New IP and ITU

Review, Looking Forward

Marco Hogewoning | 26 January 2021 | Roundtable for Governments

Recap New IP: Our Concerns

- System designed in a "top down" fashion

- Aimed to embed and integrate control elements

  - Inside the core of the network

  - Across the different architectural layers

- Seeking to expand ITU's remit towards the Internet

  - There never were any real attempts to propose this work at IETF

- It lacked any credible use case and problem statement

  - The technical rationale was totally flawed and non-existent in parts

  - There was no industry support, not even to acknowledge the problem

Getting The Job Done

- We managed to suppress all the proposed changes

- Incredible work by many governments and sector to push back

  - Joined contributions, showing the value of public-private cooperation

  - Making full use of all our experience and expertise on topic and process

- We got the result we wanted, but it fell somewhat short

  - The process safeguards did what they were designed to do

  - Lack of consensus exhausted all options to move forward

  - "Agree to disagree" is what eventually put a halt to it

  - There is also no agreement that we do not need such a system

Gone, but Not Forgotten

- The proponents might bring (parts) of New IP back elsewhere

    - The existing and re-affirmed study questions leave room for work items

    - Need to remain on guard to this, also in other venues

- Obviously, it left a few people very unhappy

    - The proponents didn't get what they wanted

    - A number of states probably feel we denied ITU an opportunity

- This was not a pleasant experience for anybody involved

    - Took tremendous effort and resources from all side

- Leaving reputational damage to the ITU as a whole

Looking Ahead

Concerns Remain

- It is obvious not all states and stakeholders are happy

  - Some still not accept the legitimacy of the multistakeholder model

  - Looking for ways to establish more multi-lateral forms of governance

  - Some simply feel ignored or unheard, others struggle with process

- Some technical arguments might be genuine

  - The Internet protocols aren't broken, but may have room for improvement

  - There are situations where IP or "Internet" is not the best option or forms a risk

  - We need to be open to innovations and further evolution of the protocol stack

  - There will be cases where not using IP gives better results

Standards Need a Neutral Approach

- Standardisation needs to be done based on technical arguments

  - Based on a consensus that there is a problem and a solution proven to work

- We see geopolitics entering the standardisation process

  - This is starting to become a problem and a risk to the Internet's evolution

- Don't discredit a solution only because of the proposer

  - Make sure it is in the appropriate venue and process is followed

  - Have them establish consensus on the problem statement

  - Insist they demonstrate the proposed solution is working

Standards are Essential

- To maintain a single, open and unfragmented Internet

- To maintain and support innovation and evolution

  - Make sure the Internet remains flexible

  - Allow it to change and adapt to new challenges

The Venue Leaves an Imprint

- Open standards require an open model

  - Make sure all stakeholders can participate

- Choice of venue determines the governance model

  - Setting the terms and conditions are part of the standard process

- To maintain the multistakeholder model of the Internet

  - Standardise it in under a multistakeholder model

  - Support and help the IETF in leading on Internet-related standards and protocols

Other Venues

Mixing Politics and Technology

- Increase in policy discussions focussing on specific technologies

  - Examples include DoH, DoT

  - More general as a means to reach policy objectives, e.g. content scanning

- Need to maintain a realistic view on expectations

- Not everything can be solved with technology

  - No doubt it can help and support us, but within limits

- Technology represents the values of its creator

  - Especially true with artificial intelligence, which needs to learn and be taught

Choices and Trade-Offs

- Not everybody is happy with all standardisation efforts

  - DoH and DoT are cause for concern, so was QUIC

  - General concerns regarding spread of encryption

- Internet standards and evolution are driven "bottom up"

  - It is a response to problems and concerns that have been identified

  - Based on requirements from the market and the end user

- The root cause might be elsewhere

  - Encryption is a defensive response to what people considered an "attack"

- Best to raise awareness on the impact of certain choices

Questions

marcoh@ripe.net