
SINGAPORE – IANA Accountability Transition
Monday, March 24, 2014 – 10:30 to 12:30
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

>> Ladies and gentlemen, if you would be kind enough, once again, to take your seats, we'll be starting our program very shortly.

Once again, find a seat for our program and we will be able to begin.

Once again, ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats. We are going to begin our program very shortly. Thank you.

Once again, if all of you would be kind enough to take your seats, I'd like to be able to begin this session.

Once again, ladies and gentlemen, if you would be kind enough to take your seats, all of you standing in the aisle in the middle of the room, we would appreciate it, so that we can get this meeting started.

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome ICANN board chair, Dr. Stephen Crocker.

[Applause]

STEVE CROCKER: Welcome again. I'm holding in my hand a press release: "NTIA announces intent to transition key Internet domain name functions."

Thank you, again, Larry.

[Applause]

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.

All right. We're going to get down to business here. We've covered the basic elements, and now we're going to get down and focus.

More than 15 years ago, the United States government chartered a course to give to the world possession of the most remarkable invention of modern time, recognizing the Internet was of the people, by the people, and for the people. And it chose ICANN, now, to oversee that transition.

It's been a singular honor for me -- and as these things often are, driven mostly by accidents of time and place -- that I got to play a small role in the development of the Internet.

So now I'm chairman of the board of directors of ICANN, not a course I would ever have thought of or plotted myself, and I've never been more proud of what this community has accomplished.

The announcement from NTIA is viewed by many as a surprise. Those of us who have been involved know how much hard work over what a fairly long period of time it took to reach that point. And as important as the announcement is, it's not a final point; it is an important midpoint, if you will, in our course, and we have work to do, very substantial work, and it starts now.

We begin the consultation process to develop mechanisms for the transition of a set of important technical functions, the IANA functions, the Internet's technical identifiers, specifically the top-level domains of the domain name system, IP addresses, and the protocol parameter registries.



And from the U.S. government's announcement of March 14th, we have developed a set of principles to guide us in our consultations.

There should be some slides up here now.

Yes.

Transition process facilitated by ICANN that is globally inclusive and collaborative, as is everything that we try to do in the Internet environment.

With a set of accountability mechanisms that provides transparency to all stakeholders globally.

Are administered in a manner that is not governmental-led or intergovernmental but, it must be said, does not exclude governments either.

That support and enhance the bottom-up consensus-based multistakeholder model.

That maintains DNS security, stability, and resiliency.

That meets the needs and expectations of global customers and partners and develops mechanisms to maintain openness of the Internet.

With the swiftness by which the U.S. government's announcement was made, I realize most of you probably have not had a chance to discuss this action within your respective communities. Clearly, that has to happen. And recognizing the diversity of the various community processes, we will need to link them together as we move ahead.



So at this time, I'd like to recognize our community leaders who are involved in facilitating these -- their processes.

The community leaders that are tasked with this responsibility are all here and I'd like them to stand as I call your names. Louie Lee, Address Supporting Organization.

Byron Holland, ccNSO.

Jonathan Robinson, GNSO.

Heather Dryden, Governmental Advisory Committee.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond, ALAC.

Lars Liman, Root-Server System Advisory Committee.

Adiel Akplogan, NRO and head of AfriNIC.

Peter Van Roste, CENTR.

Paulos Nyirenda, AFTLD.

Carolina Aguerre, LACTLD.

Don Hollander, APTLD.

John Curran, ARIN.

Paul Wilson, APNIC.

Raul Echeberria, LACNIC.

Alex Pawlik, RIPE NCC.

Russ Housley, IAB.



Jari Arkko, IETF.

Kathy Brown, Internet Society.

Pat Kane, VeriSign.

And Fadi Chehade, actually, ICANN.

[Laughter]

[Applause]

Let me add a word. I've had the pleasure of working with almost all of the people I've just named, and getting to know them personally. This is a stellar crowd.

This is a committed, dedicated, knowledgeable -- deeply knowledgeable set of people, a very fit set of leaders for us, selfless and experienced in working with the communities that they lead and with each other. This is a fortunate situation.

And I want to offer thanks that as a group, as a community, that we have grown, and not only grown as a community, but that we have nurtured and grown leaders among us that will help carry us forward.

So having made those introductions and now set the stage here for the beginnings of consultations that need to take place -- and these consultations are important because it's relatively easy, one might imagine, for a small number of people to go into a room and say, "Okay, well, let's just sketch out what the next steps are." Any one of us might be able to do it. I don't know that the answers would look anything like



each other. But it is that comparison of ideas and the consultation that is all important, and so it begins now.

This session will be led by Theresa Swinehart, ICANN's senior advisor on strategy. She's the point person for us, for the ICANN staff, on the transition process, but of course emphasizing yet again this is a community-led process.

Theresa?

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you very much.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you. So we're ready.

So first, we had all the names who stood. We have an entire room full of people. This is absolutely amazing.

The -- for me, on a personal level, this is actually quite a remarkable moment. My first ICANN meeting was the ICANN meeting in 1999 in Singapore, so the opportunity -- as others in this room who may have been there or been at other meetings leading up to this -- to see where ICANN was at that stage, how it evolved, how it grew, how its processes were put into place, how it became more global and accountable, and to be here today for the launch of this event is really quite a moving



experience but also quite an opportunity and a challenge for the work we have ahead.

So with that, a few housekeeping items.

The session flow, we had Steve with the opening.

We will have Fadi and some of the community leaders who are facilitators to their community look at an introduction of the scope. What is this about. The work.

We'll then have a conversation, a public consultation, on what are the elements that are going to be necessary for a really good process.

Then we'll have a conclusion.

We do have remote participation, so we'll be taking that, when we start that session.

We're also going to have an email address that will be open until the 27th for people who want to provide input during that phase.

And of course we have dialogues this week and then we have the public forum session later in the week, where we hope also to get some feedback.

So with that, I want to invite the community leaders who are the facilitators for their communities affected by the IANA function to the stage.

And what I do want to reiterate -- and Steve had mentioned this at the beginning -- is we certainly appreciate that everybody has not had the opportunity to talk about these issues with their communities and so



this is an opportunity to sort of set the scene, but we certainly appreciate that this is the beginning of a process.

So with that, could I ask Byron, Jonathan, Heather, Louie Lee, Adiel, Russ, Jari, Pat Kane, and Fadi to come up to the stage.

Thank you.

And I will ask Elise to come to the stage and she'll do just a very brief overview of IANA for us and then we will head it off to the next part of the conversation.

ELISE GERICH: Hi.

THERESA SWINEHART: Hi. Thanks so much, Elise.

ELISE GERICH: Thanks. This is really an exciting moment, especially for the IANA department, and we're really excited that this panel is going to kick off the IANA transition steward- -- IANA steward- -- I wish I could speak better -- the IANA stewardship transition process.

And earlier today, Fadi showed a picture of Jon Postel, and, you know, I have the privilege of running the IANA department. At that time, Jon, as Fadi said, had one little index card. Well, I'm lucky to have the support of 10 really, really good people in the IANA department.



And on the wall behind me, I think you see the three IANA functions, and we do have subject matter experts who are well-known to most of the community.

Kim Davies is sitting up front. He's our subject matter expert for TLDs and root zone management.

Michelle Cotton is our liaison to the IETF and the IAB, and she's home taking care of all the stuff we have to do for them all the time.

And Leo Vegoda has been our liaison to the regional Internet registries, and he's happily given away all the IPv4 addresses to them and so now they're the ones that get all the questions about IPv4, but we still have autonomous system numbers and IPv6 numbers.

But I just wanted to let you know that we have a really great department and we're looking forward to following and seeing all the things that come out of this consultation process.

And if you'll go to the next slide, you'll see that already, we do a lot of things that we report to the community.

Because the IANA functions process is open and transparent, all the registries that we maintain on behalf of the regional Internet registries, the IAB and the IETF and the TLDs of the world are all available, the activities that we do on their behalf.

So I just wanted to thank you all for showing up to help in this transition process, the transition of stewardship, and for offering your opinions in this public consultation.

I'll now turn the stage over to Fadi. Thank you.



FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you, Elise.

[Applause]

Thank you. Okay. So we launch the process to design the process.

This morning, we're together so we can agree on the process, not on the substance of the transition. That will be done later, as we get into these discussions together.

But first, we need to agree how to do this in a multistakeholder way together.

But I must start by recognizing my colleagues. Every one of the people on the stage knows that the last few months of discussions of ideas around how we would start this day have been very fruitful. Every one of them has brought enormous value to the debate and the discussion, and they're extremely knowledgeable.

VeriSign and ICANN and NTIA have worked for years to ensure the security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS and the registries, and I thank VeriSign for that service that they did because this is, indeed, a community service that VeriSign does for all of us. Thank you.

And of course next to him right there are the technical community representatives, the facilitators who will help us communicate with the technical community.



Both Jari and Russ have been truly good guides for me so that I understand their role and the role of the rest of the community. And they have a very distinct and important role.

They provide us the specifications and the policies upon which we build these registries.

These are their specifications and their policies, not ours.

We implement them, hopefully faithfully, and today we will start talking how we ensure the stewardship of our implementation of their policies and their specifications.

Thank you both for being here.

Next to them is Louie Lee. Louie will be recognizable in any ICANN meeting because of his hat --

[Laughter]

-- and he has always -- always been very helpful in reminding me that the second "N" in "ICANN" is numbers. So ICANN is not just about names, even though some days it seems this way, but Louie has been a very faithful reminder for me that we need to pay attention to the names, and he is responsible for the ASO, one of our very key supporting organizations. Thank you for being here.

And next to him is Adiel, a good friend from Africa. He is the CEO of AfriNIC, but also very importantly he is the current president of the NRO, which is essentially the grouping of all the five RIRs. How they work together is through the NRO. And it is because of this that he's on stage and he brings an incredibly important perspective on the numbers



side because ICANN -- ICANN's IANA department also is responsible for the numbers registry.

Once again, the policies related to numbers are done by the registries, okay? So we are performing their global functions. They produce the policies. We perform.

So we are, in a way, at their service, just as we are at the service of the IETF community.

Next to him is Heather Dryden, the chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee, the GAC. She brings with her an important view of governments on how we manage especially the naming area, but also all the areas that ICANN is responsible for, and her voice and her contribution here is going to be very important because as we move to a new era where the U.S. government is not the steward of what we do, governments need to know what part they will -- what role they will play in the new stewardship model, and we need them to be there.

So even if I said earlier today it -- we cannot transfer the stewardship of the U.S. government to a government or an intergovernmental organization, that does not exclude governments. Governments are stakeholders and they need to be here and they need to have an important voice, so we welcome Heather to the group as well.

And of course to the left of Heather are our community leaders, Jonathan Robinson for the GNSO, our supporting organization responsible for the policies of ICANN.

In the same way, we implement the policies of the IETF and the specifications that come from them and from the RIRs, we also



implement the policies that come from the GNSO. The GNSO is the policy body of ICANN, and from them, from Jonathan's groups and stakeholders, we receive the policies to drive our work on the generic domains.

And to his left is Byron Holland, the head of our ccNSO, which is the supporting organization which brings together the ccTLD community. He is here representing only the ccNSO, and I would like to recognize that there are many ccTLDs in the world who are not part of the ccNSO but they are part of this consultation. We need to reach all of them. And one does not need to be part of an ICANN community to participate in consultation.

You noticed one of the four key principles from NTIA for successful transition is that all customers, all people affected by our work need to be part of that process. No one shall be excluded, and they do not need to be necessarily engaged in ICANN, although we welcome them and they are all part of our community.

Okay. So with this introduction, I would like to explain to you a little bit how we understand the scope of this transition. So I will show you a slide that hopefully will explain some of that.

So, first of all, let me explain that there are in the IANA functions four key areas that we are responsible to coordinate. The first is the protocol parameters. The second is the general purpose I.P. addresses. The third are the generic domain names and, lastly, the country code domain names.



Now, whilst this is not the scope of what we're doing in this transition, this next column is just to give you an understanding that the policies and the specifications that IANA implements for these four areas, especially the global policies, not the regional or local policies, come from these groups.

So the IETF represented by Jari here is the body that provides us the IANA policies and specifications for protocol parameters. Whilst the ASO, Louie Lee, is the group that then gives us the policies related to I.P. addresses globally. The GNSO, represented here by Jonathan Robinson, gives us the policies for the generic domain names. And, finally, it is the ccNSO and the ccTLDs that together provide us the policies that we need at a global level for the country code domain names.

Now, once they give us these specifications and policies, the IANA department, whose head you just met, Elise, implements these. They operate the registries for these, which are tables. Sounds simple but they are the heart of the technical and logical layer of the Internet, and they are extremely important.

Now, let me explain a little bit how we implement these. First, there is an operational aspect to these; and then, second, there is an accountability aspect to these. So if Jari gave me a new specification for protocol parameters, I would operationally implement it in the IANA department and then there is an accountability function that ensures we do it. Let me show you who occupies these boxes.

So the operation of the registries for protocol parameters and I.P. addresses, the general purpose I.P. addresses, is done by ICANN. And then the operation for the generic domain names and the country code



domain names is done by ICANN, VeriSign and, of course, the root operators. And today this is done via a contract that ICANN has with NTIA and a separate contract that VeriSign has with NTIA. That's how it's done today.

Of course, as we transition into the new mode, then the relationship of NTIA with ourselves and with VeriSign as it relates to root zone management is part of what NTIA announced on their Web site, that they plan to sunset and move beyond that, so the unique involvement of the U.S. government through NTIA in the root zone management.

By the way, when I say the term "root zone management," that's essentially this -- I don't have a pointer, but it is the box that says "ICANN/VeriSign/root zone operators." That's the registry for names, otherwise known as the root zone area.

So the management of that area and the involvement of the U.S. in that area from an administrator standpoint, that is going to also go away; but more importantly it is the accountability.

So let's talk about the accountability because the world needs to know when we perform these functions based on the good policies and specifications that these folks give us, that we are performing them according to policy and we're performing them with the very important principles of accountability and transparency and giving that legitimacy to the world for the functions we do.

So today who does this? Let me start with the protocol parameters. IAB and the U.S. government are the parties that legally are responsible



and practically responsible today for the accountability of our work on the protocol parameter registry.

The regional Internet registries represented here through Adiel's role as the NRO leader as well as the USG are responsible to ensure that ICANN performs its functions in the area of I.P. addresses.

Now, when we go to the names or the root zone management area for the generic names, generic names like dot com, dot org et cetera, and all the hundreds of new ones we are rolling out as we speak, it is the gTLD registries who, believe me, keep a good eye on us, the GNSO represented here by Jonathan, the GAC -- pardon me, the USG. Together these provide accountability and visibility on what we do.

And, lastly, on the names on the ccTLDs and the country code domain names, the ccTLDs, the ccNSO, the GAC and the United States government perform accountability functions on us.

And in a moment when my colleagues will speak, I will invite them to explain how their community and their membership participates in these particular accountability activities.

Now, this is the change that we need your help with. This is what the public consultation is about. As we move forward with the USG no longer in these boxes, who is going to perform the accountability functions? Now, here let me be extremely clear. The U.S. government has not said that these accountability functions must be replaced, replace their role with a new institution. They were very specific that we hope the community will benefit from its multistakeholder heritage, from what worked today, and establish mechanisms of review, of audit,



of escalation that the community's comfortable with to replace the role of the U.S. government.

So we are looking for multistakeholder mechanisms in each of these boxes. Now, I want to be clear again that these mechanisms, when we start designing them, not today, after the process is in place, do not need to be necessarily new things. They could be existing mechanisms. So anytime you're asked to put something in a box, I think the first wise thing to do is to say: What is there now? Is it working? Does it meet the requirements of the community? And if not, let's enhance it, let's strengthen it. But first let's learn what's there and then strengthen it, as appropriate.

What is important is that we all end up with a mechanism that is solid, that has visibility, that satisfies the global community, and that is rooted in the multistakeholder approach that has worked extremely well for us to date.

So the public consultation is to fill these green boxes. That's what we're doing. Today we're not discussing what's in the green boxes. Today we're discussing the process by which we're going to come together to actually fill these green boxes.

Now, there are some fundamental consultation guiding principles that have been handed to us from the community and from the United States government announcement. I'm just going to go over them quickly.

Number one, we are just a facilitator, ICANN. We are not the decider. We have a community and many other communities to bring together.



We convene. We engage. We facilitate. We are not running this from a leadership top-down standpoint. And that's an agreement we made with our fellow communities, and I share it with all of you as our ICANN community. We are one of many. We should participate with everyone on an equal footing in this discussion.

Number two, the U.S. government is not looking for us to go create new institutions, as some people are reporting, nor do we think this is necessarily the right way to go. We believe that mechanisms that are rooted in the multistakeholder model should work. And, once again, before we rush to create new things, let's review what's there today because it may be at least adequate, maybe it needs to be strengthened, maybe not. Let's be calm and wise about how we go about this process.

The third bullet deals with the transparency issue. We are not going to develop these mechanisms in closed doors. These mechanisms must be developed with transparency. And once they're in place, they should be mechanisms full of transparency so that everyone, governments, private sector, civil society, everyone, every interested party, should have full visibility and transparency to how we do these functions and how we ensure that they meet the policies handed to us.

I've mentioned this three times before, so I think it's enough, but that next bullet emphasizes again how we will not succeed. We kind of know the answer to this question in the final discussions with NTIA when we are ready with that plan. Let's make sure we remember that as we go through this. We will not come back with a successful transition plan to NTIA if that transition plan to them is a plan that is



governmental-based or has a group of governments replacing the U.S. stewardship. We have to come back to them with a truly multistakeholder mechanism.

Accountability must support and enhance the bottom-up model. Accountability mechanism must maintain the DNS security, stability. We will not do anything to jeopardize that. And this is why I'm very glad that VeriSign is with us and is participating in that plan. We are partners, and we need to make sure we maintain this partnership to give the community the absolute assurance that nothing here will jeopardize the stability.

The accountability mechanism must meet the needs of the global customers and partners, not any one particular group. And, finally, they must keep the Internet open.

So before I ask my fellow facilitators to chime in a little bit, I want to say one thing. There is no deadline per se. Yes, we understand that the U.S. government's contract with ICANN may be -- may need to be renewed in September 2015.

But we should do this well and do it with all the time we need to do it properly. So for those of us who are feeling rushed or feeling we don't know if we'll get there, let's figure it out. We have several months here to gather together to put a process. And if we're not ready on the last day of September 2015, there is no guillotine or anything that will fall on us. We can continue working and figuring out how to advance together. Our partners in the U.S. government and NTIA certainly want the security and the stability of the Internet as well as much as we do.



So let's try and aim for some deadlines together, and that's part of the process that we will gain, not today, when the process starts. But let's also know that there is no absolute deadline. It is in our hands as a community. What's important is to come back with a proposal that meets these important guidelines.

With this, I'm going to ask my colleagues -- and we'll start with Byron there -- to just share with us -- Please one second, Sebastien. If we just allow the panelists to just each a minute.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I really would like to know if the multistakeholder is without end user. Thank you very much.

FADI CHEHADE: No one heard what Sebastien said. Sebastien is a member of the board, so I will repeat what he said. He was saying the panel does not include users. The user community is not represented. End users, pardon me, end users. We're all end users.

[Applause]

Every one of us is an end user, Sebastien, in a way. So I hope that helps a little bit.

But the reason these individuals were chosen is if we please -- I'll go back. If you look at this slide, these are the individuals whose communities are represented on this graphic. So this is -- this is why we ask them to be there. Of course, there are other communities we still need to go to and bring into the process. But this was intended so we



can focus on the current players in that grid and the organizations on that grid are the organizations here.

But I want to assure Sebastien and any other community member in ICANN or outside of ICANN that this process is open. Everyone is welcome. All we're doing is engaging in a dialogue, and the dialogue starts today. No one will be excluded, period. No country. No user. No group. Anyone that is concerned with the Internet and the accountability of the IANA functions performed by ICANN and its partners is welcome to this process. Okay?

So with this, I'm going to ask Byron. Byron, why don't you share with us a little bit how does your community engage in these processes, within your community and with the rest of the communities? And then we'll come down the line quickly. If you keep your comments short, that will be great so we can engage everyone after that. Please go ahead.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Sure, thank you, Fadi. First I just want to take a moment to say thank you to Larry Strickling and Fiona Alexander to have the intestinal fortitude and the vision to actually take this critical step. And I just want to -- I think we should all make note of that, and I certainly want to do it.

[Applause]

As one of the primary customers of the IANA function, as you can imagine, this transition issue is very near and dear to my community's heart. And given it's Monday morning, I hope you can also appreciate that we haven't really had a chance as a community yet to talk about



this issue. But, generally speaking, my sense from the community is that we're very excited about it and optimistic about this evolution.

The ccNSO, which I'm the chair of, is only one of the actors in the ccTLD community. And that's already been mentioned, but I think it bears repeating. There are 149 CCs inside the ccNSO, but there are still a significant number that are not part of our ccNSO community but a part of the regional organizations or the broader ccTLD community. And they're all also customers of IANA and need to be part of this dialogue, and will be part of this dialogue.

But within the ccNSO, we have a number of processes by which we try to work through or wrestle down challenging issues of which I'm sure this will be one. So we have -- I mean, we have study groups with a clear process for how they work. We have working groups. We've done fast-track PDPs. Many of you will remember the IDN fast-track PDP process and, of course, the more fulsome full PDP process.

We also have cross-community working groups, and I think that's an important thing to keep in mind during this process.

So all of those are mature processes through which the CC community, which has a very diverse set of members, work through the issues that we have to.

I think the other thing, like I just said, bears mentioning is the cross-community working groups. With my IANA customer colleagues here on the panel, much of what IANA does has similarity for all of us. So I think this is a great opportunity for us who don't necessarily work in cross-community working groups that often to say is there 70, 80, 90%



of the accountability issues, do we have them potentially in common? We should be having that dialogue and then going back to our communities to really work through the final unique components that are distinct to our respective communities.

And I would say within ours -- I'll just make a quick comment -- you know, IANA is just not a technical function to us. Since we don't have a contract, many of us don't or most of us do not have contracts with ICANN or IANA specifically, yet IANA implements important policies to us, it's critical that we as the CC community have the time to work through some of these thorny issues that will be part of the IANA transition.

I mean, there are issues like delegation, redelegation that are particularly thorny. And some of their related issues are not actually policies yet like CC retirement.

So we as a community are definitely going to have to work through those issues that are unique to us and that are not yet fulsome policies for IANA to implement. So while we're very excited about this evolution, very positive and optimistic overall, I would say, there's still much work to be done and some tough issues for our community to work through to ensure that we have the robust accountability from IANA that I'm sure we all look forward to. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE:

Jonathan.



JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thank you, Fadi.

I guess I would like to start by echoing Byron's thanks for the courageous decision and recognizing the importance and significance of the occasion and the process.

The GNSO is of itself a diverse multistakeholder organization. The minute you talk about it, one talks about it, one needs to recognize the diversity of the stakeholder groups and constituencies that make up the Supporting Organization, each of which has its own leadership and in some cases even components of the leadership dedicated specifically to policy. These groups (audio problem) typically on a Tuesday at the ICANN meeting and as has been recognized, I mean, for us there is -- that's a first opportunity to really gather together in those groups and start to -- start to digest and process where we are. And we have a robust and already developed Policy Development capability within the GNSO, typically manifests through what we call a Policy Development Process which is a bottom-up process based firmly in our working group model.

We have a council within the GNSO, that's the group that I chair, and that GNSO council is responsible for managing Policy Development Processes within the GNSO and in fact includes liaisons from other parts of the community which is important to provide that -- our own multistakeholder input, if you like. I think it's really important to recognize that we already have structured, organized, and bottom-up policymaking function within the group and experience of working with that and also as Byron touched on, other experience of working in a cross-community way with others in our own community. So whilst this



is the start, we've got some work to do and we've got some figuring out how are we going to deal with this unique problem. We don't start from the ground level. We start with a lot of experience and access to a lot of experienced people. So we approach this with a sense of anticipation and excitement but recognizing that we've got a way to go. Thanks.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you and good morning, everyone. So like others, I would like to thank the NTIA and Larry Strickling and staff for their dedication and determination in this matter. And for coming here to the Singapore meetings as a first opportunity to really engage with this community and draw on its experience as we face this new and exciting matter regarding the stewardship role that the U.S. government has played. From the perspective of the Governmental Advisory Committee, we had an opportunity yesterday to hear from Larry and all of the representatives that spoke in that discussion welcomed the decision. And I think that is a very good indication of the interest and intention of governments represented in the GAC here at ICANN to engage and really truly come to understand what is involved in this matter and there is an expectation, I think, about involvement for the Governmental Advisory Committee.

Recognizing that this is really a technical and administrative matter, I think it might be appropriate to point to some of the successes of the past and to note that most of the advice that comes out of the committee is focused on the naming side and of course that includes the generics and the country codes. So it's really convenient that I get



to speak after my colleagues Byron and Jonathan on this. But in moving the gTLD program along, you will recall a Board/GAC consultation process where our advice was almost entirely taken into -- taken in as part of the decision-making at ICANN.

And on the issue of country codes, which are very close to the hearts of governments, we have a really solid history of working jointly with the country code name supporting organization and there are efforts underway in the area of delegation and redelegation and what we call the Framework of Interpretation working group effort here at ICANN.

So to sum up, I think again there is this expectation of involvement, but appropriate involvement. And I would just point to the demonstrated experience and utility of having governments as part of the ICANN structure and able to comment on the public policy aspect of things. And like Jonathan mentioned, having that experience within this community is going to be useful to us here as we -- we look at the very specific issue of the stewardship role that has been played by the NTIA. So we are ready to assist and we will of course be discussing this matter further as our meetings go on this week, like others in the community. So with that, I will turn to the next speaker. Thank you.

ADIEL AKPLONGAN:

Thank you. I will join previous speakers as well to express our thanks to Larry and Fiona and their team for allowing this to happen. I think it's an important moment and that on our level, we definitely welcome this clear intent for transitioning this oversight function to the community widely.



The NRO has issued a statement that this announcement was made where we publicly express our support to the process, our engagement to work with ICANN for this process, and following up on that, several of us as well have already start engaging our various communities. As you know, we -- we have formal regional organization which are the RIR, and we have the community that are organized and always very familiar with this policy of bottom-up development process. And we intend to use them actively in this process by discussing with them at the different regional meeting using different discussion mailing list as well to engage them on how we enhance those stewardship mechanism that exists.

There is two aspects in what we do as RIR. We have a regional policy that is a policy that apply to us, RIR, individually which are defined and developed by our respective community, and we have the global policy, a policy that is applied to IANA function. And I think it is very important to also take into consideration that IANA function is only just one function of ICANN globally. And the organizations listed here are those who receive directly service from IANA and as RIR on our own we are one of them. So the global policy that IANA use to serve us, our policy that are also defined through our different community and the ASO is there to facility those global policy within the ICANN framework. We have an MoU with ICANN to define the role of the ASO.

We have other mechanism with ICANN we define the type of service we are expecting from IANA. We review this regularly with ICANN. So we are going to put all of that on the table with different community to see how, now that the U.S. government plan to be removed from the global picture, how can we strengthen those mechanisms which are in place,



working closely toward this process. What is very important for us as well is to broaden as much as possible the process. As Fadi has said, this is the beginning of the process. We have to clearly define how this process goes beyond just the ICANN framework, allow others to input into the process. So what will come out from it, really engage everybody and this is satisfactory to everyone. So I will let Louie probably touch on the global policy side of all of this. But we are very committed to be engaged in this process. Thank you.

LOUIE LEE:

Thank you, Adiel. And thank you very much. I echo everybody's sentiments about the NTIA's work, Larry and Fiona's and the staff's team. And also I want to thank you for your continued efforts after the announcement to educate and correct misconceptions that are going on amongst not only the government officials and the U.S -- but also the U.S. public.

The ASO is here -- we are representatives of the numbering community. The numbering community specifically refers to those that are interested in IP addresses, both IPv4 and 6 as well as autonomous system numbers which is critical in the routing system.

The five RIRs have their own communities to help facilitate discussions for policies that are very specific to the five regions, each of the five regions. It's broken up in the regions to help address the specific needs within the regions. And while the processes in the five different regions vary slightly with timetables, the number of times they have meetings, but they shared the principles in the Policy Development where it's consensus-based, multistakeholder, and bottom-up. For



multistakeholder, these communities would include the end users, of course, operators, the -- those in education, researchers and developers, civil societies, governments, and law enforcement. Just to name a few.

So in the global policy context the same text is sent to all five regions for discussions around the world. This is discussed oftentimes in parallel and take many months for discussion. And the -- if you can imagine, a discussion happening in parallel around the world is difficult to have when one region brings up issues and would like to make a change to the policy proposal that's not immediately fed into the next region or if this is happening after one region has already made their own comments and need to feed back into that region for further consultation. So if I would say that once the global policy is agreed upon across all five regions, at that point it's already been well vetted across the world with the -- with the principles that I've spoken about. I'm glad to see that this new process here that we are working on here today includes those principles where for us we do not limit the input to just those that reside in the region or have operations in the region but we welcome input across the world with whomever that's interested in the development of the policy that may or may not affect them directly. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO:

Maybe I'll go first and then Russ continues from the IAB side. So first of all, I'm very happy to be here today and talk about this topic. I welcome the historic process started by the NTIA and I believe we, the Internet technical communities, you all, we can evolve IANA in the responsible



manner in the way that the Internet and stability -- global stability requires. But I wanted to give you the engineering IETF view on this.

Obviously we care a lot about the Internet, that it works well, that all aspects of managing it are done carefully, but this one particular aspect that we care directly on depend on it directly, the protocol parameters. As part of our standards work we end up allocating protocol parameters such as support numbers, option numbers, and so forth. And the IETF role in that space relates to accepting the allocation policies, when can you do these allocations. We also want to ensure their faithful implementation. And we work together, of course, with the IANA who actually maintains the database of those allocations. The IETF and ICANN actually have a contract and agreement about what our respective roles are in this system and those roles have been defined very clearly.

I wanted to make a couple of observations about the protocol numbers aspect. The first thing is this is an ongoing evolution, has evolved over time. In the last 15 years we have seen the creation of contracts, service level agreements, role definition RFCs, you know, as another group that tracks the relationship and not to mention thousands and thousands of RFCs that actually specify the policies regarding what protocol numbers can be allocated. So the process recently started by NTIA is historic but it is still just another step within that evolution.

And finally, just a couple of personal suggestions on what to me, at least, is a reasonable way forward on how we can reach a good result in this process. First, I think it's necessary to stay focused. There are many problems in Internet. Many problems in Internet governance. Let us



focus on this discussion on figuring out how the arrangements go for IANA. That's, you know, a defined problem, let's deal with that. We know how to deal with that. You know how to deal with that. We know how to deal with that. Second, this is broader than ICANN. And some of the discussion has to happen in other organizations. For instance, we -- the IETF have always been running a process on, you know, what do we do with IANA, how the policies and various other things develop. We still need to do that. So we need to form our own opinions as well in other communities. And finally, let us run a community-based process so the communities itself can show the way forward. And we certainly are doing that already with the IETF. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

I'm Russ Housley. I'm chair of the Internet Architecture Board, and like everyone else up here, I welcome the recent announcement by NTIA. And as you already said, this really is the next step in a process that was started more than 15 years ago.

For the protocol parameters, the system has been working very, very well for us. And it -- the way that it's been working provides confidence in the multistakeholder approach and that confidence is justified. The policies are developed by the IETF community, the operations are performed by the IANA portion of the ICANN organization, and the oversight and accountability is provided by the IAB. We have agreements and specifications in place. The agreement includes an MoU that was signed by the chair of the IETF, the chair of the IAB and the president and CEO of ICANN 14 years ago. Almost 14 years and 2 weeks. So as part of that, we develop a service level agreement each



year. And each year we refine that because as the Internet changes, so do the needs of the protocol parameter registries. And we find that the associated review that happens as keeping that SLA evergreen is an important part of our accountability structure.

Since the beginning of this year the IANA department has made edits over 1,000 times to the protocol parameters. It's a very active part of the IANA process.

This includes new protocol parameter registries, assignments in existing ones, modifications and deletions from other registries, and document reviews as the policies are developed.

We are looking forward to engaging with the entire Internet community in figuring out the way to go forward on this whole process. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you.

PAT KANE:

Good morning. I would like to thank Assistant Secretary Strickling, specifically, and NTIA in general for their long stewardship of these IANA functions.

And Fadi, I'd like to thank you for inviting VeriSign to participate in today's panel.

VeriSign recognizes that it is probably the right time to transition the IANA functions and stewardship of those functions away from the United States government. VeriSign further recognizes that ICANN --



the ICANN community is ready to begin the conversation and its multistakeholder bottom-up structures have matured and will be the means by which a proposed solution for the transition is developed for continued operations of the IANA functions.

We support ICANN as the convener of this process as we find solutions for the clerical, authorizing, and technical operations of IANA which are all tied to accountability to the community.

VeriSign, at the direction of NTIA and as part of a community service, performs the actual root zone maintainer role, which is a collection of technical checks before we publish the final root zone for the root servers to use in their operations. We do this in a structurally separated relationship with ICANN and the NTIA that has proven successful for 15 years.

The cooperative agreement that defines VeriSign's participation in this process allows for the NTIA to unilaterally terminate VeriSign's role at any time. We strongly believe that if there is a transition to another party, this technical role -- for this technical role, that our record and the operational practices that made that record possible should be the standard to which successors are held.

The global community has come to rely on that standard. This is especially important in a world with a DNSSEC-enabled Internet where systems and content now require constant refreshing availability.

The accountability regime that replaces the NTIA's stewardship should ensure enforceable and auditable transparency and accountability mechanisms. The DNS community and the global business and user



communities deserve no less, as such mechanisms are critical to the functioning of an open and secure Internet for everyone.

We look forward to contributing to the process and the proposed solution. Thank you, Fadi.

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you.

Okay. Now it's time to bring you into the conversation. Let me just thank my colleagues. Thank you very much for the statements you did.

If the governance of the -- the technical governance of the Internet is a pool, you just took a dive in the deep end. If you haven't noticed, there's a lot that is going on.

There are a lot of mechanisms, there are a lot of relationships, there are a lot of commitments that have been put in place for many years.

Yes, the U.S. role is there and is important, but in the last few years it's been largely symbolic.

A lot of the infrastructure that enables the technical governance is here, is embedded into our communities, so this should be our starting point and that's why it was very important you hear from the people who day in, day out, decade after decade, have been doing this work.

Now we need to understand it, be comfortable with it, strengthen it, and today, let's move into the process of doing so.

So with this, Theresa Swinehart.



THERESA SWINEHART: And thank you, everybody. You're welcome to stay up here or if you'd like to go back and sit down, whichever is your preference. Well, okay. That sounds great. Thank you. This is wonderful. I see the line is already starting, so just one second. Let me set the scene a little bit.

What we have here is first you have a scope of what all the dynamics are in all the different organizations involved in this, and I have -- as we know, this session is to get input on the process to be used to develop a transition plan, so we're really focusing on that aspect, and we thought it would be good to talk about some principles and mechanisms, though I see an enthusiastic line here so I'm getting ready for that. Why don't we just go here. Whoa. Not quite.

There we go. Voila.

So we thought that this might be helpful to help us get sort of two buckets of input that might be relevant for this, but please note at the bottom as well that this conversation doesn't end at 12:30. Everybody is having community dialogues this week. There's an email address that's up. There's a public forum address. So we're really at the beginning of this.

And so why don't we kick it off, and please, for the purposes of -- okay. So just a second.

For the purposes of timeliness, let's try two minutes, and if you could state your name, that would be great.

And who is starting out? Thank you.



CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Good morning. Good morning, everybody. Thank you. Good morning, everybody. My name is Chris Disspain. I am a board member of ICANN and the CEO of the dot au ccTLD and it's in that capacity that I'd like to make some comments on the slides.

Very simply and very quickly, picking up on Byron's point, yes, there are synergies across the legs of the users of the -- of IANA, but I think it's pretty clear from what we've heard this morning that one size does not fit all.

Because one size does not fit all in the services that the IANA provides, my view is that the process itself needs to be conducted by the organizations themselves in an open, transparent, bottom-up, multistakeholder way, and the analogy that I have been using to talk to some friends over the last few days has been to talk about a quilt-making group.

So each of the four or five legs will go away, knit their portion of the quilt, and then it comes together and becomes a large quilt, and as long as the process -- the missing -- the portions of the quilt is itself open and transparent to everybody, and at the end there is a single quilt that goes out for another process of openness and transparency, that ought to enable the community to feel fully enrolled.

I just want to make the point that in respect to the ccNSO, we are very good at having these sorts of processes. We are very good at having the at-large organization and the GAC enrolled in our processes. And



equally, I know that the IETF and the RIRs in their processes are very good at enrolling those people who need to be enrolled in that.

So that's just a starting point, maybe, for some thoughts.

One size doesn't fit all. Do it within the -- the legs, but monitor it and make sure that where there are synergies, to pick up on Byron's point about there may well be service-level synergies, et cetera, that those are picked up so that the work isn't repeated across all of the four legs.

Thank you very much.

THERESA SWINEHART: I'm sorry. There we go. Fantastic. If you have ideas of specific examples or best practices that you could send in, that would also be really helpful.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sure.

THERESA SWINEHART: As we look at the process, we want examples.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you. Yes, sir.



AIZ BAWAZ: Thank you very much. My name is Aiz from WORLD1NNOVASIA. We're part of the W4 Web (indiscernible) consortia.

My proposition with regard -- first, thanks, Fadi, with the forthcoming initiation.

Can you refer to the fundamental, the backbones that you are referring to?

Can you please do that?

FADI CHEHADE: If we could ask the team to put back the grid, that would be appreciated.

AIZ BAWAZ: Thank you very much indeed.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thanks very much.

AIZ BAWAZ: Fundamentally, looking at the near-side precedent, just an opinion.

Now, firstly, with regard to Number 1, you notice that you still remain to be with the (c) entity, that when you refer to the generic domain name, I mentioned in 1999 at Marina del Rey the requirement to have the fifth sense. That is to say, the non-generic dimension. It is not there from then until now. So your platform is irregular and a question of such irregularity must be addressed before you can move forward.



Secondly, with regard to the ICANN VeriSign dimension, I'm not against VeriSign but I was thinking that could VeriSign subscribe to the open innovation initiative so that, you know, instead of, you know, the root operator, be open in such a way that, you know, the lead director and the lead actors be identified and be communicable.

So the question is that the community seems to be UFO and the question is very mono-silo dimensioned.

And thirdly, with regard to the possibility, I was thinking here that in respect to the IPv6, there was no mention at all, and if IPv6 is -- instead of long-distance dimension, the near side need to be addressed. I don't agree with the IPv6 totally, but it doesn't mean that it cannot be activated on a more positive dimension and direction, that we are going to work on that too.

And finally, too, just to be fair to the others, could you -- see, your comment on the Huffington Post is good, but let it not be a one direction, one-dimensional media dimension.

So I request, with regard -- with your statement, now could you also address with the mention of Berners-Lee, you know, bill of rights, because it's important that, you know, the matters be looked into. Thank you very much. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you. And if I could just --

Thank you very much. That's helpful.



If I could just remind everybody, we are looking at the process aspects and so please, your suggestions on that. If you have other non-process-related aspects, always feel free to send those in as well but that will be a later launched.

Yes. Ray, please.

RAY PLZAK:

Ray Plzak, member of the ICANN board, and my day job is my personal life. I retired.

You made a comment, Fadi, that Louie reminds you that there's a second "N" in "ICANN" that stands for numbers. There's only one "N" in "IANA" and it stands for numbers. So it's important to mention to remember.

It's also important to remember that two-thirds of the functions of IANA deal with numbers.

So having said that, it's very important that the focus be on strictly IANA and the policies that affect IANA.

The things that IANA do -- does are transactional policies. It's the interaction between the IETF and the IANA to get protocol parameters or port numbers. It's between the regional registries to get blocks of IP numbers or AS numbers.

When you get to the names area, you've got something slightly different, because in a very pure sense of it, what happens when a name goes into the root zone, it's actually the allocation of a specified unique string.



And so the real policy that IANA is doing there is allocating a unique string.

So what you have to do then is look at all the rest of the policies.

Internal to the IETF you have a lot of policies that dictate how they get -- RFCs are produced, what they go through to get to the point where they can ask for a protocol number be assigned inside the regional registries when they do a global policy. It's what IANA has to do in order to do that and what ICANN is going to -- IANA's going to expect from the regional registries. And when you get to the number -- to the names, it's the same thing. However, there's additional stuff in the country codes which has to do with the transactions around their servers and so forth.

All the rest of the policies have to do with the internal operations of those groups, the way they manage the resources that are given to them.

So bottom line, focus on just the transactional policies as they apply to the IANA. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you very much. Thanks.

MIKEY O'CONNOR: Hi, Theresa. Hi, members of the panel. My name is Mikey O'Connor. I'm a member of the ISP constituency and the GNSO.



I may have mentioned working groups before once or twice in a similar forum, and I want to commend this process so far. Fadi asked was Mikey going to be happy. Mikey happy.

I think you all are a steering committee and I'm going to do all process all the time. I'm pretty clueless about the content. But in terms of the process, this is a great start.

Fabulous steering committee. Fadi, I sent you a note but I imagine it didn't get through the 10,000, so let me just pick a few things off the note that I sent you. And I'll send it again if you give me the secret address.

[Laughter]

MIKEY O'CONNOR:

What I was asking for is a solid statement of work that has broad and deep buy-in across the stakeholders. I think that's our first big deliverable. And I think we're well on the way to getting started with that today, and I think a process to define the process is pretty good.

A few things to put in there, and I'm going to go for a minute, but -- so what's the problem we're trying to solve? What's the puzzle?

Got a good start there.

What's the scope?

Got some work to do there.

Who has a stake in the outcome and are they involved yet?

We got some work to do there.

What's the goal?

Et cetera, et cetera.

I think where we got to get fairly quick is what's the approach. How are we going to actually do this work.

THERESA SWINEHART: Yeah. Uh-huh.

MIKEY O'CONNOR: And that's where I want to close is I just want to mention working groups. Thanks.

THERESA SWINEHART: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much.

STEFANO TRUMPY: Thank you. Stefano Trumpy from GAC for Italy and also a member of EURALO, so in a way, I will encounter some of the objections of Sebastien Bachollet.

So the point is that in this start of this process, in the start of this process we will need to organize national consultations because there is a lot of new actors that reading in the mail this notice about the IANA drifting out of the U.S. government, there will be a lot of more individuals in the government and in the society that wants to



understand. And -- but in the end, the IANA, you know, that is a service that is not very perceived by the end users.

THERESA SWINEHART: Uh-huh.

STEFANO TRUMPY: And then this is has also policy implications, and so organizing this kind of internal conferences is not easy because then you will find people that object to the fact that IANA -- that ICANN is running new gTLDs, trying to connect this to the problem of IANA service and so on.

So -- but this is something that especially the GAC members has to do internally, because they face new actors that find difficulties in understanding. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you. Thank you.

Y.J. PARK: Can we hear?

THERESA SWINEHART: Yes.

Y.J. PARK: Thank you. Y.J. Park from (indiscernible) Korea. As many of you know, I've been a longtime participant of ICANN, and I very feel excited to be



part of this history and experimental kind of dialogue on the globalizing the IANA.

Currently, I'm participating in ICANN as (indiscernible) of APRALO, but also a member of Korea Internet Governance Alliance.

So let me share some, you know, statements in capacity.

So let me join welcoming NTIA's statement on IANA. We have long awaited since 1998, but worthwhile waiting for the recent decision from U.S. government.

Appreciating U.S. government's role in ensuring stability and security of the Internet for the past years, Korea Internet Governance Alliance, as a multistakeholder Internet governance (indiscernible) in Korea, would like to commit ourselves to maintaining stability and security of the Internet together with the global community here.

Since 1998, ICANN has expanded not only ICANN community itself from several hundred to several thousand, but also commercial namespaces on the Internet.

When it comes to institutionalizing the future globalized IANA, IANA's leadership should be strengthened with noncommercial stakeholders such as users and public sectors.

I would like to highlight implementation of IANA should reflect true sense of globalization that invites more diverse stakeholders in this community, including those who have been very ineffective and silent. Asking for more open and transparent decision-making process of institutionalizing IANA, I'd like to confirm Korea Internet Governance



Alliance's dedication to building global consensus on the globalized IANA formation.

Lastly, as a member of Korea Internet Governance Alliance, as multistakeholder from Korea, we would like to support the idea of exploring IANA's structural options down this road together with this global community. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you. Thanks very much.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Theresa.

Mike Palage. I'm a 15-year ICANN stakeholder participant, and I would like to answer the first question regarding important principles for this process and I believe the most important principle is respecting institutional knowledge and precedent.

And with regard to that point, Fadi, this weekend during the GNSO and today in your opening ceremonies when you were talking about accountability, two of the mechanisms that you've repeatedly referred to is the U.S. government in the IANA contract, as well as the Affirmation of Commitments, and what -- from an historical perspective, what sort of rubbed me the wrong way was those were external top-down mechanisms, and it was you not recognizing the three bottom-up accountability mechanisms as provided for in the bylaws: the ombudsman, independent review, and reconsideration requests.



And as we talk about these accountability mechanisms, I think this is why we need to look at the institutional knowledge. We need to look back at 15 years of these mechanisms, some of which were added in the ICANN 2.0 reconsideration, and see are they working, because I do think it is important to look at that historical knowledge and focus really on the bottom-up accountability mechanisms and not necessarily the top-down. Thank you.

KURT PRITZ:

Hi. This is Kurt Pritz from the Domain Name Association.

First, I wanted to say that Mike didn't sound like a 15-year-old member of the community.

[Laughter]

So I'm not used to public speaking and speaking on behalf of stakeholders, so I have to refer to some notes.

But we welcome -- you know, we certainly welcome with everyone else this next step in the evolution of the multistakeholder model. It's the realization of a goal charted 17 years ago by many people in this room, so thank you. Thank you, Becky.

DNA. The DNA, for those that don't know, their members are involved in the provisioning and sale of domain names and as the primary navigational tool on the Internet. We are registrars, registries, resellers, aftermarket providers, and some of the most widely recognized customers of IANA, so we'll be playing an active role, moving forward.



The IANA process runs extremely well now. ICANN executes its role competently and effectively. The U.S. government provides lightweight timely oversight and VeriSign performs flawlessly.

It is important that any new oversight mechanism performs as reliably and consistently and in a manner that prevents the Internet from onerous regulations or content controls. That change cannot be undertaken lightly. A poorly designed process can affect DNS stability. Therefore, the DNA welcomes the deliberate, thoughtful process inclusive of all stakeholders that to determine the future of the IANA functions, the process must focus on the needs and objective of IANA customers. And for names, that's TLD registry operators. The registry operators are the ones who operate the key Internet infrastructure and who, in turn, operate on behalf of a larger global community of Internet businesses and users. If something goes wrong for the TLD registry operators, it is an impact affected by all.

The NTIA principles for this process include multistakeholderism and a prerequisite for the participation of those affected by this change --

[Timer sounds.]

- the TLD registries.

So as we develop and implement a process, we think that when we start the process, it's not a time for discussing solutions. First we have to understand what the objective is and the gap between where we are and where we want to be. And the objective cannot be defined without the active participation of IANA's customers that are gTLD and ccTLD registries. And we ask that you proactively include us in the objective



setting at the outset. And when we get to proposed solutions, we must test them over and over again to ensure the new process is as robust or robuster as the present model. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you. Thanks very much.

MILTON MUELLER: Robuster?

THERESA SWINEHART: Milton, please.

MILTON MUELLER: Milton Mueller, Syracuse University, Internet Governance Project.

Like many of you, I would like to thank Larry Strickling for this change in government policy, and I would also like to thank Edward Snowden.

[Applause]

In terms of principles and mechanisms, I'd like to begin with one that I hope you don't take offense at but I think it is important to lay it on the table. And that is a principle to recognize that ICANN has a stake in the outcome. ICANN as a corporation, as an organization has an interest in the outcome.

And, therefore, while I understand why you were given a task at convening, it means you have to be very careful not to try to control the outcome. And I think the diagram that you had up was not only



incorrect in certain elements, which I'd be happy to explain but steered things towards a certain outcome. So I think we have to be careful of that.

Second principle would be there has to be an opportunity to put all options on the table that are not ruled out by the USG. Obviously, we have to rule out some according to those constraints, but all options have to be considered fairly and rationally.

And, again, I heard things from you in your introduction that said, "Don't talk about new organizations or institutions." So I think that we shouldn't be hearing those kinds of things at this stage. We can debate whether it's wise to have these new organizations, but we don't want to rule them out.

And, third, I would add as a principle, use all available mechanisms. For example, you told us not to discuss this at NETmundial, but I don't know why we would want to do that. It's a mechanism. It's multistakeholder. It's open. Let's use that and any other thing such as an IGF where we can talk about this issue. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you. Thanks very much.

[Applause]

Please, Steve.



STEVE DeBIANCO:

Thanks. Steve DeBianco with NetChoice. Principles are up there on the board, and principles are necessary but they will not be sufficient to design a mechanism. I mentioned this at the NCUC meeting the other day, that programmers, when we build things, we don't really use just principles. We turn to something called use cases or scenarios. And those were essential to actually build code. For the non-programmers in the room, a principle might be safe driving in the winter weather but a use case might be how do you handle a situation when a car starts to spin sideways. That's a use case. We code for use cases. That's how you build mechanisms.

So looking at this right now, I think the use case approach could be inserted into our process. And we would come up with use cases and ask: How will the new mechanism prevent these scenarios or induce consequences for negative scenarios that will prevent them from happening? And I will give five quick examples.

If ICANN, for instance, failed to live up to the affirmation or failed to implement an ATRT recommendation, that would be an example of a use case. And we would want to see how does this mechanism use the leverage of IANA to prevent that.

A second one might be that if ICANN worked to reduce its legal presence in regimes where users and registrants and contract parties needed to bring lawsuits, how would we remedy that?

Another one would be what if ICANN were, well, overwhelmed by lawsuits and began to fail to do its job? We have to handle that presence as well.



There is another issue with the root. Let's do a use case that says: What happens when ICANN is submitting to the root a new TLD and the folks involved in this process believe there are security, stability concerns? Collisions, for instance. What would be the mechanism by which they could stop the delegation or delay the delegation?

And, finally, what if, in fact, governments change their voting structure from consensus to simple majority and some future GAC tried to suggest to a vulnerable ICANN board that we had to pull something out of the root because it was --

[Timer sounds.]

-- a concern to governments in terms of free expression. These are just five examples.

I'm sure the community can come up with several more. So what we would do with these use cases is to try to see if our new mechanism would answer these challenges at least as well as the current mechanism of USG oversight does. We should aspire to replace it with a mechanism that would do at least as well. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you. You just reminded me, I was saying it earlier today as well, there's a session this afternoon on accountability and ICANN accountability. So I think that would also be a wonderful opportunity to raise those issues again for that dialogue.

So just to flag that session for this afternoon as well. Thank you.

Fiona?



FIONA ASONGA:

My name is Fiona Asonga from Africa in particular. I would like to start by congratulating the NTIA for what they have done in terms of opening up the IANA function. However, I think I need to just emphasize a few things. I think the most important principle here is multistakeholderism. However, we need to look at what we have in place, the groups that exist, and analyze and check to what level do they incorporate the multistakeholder approach and at the same time the bottom-up process.

Coming from a region where our key basic needs are far from the use of the Internet, I think we must recognize that to some level, certain governments will have to be involved in this process. I want us to be careful about the use of the term "non-governmental." Let us be open because in my part of the world, my country specifically, the government is the custodian of public good and we cannot ignore that. Government drives I.T. development, Internet development, processes, activities and everything. Without their participation, civil society, private sector has no voice.

To give us a voice to be able to participate, you must engage our governments. And, therefore, we need to be careful about when we present the principles about specific -- be very specific about non-governmental. Let us be open. Let us welcome governments to the table. Let us discuss, and maybe one way of doing it is by using the different groups that are already working with IANA, getting them involved, all stakeholders to the best level that they can. And let them



give us reports on how they're doing it. Then we can pick it up from there. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you very much. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE: Fiona, thank you for your comment. And I want to emphasize what you said. The intent here is not to exclude any government. In fact, if governments are not part of this, this process will not be legitimate. So the message from the United States government is we do not want a mechanism -- a proposed mechanism or set of mechanisms that are uniquely including governments, right, that we're all participants. It is a multistakeholder mechanism. But I want to be very clear on that, and thank you for emphasizing that point. Thank you, Fiona.

THERESA SWINEHART: We'll take you and then we have a remote participant which we will bring in and then go back.

PHILIP CORWIN: Good morning. Philip Corwin, founder of Virtual, LLC, speaking for myself and welcoming the opportunity to participate in and I hope to constructively contribute to the very important process we're starting this morning.

At the opening session, we saw a video of the board vote in this room three years ago launching the new TLD program. I was in that room.



What was not shown in that video, in that short clip, but what I remember very vividly was a very contentious board meeting in which there were divided opinions. There was dissent. There was a split vote, and I think the very willingness of the board to allow the entire community to see that strengthened the acceptance and the credibility of its decision.

Under current practices, if that vote was taking place today, it would be behind closed doors and the community would be provided with minutes which, based on current practice, would not reflect divisions, would not indicate a vote count. In that instance, there has been a movement from transparency to more opacity.

I attended the GNSO Council meeting this week and heard council members voicing concern that their central role in setting policy for gTLDs was being marginalized. Now, I bring these things up not to criticize but to make the point that as the community considers what accountability mechanism is needed to replace the role played by the U.S. government in the renewal process of the IANA contract and its enforcement role of the Affirmation of Commitments, their perception of ICANN's commitment to transparency, to a bottom-up multistakeholder process is going to influence what the community decides. And I hope ICANN takes that into consideration and considers whether it needs to re-examine some practices as we begin this journey. Thank you very much.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you. And I hope you're able to make this afternoon's session as well.



FADI CHEHADE: I want to emphasize, as Theresa said, a couple of times, in the interest of the dialogue being fruitful, we need to separate what we need to do to replace the stewardship of the U.S. government on IANA and then as the gentleman spoke and the previous speaker as well, what are the mechanisms we're going to put in place to keep ICANN accountable. Let's keep these -- they are interrelated, I agree. But we have separate streams to deal with these things.

And this afternoon at 5:00, all the focus will be on precisely the points you bring up: How do we ensure ICANN remains accountable, transparent and in check for the whole world? We will do that this afternoon. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: If I might just bring in one remote participant and then we will go to you. Thank you.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Thank you, this is Matt Ashtiani for the record. We have a remote participation comment from Alejandro Pisanty. Alejandro notes: A very relevant set of principles has been put forward by the strategy panel on ICANN's role in Internet ecosystem. They are the products of analysis that foresaw its possible application in the evolution of ICANN and IANA.



We invite the community to use them as a starting point. Additionally, some panel members like Pindar Wong and Hagen Hultsch are around in Singapore and are expecting to discuss this issue further.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you, Alejandro, for participating remotely.

Yes, sir.

PAUL FOODY: Hi, Paul Foody speaking on my own behalf.

Fadi explained that we're together so we can agree on the process. We need to agree how to do this in a multistakeholder way together.

I don't know what happened to the sound. That is bizarre.

The framing questions are: What are the most important principles for this process? Now, you have got nine people on the board here. Every single one of you have spoken about your gratitude for Larry Strickling's courage. Heather spoke of his determination.

The implication there is that there is a group of people who are against this. So why isn't that group represented here? Louie Lee talked about senators, U.S. politicians, and the U.S. public being concerned by this. And I can understand that. I mean, the Internet was developed as part of the American defense. You know, it was a part of the military program.

And now America is giving that away? I mean, it would be great to think that we live in a peaceful world, but that's far from the case.



So my point is: If we want this process to be productive, it needs to be representative and the people who are against this need to be given exactly the same sort of voices as the tiny minority this room represents because right now we're talking about the new gTLD process as if it's a success. And, yet, we are seeing billion-dollar assets sold for peanuts. And that should be ashamed -- this should shame all of us. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you.

Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Hi. Thank you. Jonathan Zuck from the Association for Competitive Technology.

Taking a step back, I think one of the things we need to make part of the process is the definition of the scope of the process. So jumping ahead to the things we want to do, I think actually figuring out what they are in the first place has got to be step number one. And I think to some extent, the slides that Fadi put up on the board, I would be interested if those could be put back up again. Begin the process of defining the scope and perhaps that's already a step too far. I think up with of the first things we're going to need to do is take a really careful and analytical look at what the actual role of the NTIA has been and make sure that that role is summarized as well as possible in the construction of our scope because I think this notion of the NTIA being this backstop of accountability for the organization of ICANN has a much more abstract nature to it than just the specific technical aspects and the



satisfaction behind the IANA functions. And so we need to make sure that we look at that rhetorical role almost as concretely as we do the technical functions.

So I don't know if it's possible to bring the slide back up again that had to do with responsibilities. But one area of scope that sort of jumped out was the question of the root zone operations. One of the things that Fadi mentioned in his presentation -- and I could have misunderstood, too -- is that part of NTIA's intention would be to retire the cooperative agreement with VeriSign to do the root zone functions potentially. And if that's the case, shouldn't that box also be one of the ones that's part of the scope of this discussion? In other words, coming up with a criteria for how the root zone should be operated if it is no longer an assignment by the NTIA.

So I just want to make sure that we sort of make sure that the functional part of this and not just the accountability part of this is also part of the scope discussion.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE: Let me be very clear about this. In that box that you noted, the biggest box there for operation --

[Timer sounds.]

-- we are implementing the policies that we don't own, that these people own. It is their policies. It is not our policies, so the GNSO



produces a policy of which you are part. The IETF produces policies and specifications. The ASO produces policies and specifications. And we have mutual agreements and commitments to implement their policies.

The question is not who implements it because they decide that as owners of these parameters and policies. The question is who replaces the USG oversight of that work. That is what is the scope of this discussion.

Now, how we get there we're doing that. We're starting that process. This is an open process. Everybody needs to participate in it. We will ferret it out. We will break it down. I took note, I think, your question making sure the scope is clear. I don't want to feel like we rushed through this. Let's take our time and maybe issue a document as you suggested describing exactly what's being replaced.

And we will be -- I liked also the other gentleman's idea of use cases. We will put use cases. This is how it was done. This is what we're trying to replace. So I think this is a good direction for all of us to be guided by. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Just to be clear -- I don't want to take up a lot of time. There are two contracts potentially in question. One is the contract with NTIA and ICANN and the other is with NTIA and VeriSign. And if both of those are intended to go away, that does call into question one of the functional aspects of root zone management and not just the accountability aspects.



FADI CHEHADE:

Yes. But my SLA is to these people as an implementer, as an operator. They own the policy. They own the specs. They define the service level agreement. I have to perform to that. The community needs to make sure that they have visibility, participation, and escalation and audit mechanisms to make sure given that this function serves the world, that that function has good stewardship and accountability. That's where the community needs to be.

We should not be as worried so long as the commitment is there for us to continue implementing things according to these policies and the mutual commitments to the owners of the policies and the protocol parameters.

Okay?

THERESA SWINEHART:

Just a small housekeeping, I'm going to close off the line just to ensure that we can get everybody out at the right time. That doesn't preclude further conversations on this; but just in a matter of time, we'll close off the line now.

Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Theresa. My name is Jordan Carter. I'm the chief executive of Internet New Zealand.

I just want to read from the NTIA press statement. NTIA is asking ICANN to convene global stakeholders to develop a proposal to transition the current role played by NTIA in the DNS.



You can pull out maybe three bits of that. There is the general stewardship function the USG has provided. It says the contracts with IANA and VeriSign and then the actual role within the IANA functions that the NTIA plays in checking.

And I want to make two points that arise from that. First of all, stewardship is not oversight. We can't pull out one part of the NTIA role and pretend the other ones don't exist. A settlement that Black Box has a particular functional role of NTIA, replace it with something else isn't the answer. We need to have a systemwide understanding that we have something that is as stable without USG oversight as it was before.

So those two things are important to distinguish.

The other point is that ICANN wasn't asked to consult the community on ICANN's plan for this transition. ICANN was asked to convene global stakeholders.

THERESA SWINEHART: Right.

JORDAN CARTER: It is extremely unfortunate that the second page of the grid that was just up there said "consultation." "Consultation" is a top-down process where elites choose what they will do and tell the rest of us. You need to get rid of "consultation" as a notion in this.

[Applause]



This is a multistakeholder forum and a multistakeholder process. And everything you say and everything you do in leading this process has to reflect that which is the declared mode of operation for ICANN. If we don't do that, the risk of this transition is that it won't happen at all. Thank you.

PRANESH PRAKASH:

Good morning, my name is Pranesh Prakash. I'm at the Centre for Internet and Society in India and with the Yale ISP. One of the problems with coming in later is that your words and ideas have already been taken, so Milton already stole my note about the Snowden line and Jonathan already said a lot of what I wanted to say about scope. But I'll just reiterate one issue there. The statement by NTIA mentions the cooperative agreements as well, but I'm concerned whether it's only a question, the scope of the current discussion here is only a question about who the counter party to the VeriSign agreement, for instance, will be replaced by or whether the fact that a for-profit like VeriSign is currently the monopoly as the authoritative root zone operator will also be examined and that's of concern to me. So if it's only about what NTIA is currently doing, then that agreement will just be with someone else, with ICANN or with someone else, right? And that's not what I want to see out of this.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you. Becky.



BECKY BURR:

I'm going to use the short microphone. Becky Burr with Neustar. First of all, I want to say I'm very happy to be standing here. It was a long time, it feels like it was a long time ago at a certain level -- and I hope this comes out properly. I'm not amazed we're making this transition. I'm sort of amazed that we're still here. There have been many moments in the not-too-distant past where the question about whether this would work was worrisome. The fact is this institution is here, it's here to stay. That's great, and I'm very excited about it and I do want to reiterate everybody's thanks to Larry and NTIA for, you know, finally bringing this to come. But I also want to talk -- because I don't want to be a buzz kill, but I have to talk about a couple of other things.

So 15 years ago, as Fadi said, we did come to Singapore for ICANN 1 and we all wore T-shirts that said -- can you see that there? "We still have a lot to do in these interesting times we are in," Jon Postel. As a member of the GAC, I think the GAC sat outside on a -- like outside a room on the floor when this was happening. I want to remind everybody, we still have a lot of work to do. And some of that work is work that we have been talking about since ICANN 1. And I hope that we use this opportunity to move that forward. So I'm going to talk about accountability, but this is a process question or a process issue.

The transition itself is multi-faceted, and I'm perfectly comfortable saying we're going to have one track for the accountability aspects and another track for sort of transition, technical, whatever. [Timer sounds.] But the fact is that even though the -- the NTIA backs up sat (phonetic) at the junction of IANA functions and the authoritative root, it was not limited to that. It was -- it effectively served as a backstop for all of the issues that come up when IANA implements ICANN's policies.



Accountability and the transition are inextricably bound up with each other. And I just want to warn that there is a -- has been a lot of conversation this week that makes me suggest -- makes me think that people are kind of deliberately trying to decouple these issues in a fundamental way and I think that's -- and the suggestion that focusing -- insisting on focusing on addressing the accountability issue somehow threatens the transition. I want to urge you guys to think carefully about the language you are using because that is a clear message and if that's what you're thinking, please rethink it.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you. Thanks very much. Yes, sir.

[Applause]

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. My name is Eduardo Diaz. I represent the International Society of Puerto Rico and I'm an elected member of the -- to the ALAC from the North American RALO. So I'm going to give you my humble suggestion from the user's standpoint, based on these framing questions. And from the important principles of this process, one of the two that I think are very important is to be inclusive and there should be a lot of transparency in this process because that's what makes the whole process available to everyone. And from the point of view of the mechanism, and I think, Fadi, you mentioned this at the beginning, we know somehow we can do this and, you know, one of the first things I suggest that we do is that you put together a group to come up with a charter and specifically, you know, explain what the purpose of this is



and what the questions that we need to answer. We need -- you know, and then from that, then you create another group and just put the whole thing together. I mean, that's what we do every day. And if we have to go out of ICANN and invite other people, then we just do it. The mechanisms are there. So that's my recommendation. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you very much. This gentleman, and then we have a remote participate and then we'll go back to the line. Sir.

WISOM DONKOR: My name is Wisom Donkor from Ghana. I have a short question. I want to know -- this is my first time attending an ICANN meeting, and I want to know if there's any action plan for Africa so they will be fully involved in the activities? You realize that in Africa there are most areas that are blank. They are trying to know what is green within the IT world. Let's say, for example, Madagascar is virtually blank. I don't see Madagascar in any of the events. If you go to (indiscernible) and some other areas. (indiscernible) in the action plan for Africa. And that's my question.

FADI CHEHADE: If your question specifically is how we're going to involve Africa into the consultation process that we are engaged in here, that's a good question and we will be taking notes that this is important. We heard another speaker, if you recall, speak about national engagement. It was the gentleman from Italy. So national continental engagement in Africa is critical, and we will take note that in our processes we should engage through all of our communities, the African community and other global



communities in the process. So this is noted and we will -- we will include it in our process. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: If I can just take the remote participant and then come back to you.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Hi, this is Matt Ashtiani for the record. The remote comment comes from Javier Rodriguez. Javier writes, this situation is like what was done at the end of the '90. A new opportunity to enhance the multistakeholder model of governance. Only improving global participation will bring a better and bigger Internet. From the past to the future the answer is the multistakeholder model, governments included.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you. Thank you very much for participating remotely.

>> (Saying name) with AT&T. Thank you, Fadi, for convening this historic moment, if you will, on the natural evolution of Internet governance. Framing the questions, I think it's already been done, well stated by the NTIA announcement. We'd like to compliment NTIA for putting forth their proposal of an intent to migrate to the multistakeholder governance structure. I want to highlight that we see this as a multistakeholder proposal. So I thank you for convening the group. And one thing I would like to highlight that Larry said a couple of days ago. We're looking at this is about three, four, five billion people



accessing the Internet, not to mention the trillions of devices that we are going to see through machine-to-machine computing. So as you're modeling this out, I'd like to build on something Steve said. Stress test it. Whatever the proposals are, put in place mechanisms that you can actually stress test what the governance will look like as we're looking at again, you know, trillions of devices using the Internet, you know, on a daily basis. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you. Yes, sir.

PAUL McGRADY: My name is Paul McGrady. I'm the chair of Winston & Strawn's trademark domain name and brand enforcement practice and also the author of LexisNexis treatise on domain name law, and I'm asking a question in the capacity as author today. Can we have the slide pulled up that had the principles that we were working on? The principles.

THERESA SWINEHART: Go back.

>> Yes, we're working on getting it for you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you.



PAUL McGRADY: Thank you. So this is a question, not a speech, and I'd like to preserve whatever time I have left so that it can be responded to. On this slide we see in all cases accountability preceding mechanisms down the list until we get to the openness of the Internet. Was accountability purposely dropped when we say mechanisms to maintain openness of the Internet, and if so, what was the reasoning? Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: That's a mistake. It's a mistake.

PAUL McGRADY: Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you very much. Yes, sir.

XIAODONG LEE: This is Xiaodong Lee, the CEO of the CNNIC, dot cn registry and the national Internet registry of China. So, firstly, I want to say welcome to the NTIA statement and also thanks Mr. Larry Strickling. I think you did the right job. I hope you continue the right job in the future. You open the door. Remember not to close it.

And also thanks the ICANN Board, Fadi and his ICANN staff team for their fantastic improvement and big progress. Thank you. The other reason -- we mentioned a lot on the technology stakeholders. I want to say we should clearly know what global stakeholder community are and where are they, and make sure the multistakeholders can be consulted



in the process. We need to discuss with the local community on this progress, and work together closely with local community. Instead of trying to bring all of them here, glad to see the community leaders on the stage. But hope you can extend the influence each community around the world.

In the process I want to emphasize that Internet is countryless but stakeholders have their own country. It is very important to encourage the developing world to join the process and also we need to facilitate a platform without the barrier of language issues. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you very much. Yes, sir.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: My name is Jimson Olufuye. I have the privilege of being the chair of the Africa ICT Alliance, a private sector led group for Africa voice of business. I first and foremost would like to thank the players, the partners have been involved in ensuring the stability of the Internet thus far and recognize the transition that has been announced. I want to suggest, as part of the Process Development, that we should look at this say project management, you know, objective or assignment. We need to have a time frame for the initial consultation. We need to engage because as already stated, it's going to be inclusive so, of course, all continents they see you as (indiscernible) for the world. Going to use all opportunities, all fora of consultation to engage us, and we need to have a multistakeholder steering group, you know, maybe in different layers that we would collect all the information and we should not



forget that what we really want to achieve in a way is to continue the assurance of the stability of the Internet, assurance of the stability. And it will definitely come when we're inclusive and we have the open mind as we are having right now. Thank you very much.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you, Jimson.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Good morning, my name is Bertrand de la Chapelle. I'm the director of the Internet & Jurisdiction Project. First point I want to make is that in the NTIA declaration the part that is as important as the substance is the process and the choice that NTIA has made not to conduct the discussion on its own as the renewal of the contract happened in the past but to hand it over and ask ICANN to do it, and NTIA should be commended for that. It brings on ICANN a huge responsibility to ask -- to act as a neutral steward of this discussion.

In that regard, to answer the questions that are out there, one of the most important things in my view in any multistakeholder process is to try to formulate as much as possible in the early stages something that amounts to a sort of common goal. I would like to expand actually on what Jonathan said. It's not only the scope of the exercise but also how we could formulate, ideally, what we all want to achieve in a common formulation. And in this regard, although it applies less to the names and numbers themselves -- sorry, to the numbers and parameters themselves, I've always believed that identity formation of a common goal for the root zone file is that the objective of the IANA function is to



ensure the integrity of the root zone file which means that no one can voluntarily or involuntarily tamper with this file. That's my contribution for a potential common goal.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you, Bertrand. Paul.

PAUL WILSON: I am Paul Wilson, the head of APNIC, one of the IP address registries. I'd like to -- I would like to say thanks very sincerely to Larry and to Fadi and to Steve and congratulations for where you've helped us to get to. But I'd also like to say thanks and congratulations to everyone who's been working on this for a good 15 years, and for most of us it's not exactly a surprise because it actually is what we have been trying to achieve.

The point I wanted to make is about the community, and we've had a lot of references to the community and I wanted to point out that the community is not here in this room, the community is much, much bigger. And the community out there is not just a featureless mass, it's actually a complex structured set of communities. The -- at the front, at the podium here, represent some of those communities. I do as well. I'm reluctant to be called a leader of any of those communities because these communities out there are bottom-up communities and we don't lead the opinions or the views of those communities at all. Those views need to be brought in.

So -- which brings me to the practical process of this consultation. And I responded to Fadi's tweet just earlier on principles which is to actually



think about what -- what we need to do is to imagine how this is going to work and think about the principles under which the consultation will be run. And in view of the communities out there that need to be included, the process needs to be inclusive and it needs to be distributed. It also critically needs to be attributive because the meetings -- there are meetings that are happening outside of this room that need to sync up. They're the opportunities for those communities to do what we're doing here, to gather together and come to conclusions or positions.

[Timer sounds.]

And they don't happen so often. The RIRs meet twice a year. ICANN, I think, will meet five times between now and the deadline, so there are - - there are opportunities for iterations, and that needs to happen, because otherwise you're not going to get the inputs which need to be processed through those communities and brought in. The iterations are important because when people -- when communities do bring their inputs in, they need to see the next iteration, they need to see the results or there will be no confidence. So the fact of genuine and responsive are also principles -- the features of genuine and responsive are also principles that this thing needs to embody. Thanks.

FADI CHEHADE:

Excuse me, Theresa. Paul, you have our unequivocal, unflinching assurance that ICANN is just one of many in this process. We are just -- we have, as you said, the huge responsibility of being asked to facilitate. But if we fail from any community standpoint to engage and convene in every possible way across the world with all the people who should be



engaged in this process, then frankly we would have not fulfilled what NTIA is asking us to do. So it won't happen at ICANN meetings alone. It will happen at all the convening places of these communities, your community, other communities. We heard from a couple of people about national and regional communities. Help us. We're -- everyone in the room should be facilitator. All of us should be facilitators. But ICANN, who has been given the responsibility to facilitate, we will put our time, treasure, and focus to make sure every community is reached as best we can.

PAUL WILSON: Thank you, Fadi.

ALBERT KABEYA: Yeah. Albert Kabeya, senior advisor of the prime minister in charge of ICT, first time for me to come here. Thank you very much for your great job.

I think that you are managing a very big community and it's very important for us and for -- especially for emerging countries.

So I go along with Fiona, who just come to talk here when we talk about NGO, and I stand behind what you're saying and what you mean by "NGO." And I can tell you that the government, our government in the (indiscernible) is now engaged to lead the community and to talk with all the community and to build up a new community in which the government will push them to set up a new community of Internet to better manage our area.



So that's to say that for Africa, we think that we need more help in terms of process, in terms of organization, to understand how we can handle the organization, simply, and how we can build up our new community, because this is a very new community and we need your help. And I think that also there is also a political message you can avoid when you say, "U.S. government doesn't want this, doesn't want that," so -- no. Such a message. So it's a community. We are talking about Internet; we are not talking about U.S. government. We are talking about something we own now.

So -- and I do understand also that the U.S. government is one who push the Internet and is one who is leading the Internet now, but from the political side, it's touchy.

But I understand. That's --

Okay. We need to go along. We need the doors to stay open for everyone to bring all we have in terms of content, in terms of culture, in terms of all the work we have for Internet. Thank you very much for this.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you. Yes, sir.

CHRISTIAN BOPE: Okay. My name is Christian Bope. I'm an AfriNIC board member.

I would like to -- because the process and the principle is very important here, right? And I would like to emphasize one thing is, because we are building something, and for a developing country, the process should be



slight, because if we are making process very complex for (indiscernible), it would be very difficult for us to be part of this process because it's a very huge ecosystem and somehow, as my fellow African people speak, they say most of African countries are lost in this big organization. I think building this process, we have to take in account to make it small, most likely, for African communities and all developing countries. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you. Thank you very much. That's brought us to the end of our line and I would like to thank everybody for having stayed on who stayed on.

A few things. This is not the end of the dialogue on the input into how the process should look, reflective of the principles and the mechanisms.

We will, as I discussed, consolidate everything that we hear at this meeting here in Singapore, whether through the on-line mechanisms or the discussions here, put that together and post it. The objective is by the 7th of April, which would then go out for public consultation, with a proposed time line, next steps, and things that we've heard here as well.

So this is the beginning of a useful discussion this week and we look forward to hearing more.

As we had noted in the process document that was originally posted, we had highlighted some key milestones which were the ICANN meetings, but those are not, as was pointed out by Paul Wilson and



many others, exclusive in any way to the enormous amount of dialogues that are happening in different communities and that will be a very essential part of the process that will be then put forward.

So with that, I just wanted to thank everybody, remind you about the session this afternoon on accountability, and hope to see you there, and again, thank you.

And thank you, everybody who came to join up here.

Fadi, did you want to say anything?

FADI CHEHADE: No.

THERESA SWINEHART: Okay. Thanks.

[Applause]

[Applause]

>> Ladies and gentlemen, if you wouldn't mind, we are going to have to close the air wall in this room, so all of you sitting in the back of the room, can you quickly pick up your things? All of those chairs have to be moved so that the session in Canning can begin on time this afternoon.

Thank you all.



[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

