

FINISHED TRANSCRIPT

ASIA-PACIFIC REGION INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM
TAIPEI 2016
A NEW INTERNET ERA

27 JULY 2016
ROOM 402
1600-1741
WS 28

OUT OF SMOKE AND MIRRORS: HOW WILL A MULTI-PARTICIPATION ENVIRONMENT
BE SUSTAINED AFTER TRANSITION?

Services provided by:

Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-481-9835

This is being provided in a rough-draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in Order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: okay, everyone, it's 2 past 14, so we'll be waiting about two minutes more, wait for the audience to be seated.

All right. So welcome, everybody. Good afternoon. In this session, we are going to be dealing with one of the subthemes of this APrIGF which is IANA transition, mainly the future impact of the IANA transition.

I noticed from the agenda that our session is the only one that is going to be dealing with this theme specifically, and I am expecting some youth IGF attendees here. So I hope this session will turn out to be really informative and helpful, okay?

My name is Julie Cong Zhu, I'm the moderator of the session and I'm from China Internet Network Information Center, CNNIC. IANA has been a major interest of mine in addition to my routine work, of course. And it's also worth mentioning that I'm not trained at school to be an Internet person, and especially am not an expert on those technical fundamental resources and things like that.

But I feel like this event, transition event, all this historical change is helping me better understand the Internet. So I think this session will turn out to be worth your time.

And I assume that nobody in this room does not know what the

IANA transition is and what is going on here. I guess what I'm going to do before the dynamic discussion is that I'm going to provide a very brief introduction to the background to make sure that we are all standing on the same page. So this whole thing, the IANA transition it starts officially like two years ago on March the 14th with an announcement from the U.S. government, NTIA. And it said that NTIA intend to transition stewardship of the IANA to the global multistakeholder community. So NTIA asked ICANN to convey a multistakeholder process to develop a proposal for the transition.

So what exactly are the IANA functions? It actually relates to three different technical communities which are called the operational communities here. They are the numbers community, the domain name community, and the protocol parameters that are mostly related to the standards developed by the IATF. For this part, I believe my panelists, they will mention a lot more details later. So I will just stop here.

Without doubt, the announcement received widespread attention because it's supposed to be a process reflecting the overall intentions of stakeholders around the globe to globalise the IANA functions. And the transition plan, thus, concerns the community that how much is to ensure oversight of the IANA function continue to adhere to fundamental Internet principles?

Given that the IANA function stewardship transition has been the focus of the past years' Internet Governance discussions and the final transition proposal has been reviewed by the NTIA pending for the U.S. government's approval now, it is therefore appropriate timing to review how the transition is reflective of broader Internet principles as well as international consensus and look ahead to discuss how will a par tigs pa tory environment be after the transition.

We also know there are many new designs arising from the proposals, and you may also want to know how will those mechanisms work, how are they related to ICANN? How are they inter-related, et cetera? So I hope this session will be an informative one with the primary goal of updating you on the latest progress of the transition and also the implementation status as well as the interactive relations between the major players' roles and groups and I do have a higher level objective here, is that I want to inspire listeners, inspire you to reflect upon the post IANA transition mechanism especially on how after implementation this mechanism is to ensure stable and secure operation in view of the benefits of customers from different regions, different communities and with different backgrounds.

Okay. That's a very brief overview of the proposal. And I guess we all know what we have in front of us. So I am very happy that today we have a broad representative of people who are involved in the transition event. And they are from different operational communities from different organizations. So I bet most of you are

quite familiar with them. I'm very positive that this session would be diversified and complete one where you can get almost all the information you want. Maybe if we are lucky, he can get to know some insider news.

So let me begin by asking each panelist to introduce themselves and explain how they are related to the transition.

Of course, if you already have some comments to make, you can feel free to bring them up and just try to keep it as brief as possible in the first round. Okay. So, Paul, do you want to start?

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you, Julie. My name's Paul Wilson, I'm the healed of APNIC, the IP address of the Asia-Pacific. I suppose most people know APNIC quite well, but we are one of the RARs that is part of the number administration system, the numbering community. We are therefore and always have been one of the key stakeholders in the IANA function. So we've been involved and we've been interested for a very long time in this IANA transition. In fact, assistants before ICANN came along. And I won't go into that now, but we can certainly talk about the background if that's of interest. We've been interested since that time and been involved with the ICANN process after ICANN came along and with the transition after the U.S. government finally made its announcement. So our interest is in the stability and the governance of the IP addressing functions which are performed by IANA and which we rely on. So I'll leave it there. But plenty of time for conversation afterwards, thanks.

>> IZUMI OKUTANI: Good afternoon, everyone, my name is Izumi Okutani. I am from JPNIC. And we were involved with IANA and I was involved with the community process with the process as the numbers community as a number of the Chris team which has worked on consulting the numbers the resources proposal. And I was also involved in the process on enhancing ICANN accountability. So that was a parallel process that was submitted to all the NTIA as a requirement in considering the transition. And so in the panel, I'd like to share my experience from what I saw from this whole process and also the engagement from the Asia-Pacific regional perspective. So I'm looking forward to the discussions today, thanks.

>> ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you. Tatia Hau. My name is Asha Hemrajani, I'm from the ICANN board. I'm from Hong Kong. I live in Singapore. I'm a member of the board of ICANN but I'm her in my personal capacity. Prior to ICANN, my background was in mobile communications. I spent many years building the 2 G, 3 G, 4G networks here in Taiwan. I think it's important that we are doing this here in Taiwan because Taiwan has contributed much to the Internet, global growth because of their work in semiconductors and also mobile phone manufacturing. So I'm from ICANN.

And I see young people here from the youth IGF. I see this gentleman here from the de facto U.S. embassy here in Taiwan. Institute, pardon me. So not everyone here could be familiar with

ICANN. So I wanted to maybe spend very brief introduction.

ICANN stands for the Internet corporation of assigned network numbers. So we develop the unique identifiers that each of us uses to reach another person on the Internet. So without that coordination, we really wouldn't have one global Internet.

Our scope is very narrow. We don't deal with content on the Internet or access to the Internet. Our focus is on keeping the Internet secure and stable and into operable.

So from a personal perspective, I joined the board of ICANN. Right before the historic announcement that Julie just mentioned. I joined the board at a very interesting time. And I have been heavily involved -- there are two pieces to this, one is the transition of the INS function stewardship and the second is the accountability mechanisms to make ICANN more accountable and also because we are in the absence of a contract with the U.S. government, we need to be held accountable. So there are a bunch of new mechanisms which we'll talk about later on in this panel, I'm sure. So I've been very heavily involved in the accountability work. And I look forward to the rest of this discussion. Thank you.

>> BILLY MOO-HO CHEON: Hi, everyone, my name is Billy Moo-Ho Cheon. I'm the Korean technical association. We help the Korean government develop policies and Internet promotion and information security.

Actually, I'm not technically involved with this IANA transition, but my colleagues and my team as ccTLD operators, we attended in the past ICANN meeting and actively expressed our opinions on this issue. And I just want to reiterate what has been said in the other appropriate international fora, thanks.

>> LIYUN HAN: Hello, everybody. I'm Liyun Han from CNNIC, as well. First off, I would like to express our most sincere appreciation for all of our distinguished guests and the attendees on site and remote participants to this workshop.

And actually during the past more than two years, our team kept our close eyes on the IANA transition process, and we actually have been involved to the process and made our great -- I can say that great contribution to this process, including launched the comments on every process related to the IANA and ICANN CCWG Working Group, yes.

And most of our team, most of our team participated in the different subgroups to the related works.

And besides us, staff in CNNIC also participating different ACes and ASOs of ICANN. So we would like to make more contribution and involvement to this process. And we are looking forward to the more accountable and secure and stable Internet for all of our users. Thank you.

>> MS. JULIE CONG: Thank you very much to our panelists for the panel. The timing of the announcement is quite interesting. It is

also by that timing that I joined CNNIC and started work on those issues. So I have got this first question for our panelists, which I think is important to solve before we truly enter the dynamic discussion because, as I said, we have reached this milestone. By milestone, I mean we have completed the proposal. And we have handed it over to NTIA. And it has been reviewed by NTIA. And it is now pending for approval by the U.S. government, which we don't know the result, what the result will be like.

So it would be great for us to do a period summary here. I just want to ask the panelists here because you are involved and have various focus and you are working in this aspect.

So the question is: How has the transition been evolving so far? You can offer maybe some general impressions according to your past experience.

And do you think is it truly adhering to the fundamental Internet principles? I have mentioned the fundamental Internet principles for several times. By that I mean, the things we obviously mention like decentralization and also relies on participatory bottoms-up process. I think most of you have been fully committed in the working and you are the right one to give us the impression on this. So, Paul, because you are from the ICG, the coordination group, I think you are the right one to give us a picture in general.

>> PAUL WILSON: Thank you, thank you very much. Since we're talking about evolution, I might go right back to the beginning, though, as I mentioned before. This transition has been expected for a very long time. In fact the reason that ICANN exists at all, the reason that ICANN was set up in 1999 or so was precisely to take on and allow this transition of the stewardship of IANA from the U.S. government to the multistakeholder community. And that's important to remember that.

In fact if you go back to the documents where ICANN was proposed, the U.S. government white paper and green paper, in those documents they said that was the point of ICANN, to take this transition -- to undertake that transition. And at that time it was expected that the transition should happen in no case later than September 2000. So we're only about 15 or 16 years late in terms of actually getting this thing done. And it's fantastic for that reason that we are very close. But it's probably not really necessary to dwell on the reason why it took so long. I think in summary, to make a long story short, it's really got to do with the success of the Internet and the fact that the Internet has changed and prospered and created so much activity and in some cases tensions that ICANN had a bigger and bigger job to do in actually keeping up with the demands of that growing multistakeholder community and growing expectations. And it was a bit of a race condition between ICANN's ability to keep up with that and ICANN to have that transition take place.

So the really critical thing happened in about 2013. And it's

my view -- and it may not be shared by everyone, but I think some people agree that it was actually the Snowden revelations that sort of helped to trigger this initiative by the U.S. government to finally do it.

Because in fact as Asha said, ICANN has got absolutely nothing to do with content online. And the Snowden revelations were all about content and all about surveillance.

There was still an association that was made between what was being heard about the U.S. government's activities and the fact that the U.S. government still had its role over ICANN. I think there was an unfortunate association there that sort of tied ICANN or threatened to tie ICANN with that same brush.

I think it's in my opinion no real coincidence the U.S. government needed to sort of act in favor of ICANN and do what it had said it was going to do.

It was no surprise because in fact the ICANN, for many years prior to that, the ICANN contracts had been renewed on a periodic basis. There had been the chance for public input into the ICANN arrangements. And in fact repeatedly, many public institutions and organizations, including the regional Internet registries, had said quite plainly and openly that we were looking forward to the U.S. government actually proceeding and making this happen. So really I think no surprises anywhere in any of that. And it was just a sort of trigger that came about that I think in my opinion helped to get us over that line of finally making a commitment to that transition actually happening. It was very useful and convenient at the time that that should happen.

So look, I think ICANN has reflected fundamental principles ever since the beginning. There are many people who I think can comment on how it's done that. Sometimes I think always imperfectly as we all of us are imperfect but in a way over the years was continually improving. And that again gave the U.S. government the confidence to do what it did. But in doing that, the U.S. government also made some -- put some requirements down, some expectations that the IANA transition would continue to effectively improve ICANN and it would be done in such a way that strengthened the multistakeholder model and so forth. And we can also talk about the truth or otherwise. And I think it's true that those things have been demonstrated.

So I think if we accept that ICANN itself is perhaps imperfect but is a multistakeholder organisation and always has been, it's had this particular need to divest itself in a way or to carry IANA out of the U.S. government authority into something that is multistakeholder. And that's part of the process of continuing to improve IANA. And when that's done, ICANN will in fact be -- will have made a big step in that right direction. And at the same time, as part of that transition, there are other -- there are numerous improvements to ICANN which are being planned, which have been

achieved already, which are being planned and which will be planned yet to come in the future.

I mean we should bear in mind that ICANN's got a very long life ahead of it and a lot of room for change and improvement in response to the expectations of the community and the developing Internet and so on.

But I really do see this as a continuum of improvement in terms of compliance with some kind of ideal Internet model and expectations. I really do believe that. Thanks.

>> MS. JULIE CONG: Okay, thank you. Does somebody want to take the question?

>> So can you remind me what was the question?

>> MS. JULIE CONG: How this process from your perspective is adhering to the fundamental Internet principles?

>> Understood. I just wanted to comment quickly on the last comment that Paul has made before I answer the question. So the fact that this process itself is evolving and continuing to improve. I think this itself is very similar to how we run the critical Internet resources. So we constantly are open to, for example, like the protocol standards. Submit new standard proposals, same for the number of resources as opposed for the names. It might take a little bit long term, but again it can constantly come up with proposals to adjust to the latest situation.

And I think this is also reflected in the process of enhancing ICANN's accountability. So it didn't actually stop with the transition but there's like Phase 2, we call it work stream 2, to consider what would be the additional improvements that ICANN, as the organisation that has a strong role in relationship with the IANA function operator can do to make sure that it remains accountable to the Internet community.

So how was this transition in line with the basic spirit of the Internet and, for example, decentralization or like making sure it's open inclusive? I think the process itself really demonstrates the composition of the ICG, its representatives of different groups, including the regional diversity. Each of the operational communities that was involved in the developing the process is again very much went through the process that is in line with how these policies around these resources are developed.

And what I found most touching about the whole process was that before getting involved in this transition proposal, I was mostly engaged in the APNIC community. So the number resources in the Asia-Pacific region. But through this work, now I work very closely with the other colleagues in other regions for the number resources community as well as I had the chance to engage with the names community in ICANN as well as the IETF. So having a common theme, homework that we all had to work together, really bonded us closely. And I think it doesn't just stop here, but the relationship and the collaboration

continues. And I think that's something that we can take out of this process.

>> MS. JULIE CONG: Okay, thank you. Asha, before you answer the question, because you are a board member for ICANN, I have to like you at the same time to maybe explain because just now Paul mentioned ICANN is nothing to do with content. So can you explain to us what is the role of ICANN? What did ICANN do to make sure the whole process is, you know, going forward towards the right position, the right direction?

>> MS. ASHA HEMRAJANI: Sure. Happy to, Julie. So, to answer your specific question about ICANN's role, so in my opinion, ICANN really successfully convened a truly bottom-up multistakeholder process to find, frankly, speaking, to find a solution to a very complex and difficult issue.

In fact, both streams, the accountability stream as well as the transition stream, they were both developed by a participatory bottom-up process. So that was our role. We were a convener. We were a facilitator of both these processes.

And, frankly, speaking, those journeys along those two streams were very, very long and arduous. We had hundreds of people from businesses, from technical experts like Izumi-san, my -- Izumi-san, my esteemed colleague, people who contributed a lot of long hours. We spent more than 25 million U.S. dollars to facilitate this process. It wasn't cheap. So if you're asking about ICANN's role, especially since I'm co-Chair of the board finance committee, money is something I pay a lot of attention to. Thousands of hours. 600 phone and face-to-face meetings. 33,000 messages on mailing lists. So tension, but lots of moments of lightheartedness and cooperation and collaboration that Izumi-san just mentioned and then finally the proposals were completed in March.

And then coming back to a point you made earlier, Julie, about what happens now and what has happened since March and what's going happen going forward?

So the transition plans were delivered in March which were evaluated by the NTI, the U.S. government. And then in June released a comprehensive evaluation and found the proposals met each and every one of their very five very stringent criteria, including for instance, that the proposals must enhance the multistakeholder model of Internet Governance. It must maintain the security, stability and resilience of the Domain Name System. It should meet the needs and expectations of customers like Paul and Izumi. It should maintain the openness of the Internet. And, finally, which this wasn't a specific criteria, but it was also very clear that it didn't want to plan that would replace the NTI's role with a government-led or intergovernmental. That's not what happened here. We have a multistakeholder solution.

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: We have ccTLD you are with KISA and CNNIC. So I'd like to hear your perspective.

>> BILLY MOO-HO CHEON: I wanted to say how I see this transition process. First of all, Korean community including the government and civil society also reiterated our opinions on this. We very much welcome this process. I think it is a process that everyone involved and bottom up open and transparent manners. And the final proposal I think cast a long shadow over the trajectory of Internet Governance evolution. Because it is developed and approved by multistakeholder community, not just sole government or Internet government or organisation. And hopefully we can -- I think we are at the final stage. And hopefully we can finish this work within this year as Paul explained. Thank you.

>> HANANE BOUJEMI: As Julie mentioned, I'm representative from CNNIC community and also representative from Chinese community. So I would like to share some experience and our feeling according to my April[] to our observation.

First of all, I noticed -- Julie mentioned a word. It's called milestone. I think IANA transition has great significance. It's like a symbol. Because just as Paul mentioned, how do you say that? It's 15 years am I right? Yes. It's 15 years' work. So we can imagine that it's very difficult work to make it successful. So when we're looking for word to the coming September of this year, I think it's possible. And positive because we heard of many voice positive. And we are looking forward to IANA stewardship. So it's a milestone. It stand for the IANA will be managed by the community. And we know that Internet thrives to the community, thrives from every users. It account on every users. So I think that's the true spirit from this process. It's the first point of view.

And the second one is I want to share two words two "not only's" to describe this process.

First, it's not only one track of IANA transition because when we talk about IANA transition, we can see another two tracks related to this transition. One is the ICANN accountability reforms and the other one is the youth stone management reforms. So there are three tracks on the ICANN website to describe and updates the process to every community. And we can see that most of the works is to the end at the first stage. And next stage is the implementation of the IANA transition. And I will share the two not only -- it is not only one day and one night and one night work. So we can't say that until September every work is finished. And to the other side, in other words, we have a lot of work and we have a long way to put forward. And here I would like to share another experience because our professor and Li is stage with member. Is member. So we know that how much great works they have worked and to evaluate and combined the three proposals from three communities. And it's very difficult to do this work. And it's difficult for ICANN to do the coordination. That's this side.

But the other side is that the word can't satisfy every community.

So there is still some critical voices and there is still too much places to be improved.

So I would like to call for more attention to the community voices and comments, including the speaking parts and the region parts. Because for a Chinese community, the language is the most struggles to participating to this process. So sometimes we are good at to write it out rather than speaking it out.

>> JULIA CORNWELL McKEAN: That's true. But maybe you can leave the encouraging remarks in the later part. We will have a specific session for that.

>> That's all.

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: It looks like my panelists, they are all very satisfied with the whole process. And they think this process is complicated. And they think it's nothing about surprise. So must be in history. But we're now going to stop here. We're not going to give ICANN a 100 percent yeah everything is good. So what we are going to do now, we're going to take a closer look at the proposal to see what we have ended up with now.

So in order to reflect the recommendations contained in the proposal, in the transition proposal felt by the ICG, ICANN has to -- must incorporate and affiliate, which is called PTI, post transition IANA. And it is first designed for performing the naming-related functions, but ICANN also intends to subcontract the numbering of the protocol parameters to the PTI.

So as I know, the laws of incorporation of PTI has been released for public comment. So this may be a very, you know, sharp questions for my panelists, but I want to ask my panelists, do you think that is it appropriate that we say PTI is still fully controlled by ICANN? And what does this relation mean between PTI and ICANN?

If we say that if it is still affiliated by ICANN, what is really changed by establishing this organisation?

>> PAUL WILSON: That's a very good question. When I think back to what was being said about ICANN if there were complaints about ICANN back before the transition was announced, it was not in my mind or it was not predominantly anything operational about, for instance, the operation of the IANA. So I think given that the IANA has been operating very effectively, very successfully with very few complaints, particularly in recent years as ICANN really professionalised that operation very well, I think the priority in the transition was actually to make sure that nothing was adversely affected. Nothing was risked by the transition. So the IANA function needed to be protected and preserved.

From the numbering point of view, that was our very key requirement and our expectation and it's what we worked for, I think, in putting our inputs into the transition process.

Now, we did not particularly care, to be honest. I think it's fair to say we were not concerned with the independence of IANA from

ICANN as others were. So I'm not going to comment on why they there should be that separation.

In fact, from our point of view, the numbering point of view, we had a very clear arrangement contractually and structurally formed with ICANN since the establishment of the address supporting organisation. And that defined our relationship very, very clearly. And so for us the accountability issues and the issues of separation were not particularly front of mind at all.

What we were prepared to do, though, is seeing that there had been this proposal to create the PTI as a functionally separate entity from ICANN's policymaking and other activities. We were quite satisfied to see that as long as it also didn't threaten the stability of the IANA functions at all.

So in our mind, I think and our arrangement specifically allowed what's become apparent that this was a possibility, our proposed arrangements with ICANN would allow ICANN to subcontract to the PTI or to some other entity without actually relieving itself of the core responsibility to do what it was intended to do.

So for us, I think, the structural separation for PTI with PTI is actually useful because it makes the IANA function very clearly defined. And apart from that, and for that purpose, I think it serves well for our needs.

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: So I'd like to pull from the number community perspective by the arrangement that PTI performs IANA sufficient separation.

>> For us I think at the bottom line it would have been the same for us even if ICANN as organisation was running the IANA functions. And I guess we and also the IETF are in a little bit of different separation compared to the names community where ICANN serves as both the policy development body and the IANA function operator. Because IARs and -- are separate development body and we have the IRRs which is an independent organisation from ICANN that allows the RIRs to have the contract with ICANN.

But in any case, the basic idea is as long as we have the criteria put into the contract that will ensure what we need in the IANA function services, we don't really care whether it's like organizationally separate or it's within the ICANN. And I think it might be better to leave it to the names people who are watching the names process whether the alternative that is setting up committees within ICANN to review the IANA functions like CC or the review team would provide sufficient separation, I think that's more up to the names community to make judgment. But, again, from our perspective, the numbers perspective, I think it gives sufficient separability as well as assurance on continued stability of the other functions.

>> Yes, I think most of the operational communities where they care most is whether the service is maintained to be good, to be stable and secure. And so far we think that the mechanism is okay. But I

think for ICANN, things will be a little bit complicated because ICANN is placed in the special position. And it has to deal with so much different claims from different perspectives.

ICANN, for example, there's this claim saying that ICANN is actually placed in the powerful position. And even without oversight of the NTIA, so Asha, how do you think of this claim? And how will ICANN deal with this situation?

>> MS. ASHA HEMRAJANI: Okay, thank you. So before I get into that question, I just wanted to explain to the people in the audience who are not familiar with what PTI is. PTI stands for post transition IANA. And that is the current IANA functions department within ICANN. And that gets carved out and separately defined, as mentioned earlier.

As it is formed that way or it was. There were some parts of the community that wanted that because they wanted to protect it. So the purpose, the primary purpose was protection.

So, I have to clarify one thing. So IANA, pardon me, the PTI is separate in a sense but is also still part of ICANN. It will have its own board of directors. It will have its own bylaws that is currently out now for public comment. It'll have its own budget. In fact, that is one of the seven enshrined, seven powers of the empowered community, the ability to reject a budget if they so wish. And it will have its own audit.

And of course because we're a nonprofit organisation, we would have to merge the audits for the ICANN and the mother company and the PTI will have to be consolidated because that's a requirement. But the PTI itself will have its own audit.

So, it's just important to note that the main purpose is for the protection and for the -- because the service level agreements were so critical to the naming community. So it makes really -- it does make a lot of sense the way it's being set up.

So a lot of the documents related to the PTI are now out for public comment. So we would like to wait and see what the community has to say on the implementation work done so far.

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: Okay, thank you, so, Billy, do you think the current design, I mean the PTI and CSC and things relevant to the post transition IANA are satisfying your community? By your community I mean the ccTLD community?

>> BILLY MOO-HO CHEON: To the certain extent, yes, we are very satisfied and happy to see that. But I think still there are parts to improve.

Like, for example, I think we wanted to see more -- we wanted to make sure independence of PTI by having separate, totally separate budget.

And also hopefully we can see more -- we wanted to bring more balance. I meant by not only geographical balance but also balance between stakeholders.

So those two points I wanted to say, thank you.

>> DR. LIYUN HAN: I think we can see some counter balance of the power in the new proposal. And the ICANN new bylaws such as there are some PTI CSICFR empowered community. And the community Forum like such as this designs to enter, counter balance the power.

But I think there is need to clarify the power distribution. And every entity should play what roles in the post IANA management and governance system.

And the NTIA to perform the operational oversights, yes, the rows on the IANA. But to the CCISO community, I saw that there are only at least two representatives from the CCSIO. But do you know CCISOs have so many members. Is that proper? Or is that scientific of this system?

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: So you are posing another question. Is that the current mechanism is whether it is taking us to the right direction, the CSC, the composition, the CSS. Is it geographically diversified? And is the community benefit guaranteed in the current design?

We are studying the audience reaction.

>> Just a very special request to the panelists. We have young people in the room. And they cannot follow you. Simply because you just drop all these acronyms time and again. I mean all of you.

[Applause.]

I mean, they are out of focus. So, please, thank you.

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: I'm sorry for this. I'm like leading this talk to insider talk, I'm sorry.

So by CSC, actually we are going to come back to this part. But CSC, we're talking about customer Standing Committee, which is to go with the PTI and other independent -- the post transition IANA -- and the other independent review mechanism. All those mechanisms that is set in the proposal is supposed to bring all people, use the mechanism to make, to participate in the decisionmaking.

So back to the question. Do you think that the current mechanism is taking us to the right direction? Do you think specifically the Asia-Pacific communities benefit is fully guaranteed in the current mechanism?

We have so many newcomers. If they want to attend, if they want to participate in decision-making process, what are the channels?

>> Can he make a supplement? Just as I mentioned, it can't satisfy every community, but it needs to be revised during the process. So when we found a mistake or we found some tracks beyond the road, so we have to correct it. That's my point.

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: Open it up to anyone?

>> I think the last comment really made a good observation that if you think pragmatically, it's not possible to everybody to provide input. And I think there has been quite a bit of emphasis that stability of the function is the most important component. So I think if we want to keep this maintained at the service level of the IANA,

it's being open. It's important that we have clear criteria on what the requirements are. And I think this is already defined in place for all of the IANA functions. For example, for the number of resources, there's a contract we exchange called the SLA, service level agreement between RIRs and ICANN. And this was out for public comment. Everybody had the chance to provide feedback, even the newcomers. The same goes for the IETF exchange of memorandum of understanding between the IETF and ICANN.

In the names, correct me if I'm wrong, I think there's development of service level expectation, SLEs, that's what it's called. And I think there was a chance for public comments.

So I think there has been a chance for everybody to provide input on what would be the expectation on the service level for each of the inner functions.

Then I think the next step is to have review whether these service level is being maintained. And in case for the numbers community, we have what's called the review committee. And that's composed by the representatives from each of the regions. So including Asia-Pacific, North America, et cetera. So five regions in the world. And they are actually being basically appointed by the community, each of the communities. So perhaps not everybody would have direct chance to have a say, but then they would -- they have the people who would be representing their views. So that would be the framework for the number of resources component. I can't really comment from the IETF or the names perspective. So if there's an equivalent mechanism, it might be fair to say that while not, you know, all the members may have direct participation, but you have the chance to choose people who would represent your views.

>> MS. ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you. I wanted to echo what Izumi-San just said. One is as Izumi-San said. When ICANN puts out documents for public comment, that's exactly what it means. Public comment. So we would like very much for different sectors of the community to comment on the different documents. And there are lots of documents being put out recently. Recently we put out a lot related to the PTI. Now I'm not sure if you want to discuss Asia-Pacific now or later in the --

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: Sorry, you can give us a general picture on the situation, what are the Asia-Pacific participation in ICANN now?

>> MS. ASHA HEMRAJANI: Sure, sure. So in the previous panel there was specific mention of 26 percent participants for Asia-Pacific for the two streams that I mentioned, the accountability as well as the transition. I would challenge that number because while on one hand the figure is based on numbers. Is based on calculation of general, the number of people who have signed up to be participants and observers. It does not reflect the few situation of Asia-Pacific participation. So while we did have some members from the

Asia-Pacific community who are members of the CCWG on accountability, it wasn't a proportionate representation. It did not reflect the population of the world. India and China combined compose nearly 40 percent of the world's population. Not 40 percent of the people who participated or who contributed heavily in these two streams were from India and China. So I would personally like to see that changed going forward.

So another aspect is I'd like to see participation from all sectors of society.

So we have good representation from civil society in Asia, but we need more Asian businesses, Internet companies, Intellectual Property lawyers, ISPs, these are still very much underrepresented.

So we have Google heavily involved but not Baidu. We have Amazon who come to meetings but not rack you tan. So I'd like to see -- very much like to see Asian businesses getting involved.

So coming back to the practicalities and going forward Izumi-San or I think Paul mentioned the next phase in the accountability work. So we finished the work stream now. Now we're going to start work stream 2. And I'm very happy to say that for one of the subgroups in work stream 2, we have an Indian citizen who will be a co-rapporteur of one of the subgroups. It's the first time I think we have somebody from India who's going to be a leader in one of the subgroups. I'd like to see more of that. It really behooves all of us in this room to participate and to participate in a sustainable way. That means to continue participation beyond attending one or two meetings. Thank you.

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: I will have Paul first and Liyun because you have for us some remarks regarding the participation. Thank you.

>> PAUL WILSON: I think this whole process has had sort of two different tracks going on all the time. And this is sort of typical of ICANN, I think, and of many things. You've got the substance on one hand in what we're concretely doing, as Julie has asked. What we're concretely doing about the new IANA model, the new ICANN model, what's the transition going to involve? What's coming.

And then we've got separately how it's being done.

And I think the participation question is really, really important and it falls into the second category.

In my mind I think what we have with the IANA transition is an extremely successful transition that has brought us to a certain point that was minimally described, being the transition of stewardship. So we've got to this point.

We have also, I understand, set ourselves up so that ICANN can go on evolving in the future. And that was the whole point of distinguishing between work stream 1 and work stream 2. Work stream 1 of things that happen before the transition. And work stream 2 is happening after the transition.

And naturally you've got to have the conditions at the time of

transition to allow work stream 2 to actually happen. We couldn't lock ICANN into a state at the point of transition where nothing could change. No one would have accepted that.

So we actually have set ICANN up, I believe, to actually be able to evolve in the future. So the work stream 2 work can happen without, I hope, the urgency that seems to be given at the moment because, I mean, these things can take time. And some of them need to take time to come to the right solution.

These things can happen. I think that was the point of the -- all the work that's been done. To set ICANN up so that the community powers and everything else evolve in the future wherever it needs to go.

So the second question is about participation. I think that's really important because ICANN is not going to go in the right direction with the full support of the community unless people can participate.

And ICANN is very good, as we all are, of setting up a framework that allows the participation and where no one is excluded, but that's very different from actually having people participate and having people include themselves. And that's going to need a lot of work. And I think participation is one thing. But we need to build capacity to participate. And we need to do that very deliberately so that ICANN, being set up now to change and evolve into the future, will do that in response to what the participants, the active participants from all over the world, including the centres of higher population really want to happen to ICANN and where they want ICANN to go.

So, yeah, I'd say we're sort of moving from a point now, I hope, of talking about a lot of detail and really having to nod out and to define and refine a model that is very nearly complete now. We're moving in to a point where I think we can really talk about capacity building and how that model is going to actually evolve in the future. I'd like it to be about capacity building now, if not now then as soon as possible after the transition actually succeeds and happens the 30th of September. Thanks.

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: I think -- first and then Izumi. And then we'll start the QA session.

>> DR. LIYUN HAN: Okay, as regards to the community participation and involvement, I think in the post IANA area, IANA is our common responsibility.

So we have to think about how to improve our own capacity to contribute to IANA's works, especially for AP region participation. So that's what we are going to think about that.

And another point is I agree with Asha's point. There are many technical communities and civil societies' representatives. But ICANN lacks the representative from the private sector. But I think the reason, one of the important reasons is there is no interest, there is no clear interest to attract them to be involved.

So maybe next work is to make the interest clear and to attract

them in ICANN. Yeah, that's my point. Thank you.

>> MS. IZUMI OKUTANI: So I'd like to strongly mention what Paul said and the process that's still working but I'd like to make a very quick in how we have contributed in this IANA transition process, what we've learned from there and then what we can actually consider in continuing providing input to the ICANN community from the apac region.

So first, I'm pretty proud of our region about the level of participation in the whole process. We're generally seen as quite quiet when it comes to the global discussions. But when you actually look at the numbers of contributions that was made from our region, it was roughly around 20 percent. That was not like not substantial but compared to other topics, it was quite a bit of contributions. And I think it helped a lot that there was opportunity for written submission. So I think there was a lot of contribution from India, China and also from Japan. And I think that each of these key community leaders also reached out to their respective communities to make sure that they submit comments. So this kind of like outreach works.

But there are remaining challenges I think as Asha has observed that throughout the discussions and the process, the voices in the realtime discussions from the APAC, if you just exclude the Australia and New Zealand, it was very limited. I think there was not many voices being heard.

And to address exactly this kind of issue, there's a group within ICANN accountability work that is to be continued on diversity. How to actually incorporate feedback from regional diversity or stakeholder diversity? And I think this is an area that maybe you will be able to contribute and share your views. And it's often quite challenging to maybe speak out, but you're able to make comments on the mailing list or during the call there's a chance for chat, so you can actually type in your comments if you're not comfortable to speak out verbally.

And I think I observed that this is actually my first participation at the APrIGF and not the global one. But I find it often said that Asians are really shy or they don't express opinions, but many of the sessions I observe many active discussions. There were perspectives being shared that is really not much shared in the global discussions. And I think that there really is a way that we can contribute. So certainly this subgroup within diversity is one of the areas that we may be able to contribute and try to make it easier for us to have a say at the ICANN community.

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: Okay, thank you, Izumi.

This is also my first time APrIGF and moderating. I'm trying to be a master of time. Thank you our panelists for giving us a very good overview of different perspectives about the transition. And now we want to hear from you, our audience. And you can have questions, you can have comments of any thoughts. So let's open the Q & A session.

I would like to hear from you. You will be the first and then.

>> Hi, very interesting again. I'm Leonid, I'm from Russia but I work for Asia-Pacific top domain association. And I've been watching these young people doing some notes. And there are very few of them because obviously the topic is really, I mean the subject matter is really complex. Let me offer some unorthodox perspective on these things so that you better understand it because for some indeed it may seem very complicated. I will take three minutes no more. So IANA function. Very simple. When there are some changes into what's so-called the root zone, someone should take the change and then ask the U.S. government is it okay? And the U.S. government would say yes, that's okay. Go ahead. So that's all about IANA function. Simple clerical function. No more than that. It was emphasized many times.

Yet, the process was colored with bitter ironies. Indeed it started with Snowden's revelations. Now Edward Snowden is in Russia where new laws restrict Internet freedoms and the rights, the users' rights are being adopted. And Edward Snowden cannot move out of Russia. So he swallows hard all these.

He started that, he's got it. The payoff is there.

Now after Snowden, the idea was to move ICANN from the United States out of the ICANN -- U.S. jurisdiction to some other jurisdiction. And to do that IANA transition.

The first point was dropped. No talk about ICANN moving out of the United States. More than that, in the U.S. Congress is question is always asked during public hearings, so can you assure that ICANN stays in the United States? And the answer is yes, no doubt.

Then certain requirements were set for the ICANN community to do that IANA transitions who set that? That was the U.S. government which probably has every right, had every right to do that because they were in let's say in control of that IANA.

So the bitter irony is that the ICANN multistakeholder community had to follow, thank God, good criteria, not bad criteria, but imposed by some government. That's also an irony.

So in the process, it was mentioned that \$25 million was spent on the IANA transition. Who's got the biggest chunk? Who was the beneficiary so far? Who has been the beneficiary? The beneficiary was the major beneficiary was U.S. lawyers. They got \$13 million. Now, the question is how much the technical part of IANA consumed? \$0.1 million. \$100,000. That's the technical function costs so far. Funny, isn't it? Now, the good advice for the board, of course, for any board: Do not wake up sleeping demons because in the process, we did realise that the ICANN board was not perfect, was not accountable, was not transparent enough. While ICANN board just realized that well, probably they were not legitimate enough because they even accused the community that the community was not legitimate enough to pose all these awkward questions to the board. That was

also interesting.

Now, finally, when we just about to trumpet victory, the Republicans who right now challenge each and every aspect of IANA transition, put that very strong political statement saying that IANA should be retained as the U.S. property. In that Republican Party's programme and that would probably be reflected in Donald Trump's presidential stance on the issue.

So I mean the future is not guaranteed for IANA transition as far as I understand it. I mean the U.S. process.

And, finally, of course, both IANA, I'm sorry, ICANN and IANA and post IANA transition structures remain a U.S. residence. And they remain in U.S. jurisdiction subject to the U.S. law. And yet there is yet another company that is Verisign because IANA is clerical function but Verisign is actually the operator of the measure function, that root zone operations. So Verisign has been awarded that contract for how many years ahead of us? Four, six years? I don't remember that.

So, anyway, another U.S. corporation got that contract to do all the work, the core work. So which means that the situation is far from being perfect. Yes, IANA is just the first minor step. It was a good test bad for the multistakeholder community but we should not be misled by these first initial success. And there are many, many other obstacles ahead of us. And that's probably for you guys, that it took 15 years for the community and another 25 years for you. So make notes. Make sure that you got a lot of accepts out of these sessions and some other sessions. Thank you.

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: Thank you, Leo. I thank you very much for taking the responsibility to try and explain the IANA transition. I think you are making it even complicated by dragging in the jurisdiction issues, political issues. So newcomers, I recommend that back to school you can continue this research on this topic, you will find it very interesting.

>> Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Jerome. I work for ICANN. And I lead the Asia-Pacific hub we call it the Asia-Pacific region. Those of you who were here yesterday, you know we support very strongly to try to build capacity for the Asia-Pacific stakeholder so that you can participate more actively and also be able to contribute to the region's Internet Governance as well as globally.

So, coming back to this, thanks a lot, Leonid for your points. I'm also going to refer to our newcomers specifically and specifically on the point about contribution and participation. So some points were already made about our culture, we're very quiet. If I disagree with you, we don't say "I disagree with you" in this room. After we finish the meeting, I will come and talk to you and say "hey, I think I disagree on your point. Maybe we should work on something else." Come back to the meeting room and then everything is more or less

we do not disagree directly in front of each other.

That is our Asian culture. Not all of us are like that, especially for the next generation. So for newcomers, I know some of you are a lot more outspoken compared to people like me. And that is actually good for us going forward because when as a region we go to the international platform, it is where -- all the action happens within the room. So if you disagree on a certain point, you want to raise it, you want to make your voice heard, you are representing yourself in a way, you are also representing your region.

Now, coming back to the point about the IANA transition process and we talked about 20 percent participation and contribution came from the Asia-Pacific region. I want to point back to something: Why is this number so high for Asia-Pacific when typically we always say, you know, our Asia-Pacific region is not well-represented. We do have many participants.

I want to give credit to people on the panel, especially like Paul Wilson and Izumi. They don't have -- there's no Ned for them to do anything more except for like lead the team and have discussion. But they did a lot more than that. In their own capacities at work, they made sure that whole communities actually know what's happening. They help to spread the word. Help to tell the community members why is the INS stewardship transition so important?

Now, what is in it for them to do this? Nobody's paying them extra money to do it. We spent \$20 million on it, all of them to U.S., half of it went to U.S. lawyers. ICANN didn't pay Izumi extra money for them to represent their community to tell them about how important this topic is.

Likewise, for like the Chinese community, we have certain in ICG on the IANA coordination group, ICANN also did not pay them extra money to do this. But why are they representing their community? To share and to go out and tell people about it. Because it is so important a topic that they feel the rest of their community needs to know.

And why I'm stressing so much paying so much attention and time on this is because this is exactly what the multistakeholder model is. When you have a topic so important to you that you know that your community needs to know, that they took a step outside of their comfort zone to go and share the word about why this is important. Why we should discuss this. And give me any -- if you don't want to participate, fine, but if you have any views, share it with me. I can help to convey those views for you.

So well within the room some of us are regular faces, but for the newcomers, I hope that this example would help to also give you a little bit of insight into how you can participate in the multistakeholder approach in Internet Governance because many of us would think "oh, I'm just one person and I don't represent a big company like Google or Microsoft. I don't have many resources behind me."

But when the issue is important enough for you, you know that within the multistakeholder model, your voice will be heard. But if you were at another platform where it is not a multistakeholder model, your voice may not be heard at all. I hope we can encourage you and work with you. From my office we try very hard to help people understand the issues that's happening within ICANN and within the entire Asia-Pacific region, we hope to work with different partners to help people understand about the model. And it's really where we can try to get more people to understand how the multistakeholder model works and work with you so that in the future, you can represent us within the region and help to shape the Internet in the future. So that's really the point I want to make. Thank you.

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: Thank you, Jerome. Any other questions or comments?

>> Thanks. I'm Rod from the Internet Society. Actually, it's not a question or comment. More request. I'd like to hear from the young people in the room. You just heard from various people all the jargons and Leonid's very passionate comment, as well.

First question for you guys? What do you know about the process that took place? Were you aware of it? And do you care?

And, two, how do you see, from what you've heard the panelists speak today, do you feel you want to be involved in the process going forward? So two questions, perhaps. Love to hear from you guys. Thanks.

[Applause.]

>> So first I introduce myself. I'm Amo. Actually I'm not from the AP region. But today I represent the AP region, Taiwan. I'm from an African country. Burkina Faso.

To be honest, I heard about at least ICANN/IANA because I'm computer science student. So should at least know something about it. But IANA transition and all those things, it was a bit complicated and the U.S. government and, yeah, didn't really know exactly who owns what and who founded what. I didn't really know. So I had to make some quick research. So when you make quick research, you cannot be ready for everything.

But for today, idea I had for the panel, I had the feeling that it was one side of the story you wanted to show. Because I wanted to ask a question actually about what kind of difficulties they have because they all said that, yes, it's going well, yes, good, but what is making things difficult? Why is it taking time? And if it's good, then it should be quick. It's like technically I feel it's easy. It's said it's simple. But why the process is really difficult? So maybe talking about difficulties may help us understand why is it important? This is the feeling I had.

So I'm sure that when I go back, I will check more about the information because actually what you said is really interesting. So for my part, I am really glad to be here and to know what I know

today. Thank you.

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: Okay, thank you. I think the Taiwan representative is making a fair point. Does any panelist?

>> MS. ASHA HEMRAJANI: So I had lunch with that young gentleman from the Burkina Faso. It's the white elephant in the room. It's the question maybe everyone would have but you're the one brave enough to ask it.

It has been long and it hasn't been an easy journey because we're talking about establishing a new relationship.

If you ask the question what does the stewardship relationship really change? First is the governance tie with the U.S. government is cut. Second is the community gets enhanced powers. The stewardship is transitioning to the community. So we're going from a stable relationship to a new relationship. Any new relationship, it needs to be nurtured. So there would be some issues but going forward I think a lot of my fellow members on the board -- and I don't spec on their behalf, I only speak on my behalf, but we do feel that these issues can collaboratively resolved. This isn't an exercise in multistakeholderism itself. And I think it has been successful. But it has taken long because of these big changes that we're making now.

And you asked the question why is it important? I mean it's important because the next billion users will not come from where the first 3 billion users come from. They will come from your country. They will come from the rest of Asia-Pacific. They will come from China, India, Africa. So your influence is more important than ever before. And I can only say how grateful I am to people like Izumi-San and Paul because of the hard work they put into the transition and the accountability work because really your legacy is something that my children, my son and the children of everyone here will be appreciative of. So that's why it's important. That's why it's important that all our voices are heard. I hope I addressed your questions. Thank you.

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: Okay. Let me take the last question from this gentleman over there. Hello? I noticed you have, okay.

>> This is from Akev from Pakistan. I'm a fellow.

During the debate -- thank you very much for this interesting debate on this very important topic of IANA transitions. I have been following this transition process and updates about it because I have been an ICANN fellow a couple of times. I've been reading about this, at least two of the experts here in the room mentioned it was because of the Snowden revelations which give rise to the need for IANA transition or something.

But when we see Congressional research papers or some U.S. government announcements, they say no, it is the continuation of our policies. In 1999 we announced that at some point in time in the future, we will actually transition it to the community, out to the global

multistakeholder model.

On the other hand, there have been attempts from different countries like the great firewall of China, the right to be forgotten from European Union, or the attempt by the Russian government to create a unit or the what AI from the Iranian government. Some thought it was the push that was created because of those attempts.

So what exactly do you experts on IANA transition think was the real reason behind this IANA transition?

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: Anyone on the panel wants to respond to this question?

[Laughter]

Okay. Off stage. Okay.

>> Thank you. I can answer this. Essentially when -- this has a little bit of history. Let me give two minutes of the history. The IANA function. So the function that Leonid has helped to describe, it was handled by one person and his name was Jon Postel. What he did was he had this very little notebook. And whoever from which IP address who owns which IP address, he would write it down in his notebook. And who owns what domain name he write it on his notebook. It started from very simple connection of my university network with your university network. So it was very simple. It was two, three people.

Over time this thing grew until it was so big. No one envisioned the Internet to be what it is at the time. Those who joined yesterday's session led by Paul, the IPv4 system address that we have has 4 billion addresses. At the time when it was quote unquote invented, people thought 4 billion? No, it's really a lot. We should have it forever. And then we realized oh my God, we have run out now. We need much more than that.

So it was the same, a little bit of that kind of mindset at the time.

Then when the Jon Postel who was also called VIANA, that was his nickname, e could not handle this job in his notebook anymore, there was a need to establish an organisation to do this. So the U.S. government established ICANN, a not-for-profit organization, to manage this function. They could very well have decided no, Department of Commerce, you do this function and it's a government function, but they didn't. The white paper on ICANN specifically said a not for private organisation would manage this function so is not politicized. And more importantly, the white paper also says that ICANN would eventually be completely privatised. In other words, it would have no contract with the U.S. government whatsoever.

So that contract that we are delinking now within the INS transition is the contract that was already stated in ICANN's inception would be removed, just that the question of the process was when.

So as many of the people have spoken, this process is 15 years,

was 15 years in the making and plus the two years' discussion, we are close to that process, end of that process now. But even then I would say we are actually at the start of it because having that transition done is only the start because we have to implement all these things. We have to test to see whether the proposals actually work in implementation. There will be some kinks we need to iron out as we go along. But it's a process that we are all in together. We started the process which allows for the global community to govern ICANN as compared to the contract that we had.

So really it was already envisioned at the start. The question was really when could we do it? And I think that this timeframe hindsight's always 20/20. In this timeframe, ICANN needed that timeframe. We needed the long 15 years to be more professional, to be more structured. We needed the 15 years to also see the multistakeholder community, how they actually managed to shape ICANN and let it grow the way it did. And so that I would say this is really the main reason rather than saying that the Snowden revelations is a cause for it, although different people would say that it could be one of the triggering factors. This as ICANN stuff, I cannot comment on that. But I'm always open to different opinions. So I think we should just accept what people think. Thank you very much.

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: Thank you. I was told by my colleague there is one more question I didn't see.

>> Not a question. I represent one community. I was crying. We are government.

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: Yes. We didn't mention.

>> 30 seconds I need to make. So we are involved since day one the same as the other communities. I make a long story short. We make the elephant dance. So is that easy? Just in short you ask what government is dealing with, it is only delegation. That is the only thing. We are dealing with time. I work to communicate in the past 15 years that's the only thing we have, a role. As a sovereign country, we need to help to say yeah, they run the country codes. And if they're not doing, take them out. That's the only thing we're dealing with.

We have representative in CSC, blah, blah, blah. There are a lot of questions. And government is there. And we're willing to change. We adopt a lot of things and not go into details. But we also have to work as much as what communities and we also need to change a lot. And government that you belong to are working in this as well and helping to whatever we can help the community to make this thing happen. I'd like to have the last word that whatever is for me personally I don't care. The journey is more important. The way that this the committee work together. We sit down greeting in the hall. Used to be in the case of GAC. We don't talk to anyone. We have our own way of working now. I think we get to know each other at least that's what's more important and that benefit I see now, no matter what is sent to us. Not important to me anymore. Thank

you.

[CHEERS AND APPLAUSE]

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: Thank you very much. I'm very happy that we start from the practical questions from the current situations and then go back to some kind of history and trying to make this session a very comprehensive one.

And this is the last session in this room and the room is not taken. So I will take the privilege of this to ask for like four or five minutes to give my panelists the last chance to offer a conclusion remark. Anything you want to say about the session on the topic? Okay from Paul.

>> PAUL WILSON: Well, it's a bit of a surprise I thought we were ending.

[Laughter]

The point I made before is that as they say the perfect is the enemy of the good. We really have achieved a lot up to this point. And hopefully that will be recognized and we will get to the end of September where the new ICANN will be born. The transition will be born where hopefully in all respects or almost all respects ICANN will be an improved organisation. It will be better functioning. More transparent. Nor accountable. More able to be adapted and evolved in the future. And more open for participation. And as I said before, being open to participation doesn't mean the people actually have the capacity to participate. So I really hope that's going to be an on going priority because ICANN will need the help of all of us and in particular the next generation of ICANN goers. So please stay tuned and take your opportunities. Thanks.

>> MS. IZUMI OKUTANI: So let's keep on. I want to echo the last comment from the floor. There's a lot we learned from the process itself while the actual development of the proposal is over.

And I wouldn't really say that it would be applicable to any Internet Governance-related issues. But then if there's anything that we can actually learn from the process, this really was the first time that the three of the operational communities: ICANN IETF and IRF have worked together jointly. And if there is another you that needs collaboration buy different stakeholders, there may be something that we can actually learn from hue we did it that might need a bit of adjustment depending upon the type of issue and things like this, but I think this is something that we can keep in mind. Thanks.

>> MS. ASHA HEMRAJANI: So a few concluding remarks. I think this whole exercise has been successful albeit tough exercise in the multistakeholder, using multistakeholder principles. So ICANN is definitely fully committed to the multistakeholder process.

In relation to the questions or the comments made about what was the true trigger? I think this is very much been something in the making for a long time, from the 90s, from the Clinton

Administration when they decided that the Internet stewardship of the IANA functions should be transitioned. So this is not something new but it's taken us a while.

And the proposal has been completed by a group of people, very dedicated, hard working. And all of their efforts have been highly appreciated and has been completed, submitted to the NTIA and they have checked it. Basically it checks all the boxes and all the criteria that they laid out in the beginning. So we are now moving heading towards September. And heading towards the time when the transition will happen. And there will be the birth of a new era. Thank you.

>> BILLY MOO-HO CHEON: After participating as panel, I also learned a lot of things from other panelists and also enjoyed questions from audience. And I think it has been a lot of work from ICANN staff and also Paul and Izumi volunteered. So we spend a lot of money and time. And I feel I took your work.

But I see more work is waiting for after transition. Like how we bring balance for the PTI and other committees inside the PTI. And if I go back, I will try to make the Korean community get more involved in this process. Thanks.

>> LIYUM HAN: Okay. Many thanks for the workshop. And couple question and comments about expectation.

The first question is how to promote every stakeholder play their irreplaceable and unique roles in the post IANA area?

And the second question is how to promote the AP region play the irreplaceable and unique roles?

And the final expectation is: How to promote our future participation? And the capacity building is a package project, including the present capacity building and including the potential capacity building just for the use participation. Because you are the future of our work. Thank you.

[Applause.]

>> MS. JULIE CONG ZHU: Okay, thank you very much. For our newcomers, if you see the eagerness in the eyes of our panelists to have you in this discussion, go back to school and find the website of ICANN. Find some problems and flaws. Do not be confused with the positive tone and they are exciting here. Find some flaws and questions.

So I will call it an end for the session. Thank you again for panelists and audience. Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

This is being provided in a rough-draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in Order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

* * *