unclear 01:04:36] related to our part of Europe, being the Council of Europe of the European Union.

There is the [unclear 01:04:47] Directive, there is the Data Protection Regulation that came up in a lot of discussions we had today on WHOIS and privacy issues. I agree that we need to think generally about what the interests are for Europe in ICANN and in our activities. We started to have this discussion among our ALSes yesterday at our GA in EURALO. We didn't have time to finish it, but I think we were going towards a direction to really support users' rights and users' interests.

When we're talking about user rights we're talking about digital civil rights. This is key to our activity, and sometimes, but not all the time, it also relates to the work that ICANN is doing. Thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL: Thank you. I've got Wolf and Jeremy. Very briefly to mention that yes, academia and governments were mentioned in the most pastel of circles.

ANNETTE MUEHLBERG: I just would like to add, on the mapping of persons – I'd like to add that we include those Europeans who are engaged in ICANN. So that we have a list of what the functions are within ICANN too, in this mapping list. That's just one thing. The other thing is I would like to support what Wolfgang said. We are very much interested, obviously, in the users' interests, but also in what other people see that might be interesting for users as registrants.

In their functions there are issues coming up, which they could give us a hint on, or we could help in other situations. For example, we had this WHOIS discussion today, and I think this is a really very severe issue in the broad sense, because it's about legal stuff, like really legal stuff. We said how can we avoid suing registries and get to the real cause, which is ICANN, so that we can comply to the laws in Europe?

I think there are a lot of issues we could discuss more in-depth on the... My English is so bad. Just that everyone has a certain knowledge of their function in the job. I think this would be interesting, to get insight and ask what they think the users' interests are. That's my wish. Thank you.

JEREMY [BILL]:

My name's Jeremy [Bill]. I rarely contribute to discussions in ICANN, because I don't represent anyone but myself. I'm just an independent consultant, but I know a number of the people here and I've been around for a long time. I wanted to intervene here just to ask a question, because something really strikes me, and that's that there's a real difference between what's being discussed here, and what's being discussed at the GAC and particularly at the high-level meeting they just had.

There, mainly European countries said that .wine and .vin were crucial issues for ICANN, and that it would make or break the ICANN multistakeholder model, and other issues to do with sensitive strings, such as geographic names. I just wonder... You just mentioned the governments were a sensitive issue, and maybe too sensitive, but if that's extreme language being used in the GAC, is that either just politician's hyperbole, and this is where the action is?

Or is it just a classic case that two communities are completely disassociated from each other? If so, isn't that something that should be thought about, and that something should be done about to bring this community, the government community, and who they're dealing with, closer together?

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL:

Thank you Jeremy. I think that's a really good question, and I think we've got a representative from the [unclear 01:09:30] region?

WOLF LUDWIG:

Well, thanks a lot for this contribution. I think what we hear at the moment at the GAC level, and the crowd of European GAC representatives, somehow demonstrates, not only today but over a couple of years, how far from user realities these people are. They have problems and concerns, which wouldn't come into my mind as a basic problem of an average European Internet user – if there is an animal like an average European Internet user.

I really believe – there may be some exceptions, and I also know some exception on the GAC – that the general output and recommendations, and the GAC communication, etcetera, which will be published tomorrow, somehow always demonstrates there is a huge gap of understanding between the different levels. I observed over a couple of years what Annette mentioned before – that from a user point of view we have many more interests and concerns in common with some business actors than with governmental representatives.

I think this is work in progress. My last remark is on an outcome, and whether we need a report or a paper. I understand this whole endeavor as a constant work in progress, because the moment you would publish a report it would most probably be outdated a year later. Therefore to have some basics and a working platform, we can share and continuously update. That in my opinion makes much more sense than just publishing a report or paper. Thanks.

SPEAKER:

I'd like to relate to one of the earlier slides with the cake diagram, which showed some of the replies of the people who were asking which issues are important for them. One of the issues was capacity building. I'm

representing a rather small organization that's mainly active on the national level. From our perspective, for example right now, the German Government has announced it will produce what they call an Internet strategy. We don't know what this will be, but in order for us to lobby our government, it's important to know what's going on internationally, and then feed that into the process.

Lobbying usually works in the way that you approach a politician and you offer a service for free for the politician, and in return he offers you some influence or at least his ear. The service I can offer, as a representative of my NGO in Germany, is to be able to collect knowledge, on an international level, and give it to him where he needs it. Now, if you support me in doing that job, I can send the right messages.

Capacity building is not only about capacity building for me. Capacity building is about putting our local people, on the national level, into a position in which they become experts, which you cannot bypass.

CHRIS CHAPLOW:

Thank you. Just to be brief, to answer the consultant gentleman at the back, my answer would be to remind the group that my understanding is that this isn't ICANN European Strategy, this is ICANN European Engagement Strategy. I think there lies the difference. Thanks.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Just a couple of reflections, if I may. First of all, on the survey, which we did following discussions on the last two ICANN sessions – the survey was a way of judging what issues to engage on. Yes, as Chris said, it was

very much that we decided some ICANN meetings back that it was essentially an engagement strategy we were engaged with here.

Secondly, on the point of the GAC, I think what became clear in earlier discussions was not so much that we should engage ourselves here on the outcome of particular issues. The .wine and the .vin is, if you like, an outcome of a particular strategy. It was that we should try and input European views into the strategic make up of particular policy issues at ICANN. If we take for instance one of the topics that came up two or three ICANN meetings ago, that was the Registry Accreditation Agreement.

Perhaps if we'd had a European engagement structure when the RAA 13 had been drawn up, that might have been very different. Of course, there's now an opportunity, if there's going to be a second round of the gTLD process, which there will be, to be able to input a European structure into that.

In the same way, the accountability review, one of the issues being looked at in the accountability view, is how the GAC is structured. If there's a particular European view there, again, that's an input into the process. Thank you.

SPEAKER:

I just wanted to thank the gentleman who pointed out that the constituencies are so far away from each other, if we are talking here about the same issues as the GAC was. For that particular issue we have to remember that there is the new Cross-Community Working Group process developed, so that might reveal some pain.

About the European case, where they're specifically discussing about .wine and .vin, I would also support the right hand side here, that's it's merely an issue of the European Union as it relates to how Europe are going to protect the trademark. In the Union there is also the outreach or external relations department, which would actually be the right place to solve these issues, not ICANN. Please let's head soon for the buses, because they're leaving soon. Thank you.

SPEAKER:

Five seconds. I'd just like to [unclear 01:17:01] what Christoph said about do count on local structures, do count on EURALO, because we know closely our ground, so take advantage of that.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL:

Thank you. I think we need to wrap up. We will set up a mailing list. I'll just say, send a note to europe@icann.org please, and you will be on a mailing list. Separately, what I'd ask from all of you, especially in the representative organizations like EURALO, ISOC, CENTR, etcetera, I'd like to take up Paul Rendek's suggestion that a small representative group of this wider group tries to have a conference call or, if not, an away day. I'd like answers by the end of next week. Thank you. That's the 4th of July.

For our independence. I want a name, or two names, for each organization, by the end of 4th of July. I want them for EURALO, for ISOC, etcetera. I'd be happy to have other volunteers, if the group doesn't get too big. Then I'll circulate a Doodle so that we can have a

first conference call around mid-July, latest, because we don't want to clash with holidays. There we'll take forward those many issues.

I was very happy to see a lot of people interested in sharing. I think in terms of outcomes, if we ended up with just a common calendar of events, and cross-promotion of each other's events, ideally starting to do more and more together in terms of organizing workshops here and there. When we advocate at national level, making sure we work hand-in-hand, or reach out with the national structures... I think there's a lot of good ideas that came out of this meeting.

I'd like this call in a couple of weeks to try and start putting this together into very short plans. Then we'll know where we're heading and what we'd like to do. I don't think we need a 30-page strategy. Maybe just a one- or- two-pager, so that we've got clear thoughts that we're all happy with. Then we can start going into more detailed issues on that.

Again, any volunteers for that follow-up call by the 4th of July. Send us your names at europe@icann.org. Any questions, any comments, anything you need generally, you can email me and Andrea at europe@icann.org I would give you my email address, except it's about 55 characters long, so just email me there. Thank you so much for the participation. Thank you. [Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]