

FINISHED FILE

ASIA PACIFIC INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM  
EVOLUTION OF INTERNET GOVERNANCE:  
EMPOWERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT  
MACAO 2015  
03 JULY 2015  
N HALL  
9:00  
SESSION 26  
APILP DAY 3  
EMERGING ISSUES  
IANA STEWARDSHIP TRANSITION DISCUSSION

Services provided by:

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

\*\*\*

This text 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.

\*\*\*

Live captioning at APrIGF Macao 2015 is brought to you by  
the Internet Society

>> KELVIN WONG: Hi. Good morning. Welcome back.

Hi. Good morning everyone. Welcome back and thank you for  
joining us in this last session for APILP, which is the Asia  
Pacific Internet Leadership Program. Today we will go through  
the fundamentals and background of the ICANN accountability  
issues. That will take the first 45 minutes. And then we can  
have some Q and A pertaining to the presentation. And after  
that, we have another 45 minutes for us to discuss the details  
or updates of the IANA transition.

Without further ado I'll welcome Kuo-Wei Wu. He is on the  
ICANN board and he is also, well, probably one of the best  
persons in this room to discuss about this topic, because he is  
also a liaison to ICG. Let's welcome Kuo-Wei Wu to this  
presentation.

(Applause)

>> KUO-WEI WU: Thank you very much. Actually, there is another person who is much better to make this presentation. Paul Wilson. He is an ICG member.

And the first rule is this slide is actually given by the ICANN. And I tried to add a little bit to better explain for the people who doesn't really understand what the IANA function is.

So in some ways I will skip it because it's a little bit kind of -- it's not -- it's uncertain at this moment.

And if anyone, you want to ask a question, you have two languages you can use, one is English and one is Chinese. Of course, if you want to ask in the Cantonese I can ask them to help.

Okay. Let me start it. I think -- first of all, I have to thank Paul Wilson also and Peng Hwa, too, for the presentations in the last two days. Because Paul give you a little bit background of what is the number name stuff and Peng Hwa was talking about IANA and the Internet governance and mentioned a bit about the IANA transition and the IANA position.

So this is a task from ICANN. The next one is more important and actually, it's given by Paul Wilson.

First of all, you have to understand what is the IANA function so you know what kind of the IANA transition means.

So if you look at this one, it's very simple. It explains that IANA, actually, the function including the Protocol, the number and the name. Sometimes we call it DNS root zone management. I think for many of you, if you don't know, don't understand this term, in the following part, actually, I just copied from the IANA blog to show you what it means. First of all, this is the IANA home page. If you look at that, it tells you basically including the domain name, number resources, and Protocol assignments. You see it's talking about the Protocol registry and how to apply for the assignment and time zone database. And the number of resources you see, it's IP address and DSN number. And then of course the last one is domain name. It's a couple of things. One is the management and the database of the Top Level Domain in the dot INT registry. And the IDN practices.

And we can go a little bit deeper and so you have a much better idea what does that mean. First of all, you can see that this is the Protocol registrar. You can see over here it's called IFC a certain number. You can see from the certified city up to the 6320. What does that mean? Actually, every change or modification in the IANA operation has to have an IFC or a guideline or guide with the principle to do. So if you remember in the last two days, I keep telling people the IANA looks like a book office. Because all the policies, all the

operation procedures is not defined by the IANA office. Like the server procedure comes from IFC. And you may ask who is doing the IFCs? Basically, it's from the IETF. So sometimes we say the Internet standard, Internet Protocol, basically, IETF is the main institution. And if you want to know more details about the IETF, you can go to IETF.org or something like that. You can go and understand what is the IETF doing. And if I try to use a much easier way to understand what they are doing, it's an Internet standard. So any kind of Internet, we are talking about SNA, a lot of DNS assignments, that is always, always, the standard comes from the IETF. So there is a reason why I think IETF is a standards institution.

But also it's a very interesting, IETF actually is not -- legally, you don't find it's a registration company or institution. It's just a group. A group of people to define the factors. But somehow all the Internet Protocol is always comes from the IETF.

Okay. So the next one I show you the number resources, actually Paul already did it yesterday. And I'd just like to show you a little bit maybe Paul already maybe explained.

The number resources, basically you have a regional Internet registry that you can see. We have ARIN. And then RIPE NCC is including Europe. But it's kind of interesting, it's the Middle East is also part of the RIPE NCC. It's twisted. Supposedly we thought about the Middle East is part of the Asia Pacific. But the Internet number allocation belongs to the RIPE NCC.

And you can see the last one is Latin America. You can see that it even goes up to the Mexico. Mexico also belongs to the LACNIC. And then there is AFRINIC and then we have APNIC and Paul Wilson is here.

And now you can see further what is IANA doing related, corresponding to the APNIC. Here you can see that.

I just tapped the IPv4 as an example. Okay, actually, I explained to you actually IANA, in the number resources, is actually doing a couple of things. IPv4 and IPv6 and also a number.

I took this as an example for you, because IPv4 basically total IPv4 is 256 is slash 8. Sometimes we call it 256 class 8 space.

And for IANA, the relation with the IR basically says every time he allocates at least one slash 8 to one region. And if you want to know which block of the slash 8 is assigned to which IR, you actually can go to the IANA table. You can see that. It tells you, like for example this one, like 001, that's assigned to the APNIC. And 002 is assigned to the RIPE NCC. And you can see that that is 005, assigned to the RIPENCC.

But you also see kind of interesting is over here, it tells you this is a legacy. What means is legacy? Legacy means before -- before the IR is kind of the well-defined, many of the institutions actually allocate agents directly from IANA. And for example when I'm working for the super commune centre in Taiwan. We have actually I think it's one big class director that would rent us a legacy space. So you see some of the space is actually co-legacy. For example, 004 is go to level 3 and this is a go to some other company. So you can see there is a legacy. So you can see what I'm saying. It's a bookkeeping. That is because IANA always -- which block of the slash 8 is assigned to which IR? Keep the record over here.

And you might be asking then if this -- if this block is assigned to APNIC. What after the APNIC, for example APNIC assigned to the IR or the local ISP? Those tables, you can go to the APNIC to see. Because APNIC has a way of checking how many agents are assigned to which institution. But IANA only shows here. It only shows the slash 8.

And then the next one is the name. A lot of people are asking about what is the IANA name doing? And in here, the most important, actually, it's called loop zone database. You can see that like this one is, you know, what is -- we call top label domain name. For example, you see the two character code, basically two character code is called a country code. All the two character code is based on the country code and it's defined by the IFC. It's called using the ISO 3166 as a table. And if you see some of the -- the loop zone is sometimes called a genetic top label domain name. Actually, most of those top label domain names have a contract with ICANN. We have a new GDE that just opened. You can see here is a whole listing. It will tell you, for example, this one is a genetic, and then that AC is a two character code. So it's a country code. And it tells you who is the sponsor organization. So dot AC is the network information centre. You know, in here. And let me go even deeper a little bit for you to understand what is the meaning here.

Macau. That is a dot MO. It's a two character code is Macau. And then in the information it tells you who is the sponsor organization, and there is a dot MO. And the Administrator, the contact person, phone number, address, e-mail, whatever. And then also it tells you who would be the technical contact. And then the following is called a number server. Name server.

A name server, what does that mean? It tells you, basically, that the domain name is linked to the IP address and whether it's IPv4 or IPv6. And so this is what is IANA doing. So you have a much better idea of what is meant by Protocol.

What does it mean, it's a number. What does it mean, it's a name.

And now we -- before, you know, after we really understand what is IANA function, and then we can go on, begin to talk about, you know, why we are talking about IANA transition.

Before that, actually, this is kind of the ICANN standard material. I try continuing you the multistakeholder mechanisms. But I think the most important, I think Peng Hwa in the first day explained to you why the people are talking about the IANA transition. Because IANA, the ownership at the moment is the US Government Department of Commerce. And who is doing the operation is ICANN doing the operation. And how -- why the ICANN was chosen to be the IANA operator? Because ICANN goes to the NTIA IFC and go to the big contract. And of course the US Government goes through their legal process and now they say okay, ICANN is an IANA operator. And you might be thought about this, then how much money we will receive the US Government? I tell you, zero. It's kind of interesting, you bid the process but you have to use your own resources to run the IANA operation. It's zero money.

And then when we are talking about the IANA transition, it's because I think -- I think that Peng Hwa mentioned about it. In 1998, when people were arguing about who owned the Internet, who should run the Internet, and then at that stage a lot of people argued and said I think it was a separate proposal, you might know. Some of the proposals say we should have an International organization in Geneva to run the Internet IANA function or something like that. But somehow the US Government don't agree. And then somehow the US Government in 1998, they come out of the White House saying we tried to compromise with the International argument and we would like to name ICANN as an International institution. And how they define International, the ICANN bylaws say we will guarantee you the top board will come from five continents. And each continent, you can't have more than five board members. So they call this kind of the continent balance.

And then the next thing of course then, now, the situation is the interesting thing is the US Government says okay, the IANA is a structure doing that, then how we do it is the ICANN can register as a number in California. And of course that was not really satisfied by the International society, because they say well, even this way, this means that ICANN is a U.S. California company or institution.

And so this structure actually, if you go back to the early days in the 1998 or a lot of the debate, how to make the ICANN really kind of the Internationalized field that the people expect. And I think many people started to participate in the

ICANN activity in 1998. I think many of you remember, actually, the US Government gave funding to -- I don't know who gave the funding. But anyway, the Harvard law school came out and helping ICANN to work on the bylaws.

And the person doing these bylaws is a law Professor, Rolan Lethic. It's a constitution. The bylaw is kind of the constitution of ICANN.

And so Rolan laid out, this is called the multistakeholder, it was in 1998. And eventually the US Government said okay, now we have the ICANN as a mechanism and we fulfill what the people expect. This is Internationalized. Okay.

And since this is called multistakeholder, then you have to define what does a stakeholder mean? In the case, then you can see that they say okay, we have large and small businesses. We have a technical community. We have Civil Society, we have Government. We have researcher and academic and also the end-user. So this is -- they call it multistakeholder. And these multistakeholder, later on you can see how the ICANN is laid out, the structural layout.

So you see a lot of people here, Academic, here are Internet Users, Civil Society, you know, Domain Name Industry, Technical, Business and Government, and Government Organization, for example. OECD. I remember in the very first time, the ICANN first meeting, actually, in Singapore. And the ITU, EU, and OECD had a representative in the GAC.

Okay. And how this is structured? Then you can see that in the domain industry, a domain industry is not a single industry. You can see many different kinds of characters and also the businesses are different.

The first one is registry, the second one is registrar and another one is domain name organization. Maybe a lot of people don't understand what does it mean, registry and registrar. Actually, when this structure was established, it separated out the domain industry and registry and registrar actually in the very early days, because one company dominated the industry called Verisign. And they also sell the name director user. And the business or the people claim that is a monopoly. So they want to split the registry and registrar. So the Verisign cannot be a monopoly of this whole industry. So in that case they created a so-called registry and the registrar and then the domain name.

Technical, you can see that technical is included in the Protocol, developer, and then equipment companies, Cisco, whatever, and Gluco. And then they were operators. You know, many of the operator, including the cable operators and the technical researchers.

And Civil Society included the nongovernmental

organizations, nonprofit, noncommercial and think tank and charity also were in there.

And then the academic, you can see there are many different kinds of people. And after that, then they started to reorg this one into the ICANN structures. So now the question is, you know, in the last year, I think the last year, because a lot of pressure from the International community expect the US Government should not have the privilege to own IANA alone. The US Government should release the ownership or the privilege to share the power to the International community.

So the US Government, in 2014, last year, the US Government announced their intent to move the ownership to the multistakeholder mechanism. And here because ICANN is an IANA operator. So they asked the ICANN to, you know, convince the global stakeholder to develop a proposal. And the multistakeholder mechanism, the multistakeholder mechanism is, you know, they need to set up the policy, implemented in ICANN in the last 15 years.

And the US Government made announcements, saying, you know, they tried to make this the final phase of the privatization of the DNS, and that is ICANN was asked to facilitate -- to serve as a facilitator.

Okay. And then why does this matter to the Civil Society? You know, I think the people begin to think about is ICANN, does it have accountability issues? Is the ICANN accountability so-called US centric? And so they want to make sure that the ICANN really does the right thing and really do, in this couple days, we are talking about it's a public interest. And it's not only for the US people. It should be a global, through the global, to do the right thing in the global public interest.

And then the transition requirements set by the US Government. You can see that the US Government laid out some of the requirements. For example, you see the transition should go to, you know, the support and the thematic stakeholder model. That means the future IANA trends should only transit to a body which only maintains the multistakeholder model.

The second thing, they say maintain the security or stability or the resilience of the Internet DNS. That means that we cannot make the Internet insecure or unstable. Because I think everybody knows the Internet right now is almost a work for all of us, or even the businessman or us, a single user. If the Internet is stable or the security has a problem, then I think we all get hurt. So there is a second condition that the US Government said.

And number three, they said there is a need of expectation of the global partner for the IANA services. What does that mean? IANA serves several times, serve to the community, serve

to the domain name community, also, the user.

And then there is a U.S. Government position is you have to make sure the Internet is open. You cannot, for example, you cannot fragment, allow fragmentation to happen. You have to make sure that the Internet is one Internet, its openness.

And also, of course, NTIA also specifies very interesting and some people are arguing about it. They say NTIA also specifies that they would not accept a proposal that replaces the NTIA role with a Government deed or International organization. This cannot be accepted. This means, for example, this is in my personal capacity, not representing ICANN. For example, for a long time there was a debate. The ICANN function should move to the ITU. And based on this statement, the US Government and NTIA says of course you cannot go to the ITU because ITU is an International organization. Something like that.

So this is the US statement, the basic requirements.

And then the US Government also said two things you need to do before the IANA transition. Two things you have to do. The first one, actually, is talking about IANA. IANA still is transition. Okay. The second one is actually called ICANN accountabilities. So these two proposals have to go to the NTIA at the same time. And with at least two proposals came to the NTIA, NTIA would start the US Government procedure to make the IANA transition. If any one of the proposals is missing, then they would say, from the US government point of view, they say this is not complete. So it's not only the IANA proposal needs to meet. At the same time, you have to enhance the ICANN accountability. So over here, then, you can see they form two groups, you would see that.

For example, the first group, in the IANA still in transition, the first group is called ICG. You know. And I'm the liaison from ICANN and Paul Wilson is a member from the -- is a member in the ICG member. Here, voting right, I don't have a voting right. And I only can request for information and I cannot make a judgment or something like that.

And the next thing is the enhanced accountabilities. This is a group called CCWG. If you would like to know what is a community doing, you can go to the Internet to type CCWG and they actually are working on it right now.

Okay. And then you can see that here is a much easier way to see the process. NTIA made an announcement. And as the ICANN began to do the process. And then ICANN, based on this one and developing the process, formed the first one. It's called ICG. And the second one is called CCWG.

And the ICG, you can see that the ICG cannot develop their own proposal. The proposal has to come from the IANA kind of

the IANA operator or something like that. So, for example, in here there is IETF. They deliver their own proposal from the Protocol.

And the second one is the CRISP. It's a team generally developed by the number community from five, APNIC and the other, and the CRISP go to the number community to develop the proposal. So this eventually is called a CRISP proposal.

And the next one is the CCWG. It's a number community. It's quite complex, we can see later on, for example, they have people from ccTLD. They have people from GNSO. They have people from the -- at large. They have people from academic. Whatever.

And so eventually these three different proposals will be -- came into the ICG. And ICG, their job is going to merge these three proposals together. And then send it to the ICANN called ICG proposal.

And then CCWG, they need to generate the CCWG proposal. And these two proposals were sent into the ICANN board as a lease for the ICG, we agreed, the ICG, saying if the ICG final proposal was sent to ICANN we cannot touch a single word in the text. Because ICG is supposed to be -- should be run as an independent.

But of course, ICANN, the board, we can have an additional comment to this proposal. But these comments have to be in public.

And CCWG also, the CCWG proposal was sent to the ICANN and then ICANN supposedly would be -- put these two proposals and deliver to the NTIA, to go through the US Government process. And of course, it goes to the US Government process, a lot of people thought about it just goes to NTIA is more complex than that. For example, once the proposal is sent to the NTIA, personally, I believe that the NTIA will definitely go to a public hearing to receive the comments from the U.S. Whatever, the voice. And it's not only the NTIA, actually a lot of people are missing another part. Because this is kind of a -- from a legal Point of View, IANA ownership is a bit owned by the US Government. If the US Government wants to deliver this property to somebody else, more than just NTIA, eventually you have to go to the U.S. Congress. And kind of interesting, because now it's the US president election time can be very sensitive. You know.

So eventually, after the NTIA, then I believe the NTIA will go to the Congress and to get Congress to agree. And then after that, then IANA transition can happen. So you can see the process is something that is right now.

And then if you want to know what is the current status, actually, the number community and IETF proposal is basically it's quite simple. It's very similar, like in the early days.

I think we -- ICANN had a contract with IETF and also have a number community for many, many years. Of course, a little minor changing is -- the number community asked for SLA, you know. Service label agreement. In the past we didn't have a service level agreement.

And this is coming much earlier. And the CCWG proposal finally in Argentina, just last week, the CCWG had a final proposal delivered to ICG already. So if you want to know what is the current status, basically these three proposals were delivered to ICG.

So the next job is the ICG needs to merge these three proposals to one. And CCWG at this moment is still in discussion. Is still in the many different opinion arguments. So that is the current status and I forget about this one. And then I almost explained CCWG, so I can skip this one. This one I explained already. This is done. And how the CRISP are organized. You can see that. And then the domain name CCWG is done. Submitted and the response on the June 25th. Last week.

And so CCWG is still working on the basically accountability issues. So I think the most sophisticated issue because accountability committee is very possibly going to change the ICANN bylaw. If they are going to change the ICANN bylaw of course there will be a lot of legal issues. And then once we do that, then we have to answer how long to implement that.

Okay. Then I did this one. And then I don't need to go to this one.

Okay So I think it's almost done. Okay. I think that's my basic presentation of what IANA transition is.

So how many minutes do we have to open the questions? Any questions? Or no questions?

Somebody wants to be a trouble maker?

>> KELVIN WONG: That's a remarkable slide. (Laughter) Actually I have a question. Kelvin Wong from APNIC. You just mentioned the proposal process from ICG submit to ICANN resubmit to NTIA. What if NTIA has any questions or they want to criticize the proposal? Who is going to defend the proposal?

>> KUO-WEI WU: Good question. We talked about that in the ICANN 53 Buenos Aires meetings. Who is going to defend the proposal? I personally asked the CCWG, the number community, do you expect -- who is going to have defense for that? The CCWG people said of course it's ICANN needs to defend this proposal. But the interesting thing -- well, again, this is my personal capacity, not representing ICANN, okay?

Because that proposal came from an independent, it didn't really go with the communication with ICANN, so I expressed if the ICANN is going to defend the proposal, we have to have some

discussion. But since the final proposal came out, we cannot touch, we cannot modify. At least we have to understand what the rationale is. So I think sooner or later we need to do this job.

And of course it depends. Because the US Government very possibly will say okay, if this proposal came from ICG, Paul maybe you can answer this, is the ICG going to defend or ICANN should defend? For example, like...

>> PAUL WILSON: We hope that everyone will defend the proposal.

(Laughter)

I'm quite serious about that. Because it's come from -- it will have come from the three different communities, the number, the names, and the Protocols, as a result of an extensive community process, which is guided through to consensus result, which should be very well supported. And I think it's fair to say that those three components are already well supported and should be able to be supported when had they go through to the final proposal.

The ICG of course needs to bring it together and support it. We also hope that ICANN will be a strong supporter as well and I think we have seen that already with statements from ICANN board members, not only yourself, but others, from Fadi Chehade himself. And I think it's in everyone's interest that the proposal be successful at the end. And I think that everyone supports that end goal. And if there are serious problems that get in the way of supporting the proposal, then they should have been identified by now so that we have something that everyone can support. Thanks.

>> KUO-WEI WU: This is a very good question. Of course, because ICANN is basically an institution, it's under the structure, it's by the Protocol and number community and also the name community, and if the consensus came out from these three communities, no matter how, ICANN has to defend for that.

And of course, maybe in some of the rationale or some of the questions, of course the community has a position to also stand as ICANN and to defend this proposal. But this is a very good question.

Okay. Next question.

>> KELVIN WONG: I think there is one last question. Sorry, we want to close the APILP. This session is intended for the newcomers. So the Q and A should generally help the newcomers understand more about what we're trying to do. Can we take that last question?

>> KUO-WEI WU: I'm sure there are a lot of questions on this so we can move on to the discussion part of that, which will be moderated by Professor Ang Peng Hwa.

>> AUDIENCE: Thank you very much. This is helpful information for all of us. But I believe why we are talking about the IANA transition this morning, I think that you, if possible, need to explain some more details why we are discussing this kind of transition issue at this moment. And I think also, if it is really -- you have some idea, how do we plan to do from the prospective of the Asia Pacific regional countries or some Government experts. That is very important for all of our colleagues sitting here in this meeting room. Thank you.

>> KUO-WEI WU: Again this is also my personal capacity because it's a very complex issue.

Suppose in 1998 when the US Government established the ICANN, in the very first time, actually, the US Government talking about sooner or later they're going to transfer this ownership from the US Government to the International. Actually in the very first statement. That is what the US Government statement said. Okay. You believe or not. Whatever. The US Government said in the very beginning, the first day when they established the ICANN, they had an intention to do that.

And then you were asking a second question is why now? Okay? The US Government's answer, very simple. We intend to do that and now it's just the right time. And he didn't mean -- mean right time, what does it mean, right time? That's a U.S. statement. Of course a lot of people have different comments. And some of the people say, again, okay, this is not my opinion, I just read it from the newspaper. I just -- I just share the newspaper to you. Okay?

Some of the papers say why now? It's because of Snowden. You can believe it or you can just ignore it. But somehow from my point of view, or the ICANN board member point of view, we are always looking at some day as soon as possible the US Government hands it over to the ICANN so the ICANN can be really an independent community -- independent institutions, you know. Not always contract with the ICANN IANA contract and every five years to renew this stuff.

And I think not only the ICANN -- I believe the whole community, including the number community, including IETF, many communities or even the Government, they don't want to see the US Government has the privilege. I think there is a general understanding. And so why right now? You can find hundreds, thousands of different reasons. But if the US Government has an intention to do that, we should be happy to see it really happen. I think that is the most important. And so, to be honest, I cannot answer what is the right -- why is now right? That's a very difficult question.

Okay. I think we can go to -- you know, because we are

going to have more discussion on this issue. And it's -- you don't need to just get my opinion. Because I'm just one single individual.

>> PAUL WILSON: Can we give Kuo-Wei Wu a round of applause, please.

(Applause)

>> KELVIN WONG: We will come to the end of the APILP session and this third session and the last session for APILP. Could I invite the Chair from APILP to give us a few words in his closing.

>> AND PENG HWA: So I want to thank the speakers for speaking. I want to point out as APILP, this is a new approach we are taking into the APrIGF. And I hope that those who attended find it useful. We need to have a repeat next year, but I guess the updated versions of this so it's refreshed.

The aim is to get up to speed so we can discuss the issues in greater depth so now we have the transition explained. You can see 45 minutes is brief but we do our best here. And then next we will have our discussion now on the issues of IANA transition.

This is me, right?

>> KUO-WEI WU: You're the only person.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Okay. So we will have a discussion about the IANA transition, I guess, the Youth IGF. Thank you guys for coming. Should we thank them for participating?

(Applause)

>> ANG PENG HWA: I suggested that we role play and maybe they might do that next time. Okay. All right.

Okay. So we are discussing some issues regarding IANA transition. It is you can see a rather complex issue. To Dr. Park's point of why, I think it's to build trust in the community by giving what seems to be a rather insignificant part of ICANN. It seems to be. But it's a very complicated process.

Okay. Yes. Just speak into it.

>> AUDIENCE: I have to say something before the youth leave the room, which is too late.

(Laughter)

Guys. If you can stay a while? The youth guys? Okay. No. No. This is exactly to me what is happening, that -- it's a very good question of why we are discussing now. But why it matters to the youth.

To be honest, why it matters to me, the people, insider of the ICANN, it might be important. I used to be an insider, I decided not to be. I'm in between and some people are outsiders. Why does it matter to the youth in Thailand? China? Us, for Asia Pacific? And at end of the day, does it really matter? Why? So I'm still puzzled. Very honestly, yes, it

sounds very important about the UN politics, but why do we need to listen? Why do we need to discuss? The fact that you guys, the youth, couldn't give any questions, means I don't think you guys feel from the bottom of your heart it's so important. Correct me if I'm wrong.

>> Do you want to address the question too?

>> Do you want to speak? Do you have any questions?

>> I do have many questions.

>> Are you asking a question of why? Are you asking a question of why or are you asking different questions?

>> I'm asking you questions.

>> Do you have speculations about why, why now?

>> PAUL WILSON: I think it's worth bearing in mind that there is no surprise about this IANA transition. This is something that started in discussions in the 1990s. The ICANN organization was actually founded exactly for the purpose of taking the stewardship of the IANA function. That's why ICANN is here. And ICANN started in 1999. So it has always been since that time, it's been understood that the US Government, having a special role and a special responsibility for this part of the Internet, that is now of global importance, just isn't appropriate anymore. But it's not a new thing. This is what was decided, and it was the basis of ICANN being started in 1999. When ICANN was started, the intention was to complete the transition no later than 2000. 15 years later we can talk about why it's taken so long and there are a lot of reasons why it's taken so long. Some are perfectly reasonable. People had other things to do and higher priorities, particularly when the Internet has grown so rapidly, and there have been so many challenges simply in its growth.

So eventually, it was expected to happen. And I think why now is because it should have happened at any time in the last 15 years. There is no particular reason necessarily to pick a point.

But I think as someone mentioned, the Snowden revelation, which shown a spotlight on to the US Government role in the Internet and it created confusion. Because people started to say well, ICANN is involved with whatever it was that Snowden was revealing. And that of course is completely untrue. ICANN has had nothing to do with the Internet infrastructure or traffic or monitoring or encryption or any of that. And in fact ICANN's mandate is to run public databases and to make transparent the information that it carries on names and newspapers.

So the confusion about whether ICANN was tainted with what

is going on, it was a very good reason to say well let's clarify this, let's complete the job and let's keep ICANN clear of the stuff, which is happening anyway.

So if there was any reason for the timing, I think it was related to that.

>> KUO-WEI WU: Very short. I think of course you might be saying well, why not this happened earlier? Okay. Or later. But I think from my point of view, I think if the US Government had the intention to do it, we should take the chance and do it, no matter when.

And if that can happen five years ago, good. And if that is five years after? Well, why we don't do it now.

You know, so continue to -- asking why now is a lot of speculation. It doesn't really help. I think what is most important is that my personal belief is just try to make it happen as soon as possible, since we have the chance. Do it.

>> AUDIENCE: So I agree very much with Izumi-San's question about why young people should be interested in the transition. The Internet doesn't only belong to the 1 billion people who have access to the Internet today. It also belongs to the several billions of people that are yet to be connected. There are 2.7 billion people are connected now. There's more than half of the world that is not yet connected. And that's one of the reasons, I think young people need to be interested in the transition. Because most of the developing world, the population are under 30 and it will affect the young people of the world, the people in the developing countries who haven't got Internet access right now.

So why now, I think I would agree very much with Kuo-Wei Wu's point that it's really a bit of speculation. It's a good point for the transition to happen and young people should be interested in this because it will affect their livelihoods. Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE: Responding to Izumi's response. And speaking on my personal views, I agree with Ash's comments. This will affect our generation for the next few decades and our next generation. So it's very important to have our participation on that.

Currently, as was mentioned, the discussion started in the 1990s, and it's going on for quite some time. So for youth, and as newcomers to the Internet governance, it's very important for us to now learn what's actually happening and to understand the whole process, before we are in a capacity to comment on it and since -- even during the ICANN discussion, there are a lot of things happening and different working groups. It is a lot for the youth to catch up to the whole thing. So I think it's important for us to work on the capacity building for the youth,

and to really work on more language diverse capacity building materials and kits for participants from different regions and across different backgrounds.

So I think that after this capacity building process, the youth will be better engaged in the discussions and make comments and even contributions to the IANA transition.

Also, thank you guys for your empowerment throughout the Conference. But for now, the youth IGF participants will be continuing our sessions in other places.

Thank you.

>> ANG PENG HWA: Speaking personally, I think that the why is important to a point. I think the why delay, in my own thesis and this is my own thesis, not anybody's, is because of what we call ignorant patriots. This is a term in the literature. They love America, they want to keep the Internet for America, but they are ignorant. And so the issue was raised about what if the NTIA criticizes the proposal, and this can very well happen. So the issue is how important is this factor of the ignorant patriots? So of course I agree that if we can move on ahead, we should move on ahead.

>> I think why now is a great question. But why not now is a better question. We talked about this for so long. And now there is a real window of opportunity for it to happen and I think this is a window of opportunity that should be grasped. We talked about this, if we give it to NTIA, and it's not acceptable, then this is something in our control to remedy now, we don't have to wait until October or November and realize that we are having a proposal that needs to be rejected. This is something that we can remedy and do something about right now.

And if you -- I think that there have been a lot of corridor conversations on the proposal. Some people think it's over engineered. Some people think it's overcomplicated. If people feel so strongly about this, then you know we should have a mechanism or we should have a collective will to collect the opinions and have our voices heard. It's not good enough to have just the corridor conversations to say it's too complicated and then the board is going to write this. And because of that, when it goes to NTIA, it will look this way or that way. The time is now to really make the changes that we want.

>> PAUL WILSON: Okay. We will move on.

>> AUDIENCE: Thank you. I guess my question is relevant to Izumi's initiative. Why it's relevant. In Beijing we organized two multistakeholder dialogs on the IANA transition and also accountability enhancement. So these questions are actually not from me. The Chinese community, at least in Beijing.

We are especially interested; we know that it's very clear,

thanks for the kind introduction. These are two parallel processes. There will be a proposal for ICG and also a proposal for CCWG. But eventually NTIA will only accept one integrated one. So who is going to integrate that? Question one.

Question two, do we have a timeline to do the merger of the two proposals from two parallel processes?

And the third one, I know -- I know that now we have a separate public consultation, public comment periods, and especially CCWG has two phase comments. The second one is coming. After the merger, will there be a new public comment period? If we can't be in the procedure, it seems that we are very time -- it's a very tight timeline if you are taking and encouraging, that is the end of October of this year, that is NTIA's encouragement for the community to complete the transition, if possible at all.

I'm not asking the definite answer from ICANN or from the Convention leader. But since ICANN is convenor of this process, the ICANN is facilitating more bottom-up proposals for this solution, this is very urgent. We do know the IANA proposal for CCWG, that is going to be interpreted as the ICG proposal, page 15 and page 23 specifically mention it's incomplete without integration with the CCWG's accountability mechanism.

So we are very, very interested in how these two will work together.

Thanks.

>> Mr. Wu, you are the only one qualified to comment.

>> KUO-WEI WU: I try to answer in my personal opinion, because it is still a little bit early, because the CCWG proposal is not coming out yet.

Regarding that, the ICG, maybe Paul can share more information. I'm not a member, I'm the liaison. Basically, the ICG and CCWG proposals are basically separate ones. It's separate issues.

ICG particularly emphasizes on the IANA transitions. CCWG emphasizes accountability of the ICANN. And so with these two, actually, if I remember that when the CCWG was working on their proposal, they were thinking about -- you know, they do have some discussion about should the CCWG or including the ICG, should touch about the accountability of ICANN or not?

And maybe the -- maybe Paul would be better to explain that. But somehow these two proposals is separate but you need to do the coordination. You have to do the coordination. The proposal is two separate proposals. Okay. And this is the first, the first answer for this one.

And CCWG, because it basically tried to enhance the compatibility of the ICANN, so there is a very -- some kind of a possibility or potential. Eventually, if the CCWG comes out,

has many different ideas, maybe some of you heard it. The CCWG tried to have ICANN as a membership group, a membership organization. Based on that one, it means the ICANN whole bylaw and the whole structure would be changed. And there is a reason why we're still working -- the CCWG, actually, -- the discussion is not merging yet. It's still quite different, you know, comments. Different people have different ideas, you know. And although somebody that might be there would be the huberate, that means some of them are membership and some are not membership.

What is the CCWG picture? It's not clear. What will it be. It's not clear after the last 53 meeting. I think Paul is a better person to answer what is the ICG eventually -- how they merge the three proposals together and what is the relationship with CCWG? Because I'm liaison. He is a better person to say that.

Thank you.

>> PAUL WILSON: Thanks for the question. Kuo is right. There are two separate process, one is for the transition of the IANA function, stewardship, and the other is about improving ICANN's accountability. And those proposals won't be merged. They need to be obviously consistent with each other, and that's what the CCWG proposal has pointed out. There are some dependencies, but they won't be merged in the same way as the transition proposal itself is a single proposal. So the transition proposal is a merger of three, component: numbers, Protocols and names.

And the reason why the ICG decided to proceed that way is because of three sets of IANA functions, for numbers, protocols, and names, are quite disjointed. They actually happened to be conducted by IANA under one -- in one office, under one roof, so to speak, because of historical reasons. But they really are separate sets of functions. And so splitting up the planning process into the three communities of interest, so the three communities could produce plans that suited their needs was the logical way to go. And the ICG hopefully will be able to take the three plans, bring them together, ensure they are consistent and not in conflict, and produce one plan, which is what the NTIA it requested. So that's the transition.

The other thing, the NTIA has some very clear requirements, which are clear and which we can demonstrate, I hope, by the final plan. The NTIA also said that there are no other requirements and there are no hidden requirements, that we shouldn't really worry about anything other than the specific requirements that they have outlined.

I think the ICG has got a relatively easy job to do, actually, and in particular now that the three component

proposals have been produced.

The CCWG on the other hand is quite a lot more vague, because the NTIA has said that the IANA transition cannot be implemented without the improvements in ICANN's accountability that will come from CCWG. But they have been a little mysterious frankly about how much accountability is enough. There can't be anything such as perfect accountability and so the CCWG and the community have to make judgments about how much accountability is enough. And I think that is going to be a little more nuanced and a little less certain than the CCWG.

But what we -- sorry the ICG proposal. What we do know is that the ICG proposal should be completed by September. It should be submitted to the US Government. The US Government hopefully will approve it for implementation early next year. But they said before the implementation can proceed, that is before the end of the IANA contract, which happens sometime in 2016, they want to see the accountability improvements, whatever they are.

So that is as far as I can tell you right now.

>> KUO WEI WU: Yes, it's very complex. When I look at what has been done, and I'm impressed with how -- how it started out. You're taking a very complex subject and then sort of reconstructing and putting it back together again. So it's quite a feat, and I'm impressed with the bit of progress, actually, despite all of our complaints and all that. But I'm impressed the way it's moving.

Okay. Other questions?

>> AUDIENCE: If I may, I'm not that interested in the details of these proposals, the accountability. I don't mean they are not important, with full respect, ut also, Kuo-Wei boiled down the Snowden thing as well as Paul, not necessarily -

-

>> And the media.

>> AUDIENCE: Sorry the media sometimes reflects people's and other organizations' opinions as well. Media alone are not creating these views. Meaning, of course, the ICANN directly is not involved in the political arena or issues of the Internet cyberspace, cybersecurity, Arab Spring, free speech, all of these political activities around the Internet directly.

But that is also causing some confusion or problem as well. You cannot deny the fact that there's -- that there is a confusion. There is a concern. And the fact that ICANN can see the proposed NETmundial with the Brazilian Government asking. It may not be the issues that ICANN is directly involved, but in order to clear the route, ICANN had to respond to all the -- or the ISPAs had to respond to. Because who is responsible for all the free speech around the Internet, cybersecurity, if the bad

guys are back --if the bad guys use the areas, blah, blah, blah. It's a hypothetical question. But because of the weight of the Internet nowadays for the global economy, the global welfare of the people, unlike 10 or 17 years ago, that there is a huge need to address these issues. And to me ICANN is part of the larger picture, so no matter how you, within ICANN don't like to deal with that, but symbolically, the ICANN is the only organization around the Internet Protocol, standards, blah, blah, blah, where you guys have gone Internet large.

If you're serious, I would like to have serious discussion within ICANN or stuff like that, but that's another matter.

>> AUDIENCE: We are dealing with the IANA transition and connectivity. What does the question have to do with this subject?

>> AUDIENCE: Because the IANA transition to me has different aspects, and one aspect is Internet politic, we cannot really deny that. It doesn't mean that it's you, Paul, or Kuo-Wei must express your opinion stuff. But the US Government is grilled like that. And they have to deal with the Congress, to begin with. And these guys see ICANN or domain name areas under their jurisdiction in part. And you have to proceed with these guys. Right? So it's not that easy. I know.

>> PENG HWA ANG: So any of you want to respond?

>> KUO-WEI WU: Let me try a little bit, because I think Izumi's mention about some of the issues. In my personal opinion, ICANN only deal, my personal thinking, ICANN only deals with very small parts of the Internet governance. The Internet governance is huge questions. Not questions, many issues, from security and then in the past you are talking about Cloud computing. You are talking about big data, open data. But I can answer just in general, like you said, that you see right now, actually, ICANN basically deals with just protocols, numbers, and names. And of course if some people want to explain the functionality of the ICANN, but I think it's very difficult because ICANN only, in general, from the bylaws, from its function, it still remains in what you call the Internet critical resources.

And so my personal thinking is ICANN is a better way to -- if this is some Internet governance related to the ICANN function, then of course we as a part of the community we need to stand and to help or to involve. But if some other issue, actually ICANN can -- ICANN can do very, very little. For example, a new topic like big data. To be honest, it's difficult for me to think about what role the ICANN can play in this.

But I'd like to raise another one as a response to Izumi's saying. I think it's a much more important thing for me right

now, actually, I'm thinking about what is the consequence when the IANA transition really is done? I don't know -- I think the people right now are thinking about oh, we want an IANA transition. But I think right now it's at the same time we have to begin to think if the IANA transition is happening, what is the Internet -- what will the Internet be? What is it going to be in the future after the IANA transition? Maybe you are saying now talking about it is too early. But I think why you need to think about it now is because if you don't think about the future after the IANA transition, then how can you make sure that the IANA transition is done the right way and doing the right thing?

So I think it's important, when you begin to talk about the IANA transition process at the same time, you have to have some kind of scenario simulation what the Internet is going to be happening in the future when IANA transition really happens.

And I think there are some people, actually raised the question, I think some of the technical people raised a small question, it might be the audience here, you can think about it. One thing we don't want to happen, no matter if the IANA transition is now or after, is a fragmentation. If the fragmentation happens, I think we will really destroy the Internet to the ground. So we have to be very careful no matter we are doing now or when the IANA transition happens after, to maintain the Internet as one instead of fragmentation, I think that is something we have to think about carefully and at least it's our -- kind of our responsibility to maintain that.

>> ENG HWA ANG: On this point I find the completely opposite reasoning. Because if the US holds it, it's more likely to be fragmented because there is no trust of the US Government. It's precisely by having this IANA system that it has trust in the system and it holds the system together. And if we all have inputs to into it we are all invested in it. And we are all able to hang together rather than hanging separately. So in fact I think the IANA transition will help the process of being not fragmented.

Paul.

>> PAUL WILSON: There are several threads here which were joined together in October 2013 in the statement from the I\* group, which preceded the US Government announcement, and it was in some way a reaction to the Snowden.

The three points said in the statement was that we called on the US Government to proceed with the globalization of ICANN, which meant precisely the IANA transition.

We called on the global community to embark on and to strengthen global multistakeholder Internet governance, which is exactly as Izumi mentioned earlier. It's resulted in a number

of things, including NETmundial and a number of other initiatives.

And the third thing was a statement that one of the drivers here was the need to avoid Internet fragmentation, because -- precisely because I think of the risk, as you put it, Peng Hwa, that with a lack of trust in the Internet itself, there was a risks of what fragmentation, divergence of people moving in different paths and different directions for different reasons, but resulting in a significant threat of breakdown. So that all came together back in October 2013 in that statement.

Thanks.

>> IZUMI: I was going to introduce the statement that Paul just read before you raised your hand. I mostly agree. Although it's small, ICANN's function is small, but keep the Internet one is very, very, very important not only for ICANN but all the guys using the Internet and future users of. And you cannot undermine the importance of this.

Operational stability, yes. Keeping the standards throughout all the operator was domain name address and all the downstream. And it is very much a technical job as well as socioeconomic cultural to me, or political. And that's what it says in the NETmundia statement is that you called for all the equal participation of all stakeholders, including all Governments. And that is -- in order to assure the global one Internet, in my view you need to get participation from Governments. The Governments doesn't necessarily mean the Prime Ministers, maybe regulators, maybe not. But there are various degrees of Government participation.

However in a very symbolic statement, between the Snowden and the NETmundial and the call for the transition at that moment, and before that was even GA, an IGF extension, so how do we keep the Internet one is of course ICANN's task. But we cannot just rely on ICANN to do a good job. Where sometimes Internet+ is mentioned from China, there is some confusion. And some people are wondering about the IPv6 transition, does it keep the Internet one or v6 network may be different from the v4, which is a serious issue, particularly economic.

So I think these are areas that should be well addressed. On top of the three proposals or those three proposals also reflect to some degree these kinds of discussions, but not fully enough yet.

>> KUO-WEI WU: Very short. To reply to what Izumi was saying. Right now, actually, there is fragmentation. The real worry is not from the technical side, actually from the political side. The political side is really a threat to the one single Internet. So I think we have to work together. It's not only -- ICANN is a very small potato. We need to work

together.

>> ANG PENG HWA: It's interesting that you say that. This issue of interim patriots, they are everywhere not just in the USA. They are everywhere. They keep us employed.

I'll wrap this up -- you have a question? And then you, I'll give you some time to give some sound bites.

>> AUDIENCE: I just wanted to make a couple points. I think -- I agree with Kuo-Wei Wu's comments. That ICANN, basically, is a technical organization. When we discuss Internet governance domestically within our country, we also realize that when we talk about Internet governance, it's a huge issue. It covers many, many aspects. And no single Government agency can say that the technical Internet governance.

So we have this problem. So when we look at it deeper, we know that ICANN is a resource management organization. So really, perhaps multistakeholder is the right model when we talk about Internet governance. So that's one point.

The second point is, I think Paul is quite correct. I recognize the statement that there are a lot of suspicions about the neutrality of Internet governance, if it continues to stay with the US Government. So this move of Internet -- IANA transition is a good move. It will just enhance people's understanding of the Internet being -- will become sort of -- the -- the community owned by the US Government, but by the community at large.

The only comments we have is when you look at this proposal is somehow we got a sense that it's very complicated and it's very political for the country, a small country, a lack of resource to follow. But anyway, this has happened.

But the last point I want to ask is that obviously we missed the September deadline. So is there any best dates that the community is aiming for to complete this whole process? Because we all know that the later it's late, it will introduce complications because of political developments in the US. Any dates that we are aiming for now? Thank you.

>> The one question is the date.

>> KUO-WEI WU: Let me explain what we think. More precisely on this day, I think Paul is a much better person to explain it.

Because, first of all, the ICG has to have to merge the three proposals together to deliver to the ICANN,

And basically, ICANN, after we receive the proposal, and the problem with the ICG, you know, we will not delay in maybe a little bit of comment and then we would like to submit it to the NTIA as soon as possible.

So of course right now you might see that. The three proposals came in in Buenos Aires and then the ICG will begin on

that. And I leave it to Paul to say that.

And I think definitely it's kind of, you know, the concept between the ICANN and the US Government is by September. It seems that September might not be happening. But the US Government already explained, even in that case they will continue the contracts, they will continue the contracts, but I think everybody is shooting for before the US Government -- the US presidential election, before that. Because we want the whole transition to be happening in the Obama administration times. Because if you go to the next President, that has some kind of factor we cannot control.

So one thing I know it's very difficult to meet before the end of the contract, in September. But also we would like to see the whole transition happen in the Obama administration. So you can see that it might be the end of September to the early of May next year, sometime like that.

And I know the ICG has some kind of timeline. I think maybe Paul you are a much better person to answer this question.

>> PAUL WILSON: The timing has been on everyone's minds.

But I think there's really not too much uncertainty about it. And both ICANN, Fadi Chehade', NTIA, Larry Strickling made very clear what the new set of phases are for the transition.

I'm not sure if you remember, but this particular diagram, which is -- that's this very colorful diagram that was shown at the opening ceremony, which shows three phases. If you don't have it, I can send it to you, sorry, I can't project it here. But it shows the three phases which are well mapped out, including the delivery of the proposal from, in Phase I, the proposals from ICG and CCWG and an NTIA review and evaluation of four to five months that includes an NTIA process and a congressional review in a four to five month period, and then an implementation, which is said to be according to this diagram, completed by ICANN 56. Remind me when ICANN 56 will be. That's the target for when the implementation is fully completed. I think that timeline is clear. And it's subject to review, but I don't think we should sort of interpret that there is a lot of uncertainty left just because it has changed a few times over the last year.

>> ASHA HEMRAJANI: The slide that Paul was referring to, that was shown by Fadi in the opening slide in Buenos Aires. The end date. He is leaving in March and the end date is June. ICANN 55, we haven't decided the location yet. But we can download that from the ICANN website.

>> PENG HWA ANG: I'll give the panelists some time, a short sound bite.

My question is for the user, what changes will the user see at the end of this IANA transition and the accountability

measures? If there is nothing much that the user will see, who will see the biggest changes from the receiving end of all of these changes? Starting with Paul. I'll give you, Paul the last word.

>> PAUL WILSON: From the numbers community, there will be precisely no operational visible change. But that's not to say that there aren't significant changes. One of the things which was built into the numbers proposal and into the accountability processes that we have been looking at has been a clearer definition through agreements of the relationships between the RARs and ICANN, a clearer accounting of the accountability structures within the RARs, and publication of those on the -- publicly on the Web sites, and what is being undertaken now is a sort of certain number of improvements to accountability.

So I think your average user won't be interested and won't see anything immediately at all. But someone who is interested in pursuing what exactly is going on will be able to see a lot more and understand a lot more of what the specific relationships are.

The other thing of course that, over time, we hope that people will not see is any of the kind of fragmentation of the Internet or any of the damaging effects that were sort of imagined as a consequence of the actions. So you could treat this whole thing as a kind of expensive but a rather expensive insurance policy against future damage, which was anticipated.

Thanks.

>> YU CHAUNG KUEK: To respond to the question, the ideal outcome is the end-user will feel no change, but the fundamental architecture will change in a way that is more sustainable and you have few people -- you have less people thinking that this is something that they are uncomfortable with and they are trying to pick apart the fundamental architecture. So that is a response to your question.

My wrap-up points would be that, you know, Chin Xi has mentioned again that the proposal runs the risk of being too complicated. And the truth is that if enough of the people who felt this way were part of the conversation and actively and engaged in a conversation, we probably wouldn't have gone down this route.

Having said that, it's not too late. But the voices that have a certain opinion need to be heard. And this ties in with, I guess, last evening's conversation about an outcomes document. I feel very strongly that we should have an outcomes document emerging from this. We can have all the caveats and disclaimers that this is not meant to be representative. But I think we're doing ourselves a disservice if we leave this room and all the thoughts that have been exchanged in this room are not captured

just disappears from there.

So that's my wrap up point.

>> PENG HWA ANG: Thank you.

>> ASHA HEMRAJANI: Of course to answer the question, the ultimate answer is that the end-user doesn't know that there has been a transition, except the ones that are really interested. And I think the best outcome that I can possibly hope from this is that there will be more trust. I agree with you, because when there is more trust, the opportunity or the possibility, rather, of fragmentation of the Internet will lessen considerably, will decrease.

In terms of wrap-up points, since I'm new to the Internet governance sphere, I just joined the ICANN board half a year ago, and before that, I'm completely new. This is how I explained it to myself is what the ICANN's role, and goes back to Chi Xi's point earlier. To me, there are two types of governance. There is governance of the Internet and there is governance on the Internet. And governance of the Internet is where ICANN is involved in. So we look at the functions, we're looking at the technology part of it. And there is governance on the Internet, which looks at a whole huge area of things that were a part of human life way before the Internet came. Human rights issues, pornography, all of these things have been problems and issues prior to the birth of the Internet. So these are areas where sometimes ICANN gets dragged into, but these are areas that we don't have full say on. So we only focus on governance of the Internet, of the functions. And that's how I explained it to myself, you know, about what ICANN's role is.

And I think this is something that would be good to -- this is something that not everyone is too familiar with., I found, in my last six months of working with ICANN. Because there are a lot of areas we get asked to comment or asked to make a decision on.

But that's all I wanted to say. Thanks.

>> KUO-WEI WU: If the IANA transition happen, actually, I'd like to see, after the future Internet, we should accomplish a couple of things. The first of course, I'd like to see the accomplishment of the Internet as more trustworthy and no fear. We don't like something like a Snowden issue to happen again.

And we don't like to see the Internet when you are on the Internet, you know that somebody is watching you in the dark side.

And we don't like to see, you know, the Internet -- it's somewhere, you worry about your privacy or your data protection will be violated or to, you know, that you feel that the Internet, you feel -- I think the first thing is that we have to

make the Internet more trust with no fear to the end-user. It's not intended just as now.

And the user, the interface will be maybe the same as now, but should be -- feel much more secure, much more trustworthy, the first one.

The second one I'm thinking about the fragmentation. I think the fragmentation would be -- would destroy the Internet. And actually will also, actually, would add big damage to the whole ICT development, and also the civilization is building on top of the Internet. So we always need to be careful not making the fragmentation of the Internet going to happen. So this is the second thing I would like to see now or after the IANA transition.

Number three is also very important. It's economic growth. I think we know that in the past maybe 15, 20 years, we see that the Internet is actually a driving force of the economy growth, no matter in which countries globally.

I would like to see when the IANA transition is not - you know, the IANA transition when it happens should be a driving force and should continue to push the Internet economy to continue to grow.

If the IANA transition is going to make the economy to slow down or even drop, I think nobody would think that is the right way to do that.

So let me just repeat the three things that are important. First of all, trustworthy, no fear. Second of all is no fragmentation. Number three, maintain the improvement of the Internet economy and continue growth.

Thanks.

>> PENG HWA ANG: Thank you. Well, on a bright note help me to thank the panelists and for answering your questions.

(Applause)

>> PENG HWA ANG: We will have a break now? Okay.

(End of session 10:45)

\*\*\*

This text 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.

\*\*\*