

IGF 2017 Reporting Template

- Session Title: Dynamic Coalition on Core Internet Values (DC-CIV)
- Date: Monday 18th December,
- Time: 9:00am (local time)
- Session Organizer: Olivier Crépin-Leblond
- Chair/Moderator: Olivier Crépin-Leblond
- Rapporteur/Notetaker: Olivier Crépin-Leblond
- List of Speakers and their institutional affiliations: Vint Cerf (Google); Matthew Shears (Internet Policy / ICANN)
- Key Issues raised (1 sentence per issue):

Freedom from Harm arose from other the other language we use, Freedom of information, Freedom of Access, Openness, Permissionless Innovation – qualities needing to be tempered because the online environment is not the safest in the world.

We should try to educate to achieve this objective of promoting systems that are safer than would otherwise be.

When we want to achieve a state of freedom from harm, we need a mix of cyber-hygiene & the right level of technical security.

- If there were presentations during the session, please provide a 1-paragraph summary for each presentation: No presentations.

- Please describe the Discussions that took place during the workshop session (3 paragraphs):

The software which makes the infrastructure is not impervious to attack. People using the network, in addition to all of the other freedoms that they have, would like to feel safe. We need to seek to achieve this, although probably not achieving perfection. We should try to educate to achieve this objective of promoting systems that are safer than would otherwise be. The political hazard in the use of the language is that organisations and governments who wish to control the way in which the Internet is used, may use “Freedom From Harm” phrase to justify a variety of oppressive methods to prohibit the use of the network. We should be very careful about the slogans we use.

Assuming that Stability, Security & Resilience go hand in hand when talking about the network, we tend to interpret “secure” in absence of the other values. We need to be very careful when inserting that Core Value, into making sure it doesn’t get taken in isolation.

But end users want the cheapest IOT as possible. Why more security if the cost is higher? If the cost is higher then it might fail in the market by being over expensive. Thus devices that are sold could be tested for a minimum level of safety or security. In US there is the “underwriter’s laboratory” for electrical safety - something similar might be created for software security.

- Please describe any Participant suggestions regarding the way forward/ potential next steps /key takeaways (3 paragraphs):

Follow-up discussion on the mailing list on:

- Freedom from Harm concept
 - Core Internet Values Observatory – which there was support for
 - Building a Scorecard
 - Use technology like WIKIPEDIA to start it off
 - Year on Year review of Core Internet Values

Reach out to:

- Other DCs
 - DC Internet of Things
 - DC Internet Rights and Principles
 - DC Network Neutrality
 - DC Platform Responsibility
- Other organisations that are working on the topic of Core Internet Values
 - Internet Society (Trust)
 - ICANN (Health of the Internet – related to DNS health in ICANN context)
 - Other organisations and researchers
 - Youth organisations

Gender Reporting

- Estimate the overall number of the participants present at the session: 30

- Estimate the overall number of women present at the session: 10

- To what extent did the session discuss gender equality and/or women's empowerment? N/A

- If the session addressed issues related to gender equality and/or women's empowerment, please provide a brief summary of the discussion: N/A