



APrIGF Macao 2015 Workshop Summary Report

Date: 3 July 2015

Time: 09:45 – 10:30 Local Time

Workshop Title: IANA Stewardship Transition Discussion

Reported by & Contact Email: Jia-Rong Low, ICANN (jiarong.low@icann.org)

IANA Stewardship Transition Discussion. As per the MSG's request, an open discussion on this topic was also held after Kuo-wei Wu's briefing on the IANA Stewardship Transition as part of the APILP programme. The discussion was moderated by APILP Chair Ang Peng Hwa. Salient points of the discussion are appended below.

"Why now?" remains a frequently asked question.

- Participants noted the US government's announcement that ICANN was intended to be privatised in the first place. Notwithstanding other theories (such as Snowden), what is clear is that we should take full advantage of this opportunity to have such a key function separate itself from any government. ICANN's Kuek Yu-Chuang noted that there have been a lot of corridor conversations regarding the draft proposals. For those that have not made their views heard, we need to reflect them or risk having a proposal that is not palatable to everyone.
- Another point raised was that this is a good exercise to build trust in how the DNS is governed (i.e. The multi-stakeholder model), as well as trust in ICANN.

The question of "why" - i.e. does the IANA transition really matter – continued to come up.

- Izumi Aizu highlighted that people do not feel or understand why this issue is important to them.
- Turning to the Youth IGF participants, Asha Hemrajani highlighted that young people need to be interested in this issue, particularly given that the internet belongs to everyone, including those not yet connected. Wilson Lam of NetMission, who leads the Youth IGF programme, agreed. Wilson highlighted that ICANN discussions are very complex and it is difficult for newcomers (particularly youths) to catch up. In this regard, it is important for newcomers to learn what is happening and understand the process before they have the capacity to comment on it. Efforts should thus focus on capacity building and also language diversity – building materials and kits.

NTIA will consider ICG and CCWG proposals together. How are these parallel processes going to be integrated?

- To the above question, APNIC's Paul Wilson highlighted that the ICG and CCWG proposals will not be merged in the same way as the 3 IANA proposals. NTIA had announced that the IANA transition cannot be implemented without improvements in ICANN's accountability. However, NTIA was also "mysterious" about how much accountability is enough. As such, the CCWG and community have a hard time doing their work as they need to guess 'how much is enough'. What is clear is that the coalesced ICG proposal should be completed by this September. In the meantime, the

NTIA will want to see accountability improvements before implementation can proceed.

While the IANA transition is a narrow topic, what implications does it have on the broader topic of Internet Governance?

- In general, the non-technical community participants at APrIGF, or APAC stakeholders tend to be more interested in the broader topics of IG such as big data, data privacy, as well as politics. It was noted that ICANN's scope deals only with critical internet resources and in this regard is relatively narrow. This could be a reason why interest has been limited.
- Kuo-wei highlighted that a key area of the IANA transition topic that is related to all of IG is that efforts towards this, in the longer run, would prevent the internet's fragmentation.
- Izumi Aizu agreed, highlighting that while ICANN's role on operational stability is a very technical one, it has socioeconomic impacts. Noting the I*'s Montevideo statement, which calls for equal participation of all stakeholders IG, Izumi highlighted the need to get participation of governments in the multi-stakeholder model. Izumi said that all the IG-related issues, including Netmundial, IANA transition, UNGA, IGF, IPv4 to IPv6, or even Snowden – all involved in keeping the Internet "one". In this regard, ICANN plays a role. While the IANA issue is in the spotlight, we need to address the larger issue of IG – which is really keeping the internet one.
- SGNIC's Lim Choon Sai said that IG is a huge issue, and in this regard no single government agency can say they can "take care" of Internet Governance on their own. As such, the multi-stakeholder model is the right model to go for Internet Governance. Choon Sai added that there was 'a lot of suspicion' regarding the neutrality of Internet Governance, and that the IANA contract with the US government IANA added to this lack of trust. The transition is thus a good move, and will enhance people's understanding of this issue and IG in general.
- Choon Sai added the issue of the IANA transition remains complicated and difficult for small countries or people with lack of resources to follow.

What is the implication for the user? And who will see the biggest changes after the transition?

- It was noted that the ideal outcome for the end user is that there would be no change. A second ideal outcome is that end users feel more trust in the fundamental architecture. With more trust, the possibility of fragmentation will decrease. With more trust, and a free and open Internet further to the IANA transition, it is also hoped that the IANA transition could be a driving force for the Internet Economy's growth.
- Paul Wilson added that for the numbers' community, there will be no visible operational change. However, changes built in after the transition include a clear definition of the relationship between RIR and ICANN (through the agreements); as well as clearer accountability structures within the RIRs (publication on websites, and improvements to accountability). The average user will not see anything, but someone who is interested to know what is going on would be able to understand and see a lot more. Paul added that one can treat the whole process as an "expensive 'insurance policy' against any possible damage" to the Internet.