

## IGF 2016 Workshop Report Template

Session Title	Dynamic Coalition on Core Internet Values (DC-CIV) meeting
Date	Tuesday 6 December 2017 (Day 1)
Time	9:00am
Session Organizer	Dynamic Coalition on Core Internet Values
Chair/Moderator	Olivier Crépin-Leblond [OCL]
Rapporteur/Notetaker	Alejandro Pisanty [AP]
List of Speakers and their institutional affiliations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vint Cerf - Chief Internet Evangelist Google [VC]</li> <li>- Maarten Botterman - Chair of DC Internet of Things [MB]</li> <li>- Alejandro Pisanty - UNAM Mexico [AP]</li> <li>- Lise Fuhr - Director General ETNO [LF]</li> <li>- Marianne Franklin - DC Internet Rights and Principles [MF]</li> </ul>
Key Issues raised (1 sentence per issue):	<p>[VC]: The Internet needs to become a much safer place and the people that designed it did not foresee misuse of devices . Malware is a technical challenge and there is difficulty in applying software updates across the network, especially for the Internet of Things ("IoT").</p> <p>Proposal for a new Core Value for the Internet: Freedom from Harm ("FFH"), which should drive the technical community's work in the coming years.</p> <p>[MB] : One way to face these risks, and adding to the principle proposed, is to introduce/increase transparency and accountability for all responsible players, such as device manufacturers, regulators in charge of approving the sale of devices, software developers, etc.</p> <p>[AP]:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Freedom from Harm, stated generally, is traditionally a function of the State, part of the fundamental bargain of the social contract in most countries.</li> <li>2. The definitions of harm, freedom and safety may not be sharp enough and may vary widely across countries, cultures, and other social groups.</li> <li>3. Implementation issues must be sorted out; e.g., would the IETF add a section on FFH considerations to</li> </ol>

	<p>RFCs? How would other standards-development organizations (SDOs) treat the principle?</p> <p>4. The “locus” of regulation and certification must be determined.</p> <p>5. Scaling, especially across borders, may be difficult to achieve. Undue state and intergovernmental organization (IGO) involvement may be predicated as a solution. If the principle is not applied consistently in a large scale, havens of non-compliance will continue to produce harm.</p> <p>6. Is there an “Internet way” to approach this problem? A multistakeholder, Internet-proper mechanism such as the IETF or ICANN in their respective fields?</p> <p>[LF]: There is a risk of more “walled gardens” based on the promise of offering FFH. Interoperability may suffer if the principle is not applied with it in mind - it is key to successfully tackle FFH openly. Work already being done against attacks (prevention, mitigation, isolation, response, etc.) should be considered. A careful development is required to avoid creating new opportunities for issues that would be harmful in turn.</p> <p>[MF]: The issue is societal/political more than it is technical, though of course it has technical manifestations and the trouble with some technical solutions is that they overestimate the power of the technical fix. The accountability of technical standards-makers must be clearer. (this was somehow mitigated by [VC] who recommended concentrating on a three pronged approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Technical means to inhibit harm</li> <li>2. Detect harm and act against its source, e.g. legal means, prosecution.</li> <li>3. Moral persuasion: put pressure on programmers and others responsible for products which can be harmful )</li> </ol>
<p>If there were presentations during the session, please provide a 1-paragraph summary for each Presentation</p>	<p>A brief presentation was made by the moderator [OCL], outlining the Dynamic Coalition’s substantive paper, summarising this year’s developments on the Global, Interoperable, Open, Decentralized, End-to-End, User-Centric, Robust and Reliable Core Internet Values.</p>

<p>Please describe the Discussions that took place during the workshop session: (3 paragraphs)</p>	<p>After the panellist made their points, participants responded and a sustained discussion took place.</p> <p>Matthew Shears: consider FFH in the context of the general principle “do no harm” - applicable to all Core Internet Values. There is the need to understand Internet design, net-neutrality, as well as open Internet.</p> <p>Tatiana Tropina: Responsibility and accountability are key but who is going to enforce them? Self enforcement? It cannot be assumed simply that consumers will prefer to buy “safe” products. Regulation is not the right tool.</p> <p>[VC]: Example from solutions in other fields: certification of electrical devices in the US through Underwriters Laboratories (UL) thus a “cyber-UL” could be developed to certify the safety of Internet devices and systems and could operate with partial automation, based on voluntary submissions.</p> <p>John Klensin: Safety standards are mostly predicated within a context of national laws. A principle like “thou shall not develop bad code” isn’t working well. Bad systems are being used because they are novel, useful and exciting, with pressure on time-to-market causing some to cut edges.</p> <p>Tatiana Tropina: a new central “layer” or center of control must not be created.</p> <p>Juan Hernandez: There should be no single overarching system. Governments have to take responsibility, e.g. for public safety.</p> <p>Joly McFie (remote): Prefer Core Values like general, broad commandments. Values are different from standards.</p>
<p>Please describe any Participant suggestions regarding the way forward/ potential next steps /key takeaways: (3 paragraphs)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adopt a discussion of this proposal (FFH) as a work programme and collaborate with other groups to address them - including DC Internet of Things (Dc-IoT) and DC Internet Rights and Principles (DC-IRP)</li> <li>2. Technical considerations cannot be ignored in discussing safety standards.</li> <li>3. Focus the DC on CIV to concentrate more on the technical design principle than on the higher</li> </ol>

layer rights and values, which are much less well-defined, and universally variable.

4. Discussion points should be sent out to the mailing list, perhaps in a small publication. Further discussion is needed throughout the year to reach a common conclusion, and then a work programme designed for the coalition.

A good starting point: There should be no overarching system and industry self-certification might be a solution moving forward.