Japan IGF Bimonthly Event: July 2017

Date and Time : Thu 13th July 2017 18:00-20:00 JST
Venue : JPNIC office meeting room, Tokyo, Japan
Participants : 29 onsite, 6 online

Survey: 14 responses
- Gender: Male 24%, Female 71%, No Response 5%
- Stakeholders: Internet operations related 38%, Business 9%, Government14%, Internet Users 10%, Academia 24%, Others 5%
- Satisfaction : Satisfied 13.5%, Generally Satisfied 50.0%, Average 25.0%, Slightly Unsatisfied 6.3%, Unsatisfied 6.3%, No Response 0%

Program:

1. Activities and Initiative by I* Organisations in Internet Governance Arena
   - APNIC/RIRs : Izumi Okutani (JPNIC/APNIC Executive Council), Paul Wilson (APNIC Director General - video)
   - APTLD : Hiro Hotta (JPRS), Leonid Todorov (APTLD General manager – video)
   - ICANN : Akinori Maemura (JPNIC/ICANN Board)
   - W3C : Hirotaka Nakajima (Keio University)
   - ISOC/IAB/IETF: Hiroshi Esaki (Tokyo University/ISOC Board), Konstantinos Komaitis (ISOC, Director of Policy Development - video)
2. Update on Internet Governance Forum (IGF) 2017
   - Kenta Mochizuki (Yahoo Japan Corporation/IGF2017 MAG member)
3. AOB: Japan IGF Update
   - Preparation for NRI sessions in IGF2017
     Izumi Okutani (Japan IGF Coordinator)

Next Meeting: 28th September 2017

Summary:

IGCJ20 focused on sharing how I* Organisations, which are often recognized from their technical activities, engage in the Internet Governance arena. Key participants from Japan in respective communities share their observations, followed by discussions among the panelists on the following questions:

- Observations on activities of other I* Organisations (by panelists)

- Differences in multistakeholder approach by each I* Organisation
- Discussions on Collaboration
- Any challenges with budget/capacity building

The meeting also covered key updates from IGF2017 by a MAG member from Japan, as well as Japan IGF Coordinator consulted participants on themes to suggest for NRI sessions in IGF2017.

Additional details:

- Observations on activities of other I* Organisations (by panelists)
  - Commonality across I* Organisations are support for multilstakeholder approach
  - APTLD
    - Does not develop policies itself.
    - However, members are ccTLDs, which develop and/or adopt policies for its respective ccTLD registries. Approach of policy development and adoption varies by ccTLDs.
  - W3C
    - Focused on technical standard development.
    - Non-technical considerations are needed for some topics: Encrypted Media Extensions (EME) and Digital Rights Management (DRM).
  - ISOC
    - Consists of Chapters and Organisational Members. Chapters has a variety of background and key stakeholders vary by Chapter.

- Differences in Multistakeholder Approach
  - ICANN
    - It has been explicit about Multkstakeholder approach from its establishment. gTLD policies are developed based on multistakeholder approach (domain names sellers, commercial users, non-commercial users)
  - RIRs
    - They have open and inclusive process where anyone can participate, including businesses and governments, not limited to technical participants
  - APTLD

- ✧ Its members, which are ccTLD registries are from a variety of backgrounds, such as government, academia, private sector, non-profit technical organization, and one may say that they are mulstakeholder as a group.

➢ W3C

- ✧ It is a membership organization but there are public mailing lists for anyone to join and have discussions. There is another organization which W3C is involved in versioning called Web Hypertext Application Technology Working Group (WHATSWG), and this has open participation. They develop the latest HTML versions.

➢ IETF

- ✧ It tolerates individual participation than organizational participation. As individuals vary, it will naturally be mulitistakeholder.
- ✧ It is also important to be market oriented. In order to be market oriented, consensus is needed to adapt to changes rather than voting. Therefore, its multistakeholder approach is to maintain a certain level of flexibility and looseness rather than to define and be fix in a particular direction, at the same time maintain and move forward based on consensus.
- ✧ IETF has initiatives to invite governments. Open participation does not always naturally lead to participants from different backgrounds. Sometimes, proactive engagement is needed

● Discussions on Collaboration

➢ In security area, cross community collaboration is important, in addition to taking multistakeholder approach in respective communities.

- ✧ For example: strengthening encryption at protocol level may cause challenges for law enforcement agencies. Discussions are needed from different standpoints.
- ✧ WHOIS accuracy and improvements discussed in both ICANN and RIR communities. Would it be the best to keep the discussions totally independent or some level of information sharing?
- ✧ RIRs are sharing challenges with CGN for law enforcement agencies and ISPs, in keeping the log to identify a user in case of malicious activities, due to shared IP address.
- ✧ There are discussions on TAG finding for https. There has not be clear

coordination between IETF and W3C, other than the liaisons brought the discussions and decision was based on trend.

- Asia and Europe
  - To some extent, European regulators need to negotiate with CENTR, as an association for ccTLD registries in Europe when they want to develop any policies. ccTLD registries in Europe hire legal experts and speculate what regulations may come up.
  - On the other hand, Asian ccTLD registries are not in that situation. They adapt to regulations once adopted but do not take proactive moves beforehand in general.

- Any challenges with budget/capacity building
  - APNIC
    - No financial issues with operating based on membership fees
    - More work needed in capacity building. It would be good to collaborate with other organisations in security area for capacity building, such as APCERT, JPCERT.
  - APTLD
    - No large monetary transactions
    - APNIC supports APTLD in trainings
    - Developed countries support developing countries in capacity building, knowledge sharing and financially. Challenge is not all ccTLDs move in the same direction, despite acknowledging it is important to coordinate and help each other
  - W3C
    - Capacity building is a challenge
    - W3C is not an organisation. It is like a project which hosts from each region exchange co-research contract. Therefore, overhead is big.
    - It is a challenge to spread those who are involved in the Web, and to identify a form to sustain the activity, to improve the Web.
  - IETF/ISOC
    - Developing sustainable financial structure is a long term issue. At the same time, independence is important, and it is a delicate balance.
    - Human resources are not sufficient everywhere, and it is important to educate the next generation, those who can do the actual work, i.e. those who will make networks.

- ICANN
  - No financial issues for ICANN
  - Complexity and long process of policy discussions are issues to be addressed.

- Wrap Up
  - It is important to coordinate with various stakeholders, especially in security area. As APNIC community, it is important to identify the area to be able contributes to such issue. Based on understanding your strength and expertise, look for other partners such as CERTs, governments and other stakeholders to work with. It would be good to see enhancement of multistakeholder approach as a whole for a certain issue, by different organisations working in its own area of expertise and collaborate where needed.
  - It is the people, which is the key for collaboration. Things move based on who is there and based on trust.
  - Nurturing the next generation is the challenge which needs to be addressed. Sustainability even with change in staff is important.
  - How to make colleagues are important, with younger generations, and across different areas. Treat young generations as collaborators.
  - Technical communities collaborate well especially in international governmental discussions. We need to work together to maintain echo system for the global Internet.