

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. There is an echo [inaudible]...

Okay. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Capacity Building Program 2016, our 11<sup>th</sup> webinar on the topic, “Impact of the IANA Transition on Internet End Users.”

Taking place on Monday, 12<sup>th</sup> of December 2016 at 13:00 UTC.

We’ll not be doing a roll call at this webinar, but if I can please remind all participants on the phone bridge, as well as [inaudible], to please mute your speakers and microphones when not speaking.

Please don’t forget to state your name before speaking, not only for the transcript purposes, but to allow our interpreters to identify you on the other language channels.

We have English, Spanish, and French interpretation. Thank you all for joining. I’ll now turn it over to Tijani Ben Jemaa, the Chair of At-Large Capacity Building working group. Thank you very much and over to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Yeşim. Tijani speaking. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is our 11<sup>th</sup> webinar for the year of 2016. It will about the IANA stewardship transition on the internet

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

end users, and for that we chose two imminent speakers, two speakers who followed very closely, and participated in the cross community working group on enhancing ICANN accountability, that was done in parallel with the IANA stewardship transition work.

Before I give the floor to our speakers, I will come back to the staff, to Yeşim for housekeeping, so Yeşim, go ahead please.

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Thank you Tijani. Let’s take [inaudible] the housekeeping presentation. We’ll have a question and answer part during the webinar. And as you see, it’s located on the left hand side of the AC room. If you have any questions, we do encourage you type them in here, and they will be directed to the presenters.

We also have a pop quiz section, and as you see, it will be located in the middle right side of the AC room. And after the speakers’ presentation, please be ready to answer the questions posted in the poll slot.

And finally, we’ll have a user experience part. There will be a seven question survey at the end of the webinar. So please, stay around for three minutes to complete them. Thank you very much and back over to you Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Yeşim. Tijani speaking again. So, now that the transition has happened, everyone can ask what the impact will be on this transition on the end users, on every one of us. And for that, Alan

Greenberg and Sébastien Bachollet will share with you their views about this issue, and they will start with Alan Greenberg. Alan, please, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Before we talk about the [inaudible] position, I think we should talk a little bit about what IANA is, because although people, I’m sure, are well aware of it, others may not be, may be less aware. IANA stands for the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority.

And just what, again, what is the Internet Assigned Numbers? Well, we know the internet is not run by anyone. However, it does presume that everyone on the internet is talking, not a common language, but essentially, has the same understanding about everything. And IANA is the source of where much of this identical understanding of how the internet is structured comes from.

IANA runs three registries. Now, in the internet, we normally use the term registry to refer to something like dot org, or dot com, or dot KE for a country code Kenya, but registries are, in general, a more general thing than that. Essentially, they’re a database. IANA runs three registries. The first one is, it tells people on the internet where the domain registries, dot org, dot com, and dot KE, where they are.

So, it tells you where to find them. The second thing it does is it manages all of the IP numbers, originally IPv4 and now IPv6 numbers, and it gives them out to the regional registries. It also handles autonomous system numbers, which are used to structure the network.

---

And lastly, as you know, the IETF creates standards for the internet. Well, many of these standards all sorts of numbers associated with them, the protocol parameters, and IANA also stores all of those protocol parameters.

So, it essentially operates three registries. Now, before ICANN was around, IANA was, to a large extent, operated, rather done by one person. That person, Jon Postel, was in fact, referred to as the IANA, the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority. Now, in the latter years, there were other people added to the function, but Jon was still, effectively, operating IANA.

Jon, unfortunately, died in the late 1990s, and the timing was such that we were just in the process of creating ICANN. And one of the reasons ICANN was created was to take over the IANA function. And physically, that is what we did. IANA has been a department within ICANN ever since it started, and it physically operates the three registries that I just mentioned.

The US government, however, which had originally authorized the creation and funded the creation of the internet, was still partially involved in the IANA functions. It had very little to do with the protocol numbers, that was done purely by the IETF. It had very little to do on a regular basis, or had nothing to do on a regular basis, with IP numbers.

That function was, the rules for how that function would be carried out, had already been created, and the US government was not involved in the process. It was, however, heavily involved in management of the

---

root zone. And there were two different ways that it was involved. First of all, every change to the root zone, now, that change to the root zone might include the creation of a new registry, and certainly with a new gTLD program in ICANN, we have seen the creation of thousands of new registries.

Every country code is a registry, and therefore, every time a country code was created, it was added to the root zone. If the equipment for the country code moved, that has to be reflected in the root zone. If the person responsible for a particular top-level domain changed, that also gets reflected in the root zone.

So, a fair number of changes. Every time a change was made in the root zone, it would have to go to the US government for authorization. So the US government would say yes, okay. In reality, certainly for many, many years, that has been an almost automated function. It was performed by a human being, but there was virtually no times that the US government ever said, no, we don't approve it.

But nevertheless, it was still part of the official process. And therefore, in theory, could have said that. The second part of the US government's involvement was a far more active one than that, and that was overseeing the management of IANA. Any time a change was made to how IANA operated, everything from building a new database system to what reports to send out, that had to be approved by the US government.

---

And the US government looked at those things carefully, and tried to understand the impact, and make sure that when the changes were made, they were made properly. Certainly, as an example, when DNSSEC was put in, to add security to the internet, the US government was heavily involved in that part, or the US government or their people they were involved, so that they, for instance, got the national bureau of standards, who had expertise on encryption techniques, was involved in that.

So, the question is, how do we get the US government out of the loop? Well, in terms of the root zone authorization changes, they just stopped. The process had many, many checks and balances in it already, and although there was a relatively complex methodology used to stop them from doing the authorization when we didn't want to rewrite software at the same time, functionally, all that happened is they stopped doing it.

On terms of the management of IANA, the stewardship process looked at that very carefully, and made a decision to split it. There was a whole set of changes to the management process, that we basically said, IANA are professional people. They're run by competent managers. They will make the changes themselves.

If something is so onerous, then they will ask for advice. The second part of the changes are for major architectural changes to the root. DNSSEC was an example of that. And in that case, we put together a committee of very knowledgeable people from the whole internet community, including the IETF, the RIRs, the root zone operators, the

---

people who actually operate the equipment to tell us where things are within the internet, and that committee goes by a rather curious name, it's RZERC, and that stands for Root Zone Evolution Review Committee.

The actual approval comes from the ICANN Board for such changes, but this committee is charged with recommending to the Board. So, that's the whole story of what IANA is, and what it does, and what the changes were.

Now, the title of this webinar is the impact of the transition on end users. Well, the answer to that is relatively simple. We heard a lot, if you were looking, certainly if you were watching US government politics before the transition, that when the root zone transition happened, the whole internet is going to stop.

You know, there is a good chance freedom of speech will be cut out because, just because. And of course, there is no substance to any of that. ICANN has nothing to do with freedom of speech. And if we planned the transition properly, then the impact on end users, the direct impact, the day the transition, the minute the transition happens, will be zero.

And as it turned out, we did it pretty well, and when the transition happened, and that happened at the end of September, October 1<sup>st</sup> this year, the moment the transition happened, absolutely nothing happened. The internet just kept on running as we expected it to, and as it should have. And there is exactly no physical operational impact of the transition. And that's the end of the short story.

Now, we’ll go over to Sébastien, who will look at it from some different aspects, and there are very large impacts of the transition, including to some extent, end users, but they’re not the operational kind. It’s not that the internet will stop running immediately, and they are far more subtle and complex.

And I’ll turn it over to Sébastien now.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much Alan. Hope you can hear me okay. Yeah, the short story is to say, nothing happen for end user. The question is, did we, will notice changes, or possible changes, in the future? And Alan [inaudible] because 1<sup>st</sup> of October to government exchange, there were no change for end user. Nothing was seen on how to use the internet, and connect to internet after this date, and before.

And for the technical point of view, nothing could happen in the future at the technical level, there is no too much risk if internet is still secure, stable, and working [inaudible]. And now we can always face some difficulties, like for example, if we have bigger, and bigger, and bigger [inaudible], again the [inaudible], then we may end up as having trouble with the system working, but it’s not [inaudible], and it will not be because of the transition of the IANA stewardship.

There is some noise in my ear sometimes, no noise, and I hope that you can hear me well.



TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I hear you very well. There is no noise here.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Good. Thank you. It’s, what is important to notice is that we went in two different tracks on this, for every, around the transition, technical transition and [inaudible] that into detail. You remember that you already have a specific webinar on the other track with the accountability, ICANN accountability, and ICANN accountability.

And we had a presentation, both Cheryl, [inaudible], and myself to present you with the work stream two. That means the second part of what will be done around the ICANN accountability. And it’s a work stream going on within the group, [inaudible] is one of the three co-chairs.

And that’s important because we still need to achieve some results at the level of diversity, transparency, accountability of SO and AC, and there are nine topics like that. But, you already follow a specific webinar. But all the [inaudible] will not have any consequences on the technical functions.

But... And maybe there is more to be seen for the end user, for example, one of the very important parts was to have the, to improve the multistakeholder system, and to try to have it as much as possible as equal, and for example, now we have one of the important change that was done with the fact that the community have a power against the Board with the different new powers.

---

And this community needs to, is composed of different SOs and ACs. Not all of the SOs and ACs, but one important group would join this [inaudible] but it's important because it's [inaudible] in the way that will be interesting in the community, is the [inaudible] community. Is now part with four other SOs and ACs of the ICANN onboard community.

And to be clear, address supporting organization, generic name supporting organization, country code name supporting organization, governmental advisory committee, and of course, At-Large and At-Large advisory committee. Now, the five groups who are together the ICANN empowered community.

And it's important to notice that in the building of the technical transition, there was a creation of somebody like the CSC but customer, it's not, customer standing committee, where we, as At-Large, we have one liaison to this customer standing committee. And the other points [and problem?] is that, in fact, in the future, as the IANA department is now a subsidiary of ICANN, with specific contract for the three parameters that Alan described at the beginning of the call, but all those three clients may decide in the future that they are not happy.

I hope [inaudible] to be very, very unhappy, but they are unhappy to leave ICANN and to give this function to run the registry of those specific data, and then the parameters, to somebody else. And if that happens, it is where we will see a lot of changes for us end user. Because today, the only organization at a global level, where we can talk about those issues of TLDs, IP members, and protocol, it's within ICANN.

If ICANN is not anymore in charge of any part of the IANA protocols, we will have less voice as end user in all of those positions. It's why, from my point of view, and I guess from other, it's very important that the IANA function stay within ICANN.

Now, last point, because I think it would be better if we had a discussion. While it's important that both end user voice and it's the At-Large and ALAC role to decide that within ICANN, and the governmental advisory committee who is the voice of the [inaudible] of the world, need to be very much involved within ICANN. If not, it will transform ICANN as a trade association, or even eventually, on the coordination of the trade association.

It's why we don't need an ICANN to be a trade association or coordination of trade association. It's why we need to be very involved as a government within the ICANN structure.

I can go on and on, but I think, maybe we could stop here and maybe Alan wants to add some points, and start some exchange, question and answer. And I can come back in a second time to other topics. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Sébastien. And thank you Alan for your presentation too. I think it was [inaudible]. Alan started by the historical, by the definitions, very, very good for our community. And also, both said that normally this transition is transparent for the end user.

---

So no impact, no normal impact on the end user, but Sébastien explained more the [inaudible] some text that may happen, from, if you want, why the end user should be involved in the governance, in the future of ICANN. Why ICANN shouldn't become a trademark association, or something like this.

So, thank you very much. And I will come back to a moment, please. Okay, so if you want, we can start by [inaudible] and then go to the discussion. So, staff, Yeşim please, we will go to the quiz questions.

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Of course. Yeşim Nazlar speaking. Let's start with the first question. When was the IANA stewardship transition completed? Is it 1<sup>st</sup> of October 2015? Is it 1<sup>st</sup> of October 2016? Or is it [inaudible]? Please cast your votes now.

And the correct answer, Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

You all got it right. It's the 1<sup>st</sup> of October 2016. 2015 was the end of the contract with the US government, but it was because the community request more time to finish the accountability work, it was requested one more year, [inaudible] we end up 1<sup>st</sup> of October 2016. Thank you.

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Thank you Sébastien. Let's move on to the second question then. The second question is, role of the US government in the IANA stewardship

---

was replaced by...? Is it ITU? Is it [UNESCO?]? Is it [inaudible]? B, another government, E, Google, S, governmental advisory committee? Please cast your votes now.

And the correct answer is?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

The correct answer is c, empowered community. It was never... One of the requests from the US government was not to be replaced by any other government or international organization. It is why another government was not a good answer, ITU and [UNESCO] was not either.

In fact, the GAC is part of ICANN, and is now part of the empowered community, but it's just one of the five member of empowered community. And then the right answer, and of course [inaudible] already a lot of [inaudible], but not the one to, around the IANA function.

And then the answer was C, empowered community. Thank you.

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Thank you Sébastien. Let's move on to the third question. The third question is, [inaudible] what are the ones not members of the ICANN empowered community? Is it address supporting organizations? Is it generic names supporting organizations? Country code names supporting organizations? Governmental advisory committee? Root server system advisory committee?

---

Is it security and stability advisory committee? Or is it At-Large advisory committee? Please cast your votes now [CROSSTALK]...

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You need to be precise, that you cannot check more than one answer.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: That’s right. I was going to underline that. You are able to select more than one option.

Let’s all scroll past our results now. And if we can get the correct answers?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: The correct answer is security and stability advisory committee, and the root server system advisory committee, decided not to be part of the empowered community. Both ISO, GNSO, ccNSO, GAC, and ALAC, decided to join the empowered community. And the right answer was E and F.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sorry [inaudible]. I think that people didn’t understand the question. The question is about the organization that are not part of the empowered community. So, this is why you see here from the version, but I think that is clear, that is five, or the five organizations, which are part of the empowered community, empowered community.

---

Thank you very much.

Yeşim, go ahead.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: [Inaudible], let’s move on to the last question. What are the new responsibilities that ALAC will undertake after the IANA stewardship transition? A liaison position, customer standing committee, a second Board seat selected by At-Large, one of the participants of the ICANN empowered community.

Please cast your votes now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: And you may have more than one choice.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: That’s correct.

And could we please get the correct answer from you, Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Mentioned that they are [inaudible] and that’s the answer of A and C, liaison position to the customer standing committee, and At-Large ALAC is one of the participants of the ICANN empowered community, as we already discussed that in the previous question. And unfortunately, and

---

it was not the topic of this discussion, but unfortunately, we have yet to see a second Board member selected by At-Large. Thank you.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Thank you very much Sébastien. And this was the end of our pop quiz questions. So, I will now give it back over to Tijani. Over to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Yeşim. So, now that the presentation has made, done, so that the pop quiz is already done, I would like you, now, to ask questions to our speakers. If you have any questions, any intervention.

ALAN GREENBERG: Evan asked a question in the chat.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Tijani, this is Yeşim speaking. Would you like me to read it out?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, please.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Sure. The question is, “Is there any danger that the new US administration coming into power in January can, or modify the work that has been done today?”



TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, can you answer this question?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can try to answer the question. The answer is, we don't know. In fact, the transition happened. Can it be reversed? Well, I don't know. There were claims made before the transition that some of the actions that the NTIA took were illegal, for instance. There were allegations that the NTIA was not supposed to spend money on certain things and they did.

The NTIA claimed it was fully within their right, and it did not violate the Congressional ruling that they not spend money on certain things. Certain Senators claimed that they indeed did do things that were contrary to what Congress said. Would that give the US government the ability to go to a court and reverse the transition, because it was not carried out according to the law at the time? I don't know.

It's pretty far-fetched that they would go do that. But since courts in any jurisdiction around the world have strong powers. So, surely if there was a court decision like that, it would be appealed and would go all the way up to the US Supreme Court, I'm sure.

Someone is creating a nice echo for me.

In any case, that's about the only scenario that I can imagine, that indeed something could be reversed by this. So, is it possible? Yes. Is it likely? I don't think so, but time will tell.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Sébastien do you have something to add on this question?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, and then I agree with Alan. But I want to add one point. It's from my point of view, even in the legal system, in US, I don't see how contract who handed six month, or four months a year, can be reinstalled, then I don't think we can go back to the previous situation. Can we go somewhere else? Maybe.

I know that it's still a question, and will be still a question when the new administration will come in January. But they will have to first of all, decide that it's an important topic, and that they will need to take action at the beginning. And they will need to decide which type of action they will need to take, because there are some possibility.

We can, for example, imagine, and it's purely speculative, of course, they want to do like in other country, like China to ask the domestic internet becoming an internet, then the rest of the world will be in trouble for, I will say, sometime, because physically, the servers, 11 are in US, and the main one is run by VeriSign in US.

But, that means a lot needs to be done before it's possible for them to do that, and I guess that the community will have some time to react and to organize. And I am not sure that a large US company, both providing some and using the services of internet, will agree with that,

because it will mean that they will not be able to really converse with the rest of the world. And I guess it's, of course, we can imagine some scenario, but it's unlikely to come.

But, as Alan, said, we will see. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Sébastien. I will not give a personal point of view, but from data, if you want, some information. First of all, the position came first from Senator Cruz, alone. And then there was other Senators joining in. And at the end, there was, I don't know how many states that made them in the Texas court, and the Texas court didn't pronounce the judgment only at the last, last minute, before the transition happened, and it was because the big and the most important companies in the US, working on the internet, had a strong position with the transition, against the complaint.

So, those are only information. What will happen, nobody knows, because as you know, in politics, nothing is predictable. Okay, before giving the floor to Yeşim, Alan, please, you have the follow-up question.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Tijani. You just said something very similar to what I was going to say, but I'll phrase it differently. What we're talking about here is not technology politics. Politics does not have to be rationale. I think we all know that. So we're going to have to wait and see what happens. That's it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeşim?

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Thank you Tijani. There is another question on the question and answer pod. The question is from Arshad Mohamed. Arshad says, “I have a question with respect to the Congressional hearing that IANA transition had to go to. Why did Congressional hearing take place on this issue when, in fact, IANA transition was a mere contract which NTIA was not going to renew? Thank you.”

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Alan, again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Actually, I already answered that question before it was asked. Senate hearings are largely about political issues. There doesn't have to be a reason, only that someone initiates it, and the rest of their colleagues go along with it. So, the answer is because. I'm afraid there is no more satisfying answer than that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I agree with you. Sébastien, any idea about that?

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, maybe one part of the answer, and it will be easier for a US citizen to answer this question, but part of the answer is because they, the Congress, have a role in the budget of the administration, and they use that as a tool to get involved, or to try to get involved in the content of the discussion about the IANA transition.

But to let you know that, this was an important topic, and it's one of the reasons I push, and we, [inaudible] to organize also a hearing. They don't have any right of decision forward in that, but I sought and others with me, so that it is important not just the Congress or the Senate in US, could be interesting, it was a question.

I would have thought that other Parliament would be interesting in this exchange. It was quite interesting, of course, with less attention than in the US. We don't have a Senator Cruz in France, but it was interesting. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Sébastien. Yeşim, we have other questions, I think, in the chat. Yeşim?

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Can you hear me, Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: There are other questions on the chat.

---

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Just coming to the chat, but I see comments, not questions. Apologies if I’m missing anything.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Because I saw a message from Evan saying, “Please answer, or please read it.”

YEŞİM NAZLAR: I did. I already read Evan’s question.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you very much. Any other questions? [Inaudible], has a question.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Another one, yes another question. Could someone offer a little more detail on what is the standing consumer committee? Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. So, Sébastien, can you go ahead?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I may not be the best one to answer, but first of all, it’s, the name, if we are talking about the same thing, is... It’s not the consumer standing, wait a second.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Customer standing committee.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Customer standing committee. Customer standing committee. CSC. Okay. But, it's better if I let him go. Please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. The direct customers of the IANA root function, are in fact, the registries. They are the ones that request changes, as I've said, either because of the location of their servers changing, some other parameters changing, the address of the contact is changing, and it is quite important that IANA reacts quickly to this process.

And it's a relatively complex process, because although it is, in theory, just alternating and entering the database, IANA has to make very sure that what they're doing is not going to break the internet. Because if you type in the wrong number, the wrong entry for instance, a whole major part of the internet can stop working.

If, for instance, you change the location of the dot com registry, and you put in the wrong address, suddenly dot com is not reachable anymore anywhere on the internet. So there is a lot of detail on how they carry out their practices. There are some automated parts, there are some manual parts. And there was a belief when we created this new structure, that there should be a way that the customers themselves

---

can audit whether ICANN is doing a good job on the root zone maintenance or not.

And this customer standing committee was created to, in fact, look at the statistics, look at the processes, and essentially decide that indeed, things are working well. If they’re not, to take some action on them. So essentially, this is an audit committee that makes sure that the IANA root zone functions are carried out effectively and to the satisfaction of the customers, and remember, the customers are the registries.

The users use the registries. You know, if whoever operates a particular country code, feels that IANA is not doing things in a proper manner, then all of their customers, the actual end users, are going to be impacted. The group is made up largely of representatives of the registries, the ccTLDs and gTLDs. We have liaisons from a number of other interested bodies including the ALAC, that sit on that group.

They don’t have a voting role if there were ever a vote taken, but they have access to all of the same information and participate in all of the discussions, so we essentially are auditing the audit committee to make sure that everything is working from our perspective. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. Also, for [inaudible] information and [not?] opinion, the customer standing committee was proposed by the registries, as Alan said, and [inaudible] PTI is a proposal from the CWG stewardship transition, which is the cross community working group on the transition of the naming function.



So, this is the proposal of the naming function, the naming function community to create this PTI, and when it was decided, it was agreed that we create this PTI, they proposed to create two budgets. One is the CSC, the customer standing committee, which is the committee to oversee the day to day operation of PTI, oversee the day to day operation, very important because [inaudible] they have the right to be sure that everything is working correctly.

They want to be able to react at any time if there is a problem. So, this is the CSC. Thank you very much. Any other question?

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Tijani, this is Yeşim speaking. We have a question on the question and answer pod. May I read it out?

Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Please, please.

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Okay. So, the question is from Amal Al-Saqqf. He’s asking, “Does ICANN have a strategy to mitigate or deal with any confluences of IANA transition on governments, oversees like China toward internet fragmentation or internet reform? Like diplomatic outreach. Thank you.”

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Do you hear the question correctly? Because there was a small noise. Alan or Sébastien, did you hear the question correctly? Because I didn't.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. I think the question was, does ICANN have any involvement or plans regarding fragmentation of the internet or other actions governments can unilaterally take?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. So, if you want to answer this question, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: The answer is, ICANN deals with governments on a regular basis. We don't have any power to tell a government what to do, or what not to do. So, if a particular government decides to cut their country off the internet, impose, you know, censoring, or control over what their ISPs and what their companies can do on the internet, that's something we certainly don't like, but it's nothing that we have any control over.

Clearly, ICANN strongly supports an open and free internet, with no interference by local governments, and given the opportunity, we may say that. But that's not anything we can have any real effect over. So, do we do things in subtle ways? I suspect so. There are some things, I suspect, that you know, that have to be done in private, because we're not in a position to chastise or to criticize governments, something we have to be very careful not to do.

You know, if there is subtle influence put on organizations or governments, maybe.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Alan. Sébastien, any thoughts about that?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you. There are two things. The first one is that, it's important that we together within ICANN, but also decide we keep one internet. And that sometime, it may be difficult, but it's one of the reasons it's so important that all of the IANA function are keep within PTI and PTI within ICANN, because it's one way to keep one single internet.

You raised the issue of the governments, and the power of the governments to decide something around internet for the country. It's not very easy, as [country borders?] don't match with internet borders. The other risk we can face, it's not just what the government can take, but some very big company, I will not name them, can also make something against a unique internet.

Just to remind you, at the beginning of the internet, not really the beginning of the internet, but when the internet start to be open outside of the university and research, we saw different commercial proposition from different companies. And when you were entering into the so-called internet, in fact, you were entering to their own line,

---

and it could happen also, again, in the future with the big providers of internet services, or internet applications. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Sébastien. Any other questions Yeşim?

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Not for now. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Any questions from [inaudible]? We still have 30 minutes.

No questions?

Okay.

I don't see anyone.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: There is a question in the chat. Sébastien speaking. About, I will summarize it as, what is possible role of China? But not to single out China, but can we have very important country or countries who will fight against ICANN and against a unique internet? It's very difficult to answer this question.

But maybe you, if you follow the question of internet governance, and I was not in Mexico last week, but there were people from At-Large there, and I don't know what's happened really. But if you some

---

[inaudible] back with Net Mundial meeting in Brazil, the only stronger position around what was discussed in Net Mundial, was Russia. China is not so much against, maybe you can imagine that it's because the China have already solved that problem for their own country.

But there are more connected with ICANN than before, and I think the risk is the less China being completely alone, because their companies also need to trade with the rest of the world, and they understood that the unique internet, it's the only answer, they have to do so.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Sébastien. Alan, do you have to add something on this?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Not really. I mean, look, we know countries have power, and the countries may choose to exercise power. And we have a major echo. There is not a lot ICANN can officially do about that, and obviously, we do our best to try and make sure the internet will continue running.

I personally think there is more threat in the immediate term from whether its organizations or people with things like denial of service attacks, which have a huge potential for impacting the internet. And very little we can do about it to prevent it, although we're clearly trying to come to grips with how we can take an internet that is not designed for that level of security, and make it more secure and reliable.

So yes, there is a potential for governments taking action. Any given government may choose to take action. We've seen one in recent cases

with a potential for one African government. We know that there are other ones that, you know, decide the internet is bad politically for their country at any given moment and may take action, but there is nothing ICANN can formally do about that.

To what extent ICANN informally does things, you know, I'd like to think they do, but it's not necessarily something we're going to do on the public stage. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. I have seen from [inaudible], seeing that someone says China is the enemy of internet with a question mark. I really don't want this kind of statement, enemy of internet or not enemy of internet. This is political. And we are not about politics here. ICANN is not about politics. ICANN is about names and numbers.

And we don't care about anything done by governments. Here we are speaking about names and numbers. We are speaking about transition, we are speaking about the accountability in ICANN. So, please don't make us enter into the political consideration.

Anyone can say that China is an enemy, the others say that no, [inaudible] and the others, no, no, it's the US, etc. So, it is [inaudible] consideration, we are not [inaudible], and we don't want to enter into this kind of consideration. We only speak about names and numbers, not the views of internet. We speak about the users of internet, we can see.

---

In this case, this country is sponsoring, this country is not [inaudible], etc. But we are not about that. Thank you. Any others, Yeşim, do you see anything on the chat?

YEŞİM NAZLAR: I see a comment, but not a question, after [inaudible] question. There are no other questions.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. Any... Alan or Sébastien, do you have other things to add, or a remark? Or perhaps clarifications?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think so. I'm glad to answer any more questions, but I don't have anything particularly to add.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sébastien speaking. Thank you. Yeah, I think what is very important that, in the question you ask us to answer it's, what are the consequences for end user? And we talk about a single internet, that's a very important point. And we talk about what is the role of end user within this process? And it was quite strong, because we had different people who participate to all of the discussion.

And are trying our best as possible to voice of the end user, and it's not an easy task. And the third point is that we need to [inaudible] ICANN to be sure that within ICANN, we will still have the possibility to raise

---

this issue that end user care about, of course, domain names, IP addresses, and protocols.

And one important point is that we need to keep ICANN... In fact, I hope we will not see the TLDs going outside of ICANN, like the [inaudible] have already done, and discuss commercial issue outside, and then come back to tell us what they want to do and how they want to do it. It's important that we keep ICANN open to end user, and that we are part of this discussion as the voice of end user.

I'm sure that Alan will... Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Yes. Thank you very much. That gets into an interesting area that I think actually warrants a comment here. People from At-Large played a very, very major role in both stewardship discussions and the accountability discussions. Those processes did not start and immediately go to the end solution.

There were many, many other alternatives discussed. Some of them, certainly in my opinion, would have been very ill-advised if we had gone that way. At-Large's participation in both of those processes, I think was both instrumental, that is we helped, and ultimately critical, that we ended up where we did. And I think it has, in the eyes of many people who are involved in the process, significantly improved the



credibility of At-Large, in that we not only actively participated, but we were very involved in the critical decisions in ensuring that the outcomes were the ones that came out of it, and were satisfactory.

So, I think the process of having been involved in these activities... Sébastien has talked about why we went into it, why we thought it was important, but one of the [inaudible] of it is, I believe, the credibility in the eyes of many people has changed, and that will allow us, I think, to take a strong position in many future discussions.

So, I think that’s one of the good things that did come out of it. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Alan. This is absolutely true, and I think that At-Large was created to give ICANN credibility, to ensure that people that ICANN is multistakeholder, because at the beginning, people said that ICANN is only American companies. Now, At-Large is the acting fully, more or less, in all things. As an example, in the two tracks of this transition, and I think the inputs given by the At-Large people helped a lot, which these points, to have this solution and not another solution, because at the beginning, Alan will tell you that it was proposed a contract co rather than a PTI.

Something that is absolutely outside of ICANN to manage the IANA functions. And it was more or less, thanks to the contribution of the At-Large people in this committee, which was about [five?] people, that

---

these things changed a little bit, of course, with the help of other people on the CWG transition.

Also in accountability, there was a lot of issues on which the At-Large had some position, and helped a lot to have the accountability mechanisms look like what we have now, and not another [inaudible]. So, of course, that is what we believe as ALAC people, but I think that the other people, the overall ICANN people think that At-Large is well important part of ICANN, and I hope this continues to be like this.

Any other questions or interventions before I give the floor to Yeşim?

I don't see any. So, Yeşim, please [inaudible].

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Thank you very much Tijani. Okay, first pull up our first question. Okay. The first question is, how is the timing of the webinar for you? If it's too early, too late, or just right? Please cast now.

Thank you very much. I'll move on to the second question. Second question is, what region do you live in at the moment? Is it Africa, is it Asia, [inaudible]? Is it Europe? Or Latin America and the Caribbean Islands? Or is it North America? Please cast your votes now.

Thank you very much. Our third question is, how many years of experience do you have in the ICANN community? Less than one year? One to two years? Three to five years? Five to 10? Or more than 10 years? Please cast your votes now.

Thank you very much for your answers. Let’s move on to the fourth question. The fourth question is, how was the technology used for the webinar? Please cast your votes from five to one, five as very good and one as very bad. You may cast your votes now.

Our fifth question is, did the speakers demonstrate knowledge of the topic? Please cast your votes from five to one, five as extremely strong mastery of the subject, and one as extremely weak mastery of this topic. Please cast your votes now.

I will move on to the sixth question. The sixth question is, are you satisfied with the webinar? Again, please from five to one, five as extremely satisfied, one as not satisfied at all? And you may cast your votes now.

Now, here comes the last question. What topics would you like us to cover for the future webinars? Please type your answers in your blank space, and don’t forget to click on the icon next to it so we receive your answers.

[Inaudible] and Tijani, would you like to continue while we are receiving those entries from the [inaudible]?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Yeşim. Yes, these questions are very important. We really need you to tell us what kind of topics that we need to address in our future, in our 2017 webinars [inaudible]. As you know, we do 12 webinars a year, and we like to address the issues, or the

---

topics, or the subjects that you want us to do. It is for you. We do that for you.

So, please now, in this area you can write and type down your suggestions, but also you can send them to the staff, so that they can receive them and we can [inaudible] them, because we will have a call in December, the working group, the capacity building working group will have a call about the topics for the next year. So, as much as you [inaudible] topics, we will be better position to select [inaudible], to have more topics to try to select among them 12 for the next year.

So this is, I think, important for you, this is important for the working group. Thank you very much. I will consider perhaps, we still have 13 minutes, or 12 minutes, so if you have any other question, any other clarification, we want to have, please don't hesitate, we have time.

Okay. There is not. I will thank you very much for attending this webinar. So, no questions, okay. So, thank you very much for attending this webinar. Thank you Alan and Sébastien for giving this presentation and answering the questions. Thank you our staff, our interpreters, and this is webinar is adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**