
NETmundial – Beyond NETmundial – Panel 2
Thursday, April 24, 2014 – 14:00 to 16:30
NETmundial – São Paulo, Brazil

>> Ladies and gentlemen, if you would be kind enough to take your seats, this session is ready to begin.

Once again, if you'd be kind enough to take your seats, we will be able to begin our session.

Thank you very much.

FADI CHEHADE: This is the second public dialogue consultation that this panel is undertaking after the first one at the ICANN Singapore and we being tens of these over the next few months, so they will be in ICANN meetings, as you can see here. ICANN meetings, in IETF meetings, in regional Internet registry meetings around the world. So this is open consultation. It's inclusive. Everyone's ---

The second comment I want to make is an announcement that next week, to Carlos' question he --- I don't see Carlos but he asked the question in the last session, when will ICANN start a process to review ICANN's own accountability and take ICANN's reviews and reforms to the next level.

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.

So I'm happy to announce that next week we will start a second process of public dialogue and review and consultation focused on ICANN's accountability.

It will be announced starting next week.

[Applause]

FADI CHEHADE:

And this is an invitation for all of us to help us make ICANN an even stronger, better place where the structures work, where the policies come out truly bottom-up, where our board members are in a nomination process that is clear and inclusive for everyone, where it is clear how you can get appeals answered and redress to happen. All of this exists at ICANN but it needs to take -- to go to the next level. You are invited to come help us take it there.

So please, starting next week, that process will start.

Now, I want to clarify, because many people said, "How is that process connected to this process?"

This process is designed as a response to the U.S. Government's decision to transition its stewardship of the IANA functions to all of us. That's that process. And they will be discussing and listening to you how to make -- create, establish, or enhance, or maybe just look at the existing mechanisms in place that are needed to replace the U.S. stewardship with multistakeholder community stewardship or specific community stewardship, as needed.

These two processes are very interrelated. I may have used the word in the past "separate." I take that word back. They are related processes. They will run in parallel, but they will inform each other. They are interdependent, they're interrelated, and if we are successful, we should get these two processes to work on the same time line.

In fact, I wish we would have started them together, but due to some work that we had to do on this process, we ended up starting them separately.

But next week, the public work, the public dialogue, consultation on improving ICANN accountability, starts and we will work together to make both of these consultations arrive at a good result and hopefully together on the same time line. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

THERESA SWINEHART:

Great. Thank you, Fadi. That also shortens my remarks, so that's very good. Thank you.

So just to -- for the remote participants, we will be taking remote participation, input and questions, after we run through the panel, so I just wanted to flag that for anybody who's staying up late of any sort.

So just a few quick points.

A lot of times we talk about the context of IANA, people here, IP addressing or the names and various other things, but what does it

actually look like to an average user? What does it look like when we type in a domain name into a system?

And this is a very simplified version so the engineers in the room, please shut your ears, but say, for example, you type in "NETmundial.br" into your browser.

What actually happens?

Well, it's actually that the Web site access leverages three kinds of address books. One kind that maps to the domain name, to the IP address; the other that maps the IP address to the networks where those addresses live; and another that maps all the technical knobs that need to be set properly for the browser to be understood to the Web site.

So this is all very important to how we utilize the Internet and how we utilize the Web and how we utilize email.

But it's also -- from a user perspective, perhaps that puts a little bit of context into everything.

However, the details of all of this will be described in a bit more detail by the panelists.

Let me just touch briefly on where we are with the stewardship and the transition process overall. Fadi briefly mentioned it.

On the 14th of March, NTIA announced its intention to transition the key Internet domain name functions, where it plays a role, to the global

multistakeholder community. And as a first step, it asked ICANN to convene global stakeholders to develop a proposal for this transition.

The proposal itself, when it is completed with the community and with the dialogue that started happening, has to meet four criteria that have been set out by NTIA.

It needs to support and enhance the multistakeholder model.

It needs to maintain the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet and the DNS.

It needs to meet the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of the IANA services.

And it needs to maintain the openness of the Internet.

So those are fairly strong criteria, so we have work to do to ensure that whatever the proposal looks like, when it's provided to NTIA at the end of this process, meets those criteria.

So ICANN has started the discussion on what the process should look like. It began this dialogue at the 49th meeting in Singapore.

The input received focused in on principles and mechanisms for a process, and I know it sounds a little bit odd to talk about a process to create the process, but it's important that we're all engaged in this and really identify what the process should look like.

ICANN, being a facilitator of that, is not determining what the process actually looks like. That's all of our work together.

The materials that were received during the discussions at the meeting in Singapore were compiled and posted on the 8th of April for further comments by the community which will be up until the 8th of May. So I would strongly encourage everybody to look at that, provide your thoughts, provide your views, provide ideas how to improve it or change it or anything of that sort.

The materials posted include the scope of the discussion around this transition. It includes a proposed framework of principles and mechanisms including suggesting creating a cross-community steering group or working group to be the entity that also helps take the input from the respective communities and their dialogues around proposals to their specific areas in order to pull that all together into what will be a proposal to meet the four criteria.

So that's where we are on the process right now. Again, I would encourage you to look at it, provide your input, and by the 8th of May, that would be great. That will be compiled and then put out for the next steps.

Fadi's already started -- he discussed the ICANN accountability so I won't belabor that. I'll let us get to the panel itself.

Just briefly on what we'll cover for the panel, if they could put the slide up on the grid, that would be great.

Is that -- not yet. Hold on. Sorry.

Okay. And what we'll do with the panel is we'll go through all the different representations of the organizations. I'll allow everybody to

introduce themselves briefly. And this is just a very high-level overview of, as you're looking at these different areas, the policy areas for each of the specific parts -- protocol parameters, IP addressing, generic names or country names -- are actually established with the respective communities with those respective organizations.

If you look at the implementation part on the operational side, you'll see that ICANN plays a role -- ICANN and VeriSign and the root operators play a role in specific areas there.

When you look at the accountability part, you'll see that in many cases, in all the cases there, you have the USG playing a role, stewardship role or clerical role. And what we're looking at in the transition of NTIA stewardship in the IANA functions is what we need to look at filling in in the green box, right?

So where the role of the USG is changing and then what we need to look at in mechanisms to ensure the accountability and the responsibility areas are fulfilled.

So with that, and that very short overview, I'd like to go through the representation of the respective organizations that have roles and just ask everybody to talk a little bit about what they do, their thoughts, share whatever they've been thinking about in their respective community dialogues around this area, and I would start with the IETF and then go to the IAB, and then with Adiel for NRO and ASO, and I'll let everybody introduce yourselves briefly.

So Jari, could I turn to you?

JARI ARKKO:

Yes. Hello. So my name is Jari Arkko. I'm with the Internet Engineering Task Force or the IETF, and I'm very happy here -- to be here today and talk about this topic. I welcome the process started by the NTIA and I believe we all -- you all together -- will have and will evolve the IANA in a responsible manner.

And I wanted to get the engineering and IETF viewpoint on this matter.

So obviously we care a lot about the Internet and that it works well, that all aspects of governing it are done carefully. But regarding IANA, there's one particular part that we have a direct dependency on. The protocol parameters.

As part of our standards work, we end up allocating protocol parameters, such as port numbers, protocol numbers, various kinds of attribute numbers in different protocols, and the IETF role in that space relates to setting the allocation policies for these numbers and ensuring their faithful implementation.

We work together with the IANA department of ICANN who actually maintains a database of those allocations. The IETF and ICANN have a contract that specifies the roles of the different parties very clearly.

And I want to make a couple of observations about the protocol numbers aspect of the IANA functions.

First, the practices have evolved over time and the process recently started by NTIA is just another step in that evolution, so this is -- it's a big step but it's still just one step within that evolution.

In the last 15 years, the IETF and IANA have seen the creation of -- of the contracts between themselves, the service level agreements that are revised yearly, role definition, RFCs, groups that track the relationship, and not to mention thousands of RFCs on protocol parameter allocation policies. And those policies have been set by, again, thousands of IETF participants in an open consensus process, and the process indeed has been open to all. We have participants ranging from academics to businesses to even regulators.

And finally, I have a couple of personal suggestions on how we will reach a good resolve in this process that is now starting.

First, let us run a bottom-up community process so that the community or communities itself -- or themselves can show the path forward.

We are certainly doing this in the IETF, so please take the time to participate in these processes and participate in the current discussion about the process for the plan and then the actual subsequent discussion of the plan that we intend to provide by September 2015.

Second, a discussion of IANA changes go beyond ICANN. I think it's beneficial to push parts of the discussion to the organizations that are responsible for the individual parts, such as the IETF and protocol parameters or the regional Internet registries and IP addresses.

Finally, I think we need to stay focused. Let's find a way to make the IANA changes while keeping in mind that there are many other parallel discussions to have.

Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Jari, thank you.

Russ Housley, chair of the IAB.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Hi. Good afternoon. I'm Russ Housley, chair of the Internet Architecture Board.

We welcome the recent announcement by NTIA and we do see this as the next step in a process that started more than 14 years ago.

For the protocol parameters, the system is working very well for the IETF community.

We have confidence in the multistakeholder approach, and this confidence is well justified.

Policy -- as Jari said, policy is being set by the IETF community. It's being -- the operations functions are being performed by ICANN. And the oversight of these is being provided by the Internet Architecture Board.

The agreements and the specifications are in place and as Jari mentioned, they're reviewed regularly, and that review takes place by people selected by the nominations committee and is accountable to the community.

More than 1,000 individual protocol parameter actions have taken place in the first three months of this year. It gives you a feel for the scale of the protocol parameters portion of IANA, and that includes creation of

new protocol parameter registries when a new protocol is established, assignments within existing registries, and modifications and removals within existing registries. And all that is going on at the same time that the IANA staff is reviewing drafts for future RFCs, to make sure that the processes that are specified in them are clear so that they can actually implement them if they're approved.

So we're looking forward to engaging with the whole Internet community as this process goes forward.

Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you, Russ.

Next we'll move to the IP addressing side. I will start with Adiel Akplogan, with the NRO, and then followed by Frederico Neves who runs the IP address registry for Brazil.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Thank you. Thank you, Theresa.

Yeah, it is a pleasure for me to discuss this specific matter with this very diverse community.

I think it is a unique opportunity for us to address and discuss this issue with you. So I'm Adiel Akplogan. I'm the CEO of AfriNIC, and at the same time, I'm this year the chair of the Number Resource Organization.

For us, I think this moment is something we have been calling for for a while and inevitably we are committed to work together with our respective communities. As RIRs, that means the number resource users, and the global community as well, in order to come up with a solution that shows that we can live up to the expectation and deliver something that ensures a continuous, stable, reliable, and secure operation of the number registry.

As one of the direct beneficiaries of IANA service, we will, of course, run consultation dialogue in our respective communities. That is a regional community. As you know, we as a RIR, we have a regional coverage where in each of our regions we have a very well-defined bottom-up policy development process which we can definitely use in order to get input of our community on this.

We have reviewed the draft process and framework document that ICANN has recently published, which will be a kind of the guideline for all of us, not only within the ICANN framework, to participate and contribute to this process of the IANA oversight, for the transition of the IANA oversight.

We have global -- globally -- we support the framework as defined in that document globally. In terms of process, we also think that it will make it more easier and probably the process effective if ICANN in this process can delegate part of the discussion to those stakeholders who directly benefit from the service of the IANA.

So that we, as a RIR, for instance, can take this up regionally with our discussion, so that the input and the contribution from our respective communities can be very pertinent to the specificity of our region.

We also want to reinforce the fact that this process is mainly about IANA function oversight and stewardship, the transition of that stewardship. It is very important for us to focus at this point in time on that specific transition and if there is any improvement that is needed related to the function itself, related to ICANN, we can focus on that later. Let's focus on this first. Let's use all the process, all the means that will be provided to give input and contribute to an oversight that we all feel part of. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you, Adiel.

Frederico?

FREDERICO NEVES:

Thank you, Theresa. Hi, good afternoon. My name is Frederico Neves. I'm the director of services and technology of NIC .br, the not-for-profit organization in charge of the dot br registry and the Brazilian NIR operations.

Having participated in this process since the EFWP, I'm very happy with the IANA announcement as this brings new hope that I will still see a closure for this process.

We should not forget that IANA is a service for a few thousand direct users but indirectly throughout all the Internet. IANA doesn't set policy. It only applied the ones created at other bodies, some of them outside of ICANN.

And these already provide a reasonable balance of power and perhaps already allocated oversight. During those more than 17 years of use of the IANA services, we have saw continuous improving of them, being the availability of (indiscernible) parsable versions of the registries, being the deployment of the RZM and others always with a high level of professionalism, availability, and especially predictability of services.

Those key (indiscernible) of the current service must be kept during this stewardship transition.

We look forward to continuing -- collaborating and improving the IANA services, taking in account the legacy that could still be seen there since the service was provided through the IANA at isi.edu address. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you very much, Frederico. Now we will move from the namespace from that part. And if I could start actually with Jonathan Robinson, chair of the GNSO, and then we'll go to Jorg and then to Byron. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thank you, Theresa. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Jonathan Robinson. I'm chair of the GNSO Council at ICANN. When talking about

the session, we agreed that it may be useful to make some remarks to orient the audience because not all of you are familiar with ICANN and the makeup and structure.

So the GNSO exists through the bylaws of ICANN, and it is an ICANN supporting organization. Functionally, it is the body responsible for developing and recommending to the ICANN board the policies relating to generic top-level domains.

The GNSO itself is a multistakeholder body comprised of diverse stakeholder groups as well as constituencies organized within those stakeholder groups. The policy work is managed by the GNSO Council of which I am the chair, and it's undertaken in working groups which are open to all.

There are unique and specific characteristics about what we call "consensus policy" developed in the GNSO in that once it is accepted by the ICANN board, it becomes contractually binding on the GNSO -- on the gTLD registries. And we refer to that as Consensus Policy, with a capital C and a capital P.

So we have comprehensive procedures in place to facilitate the development of this critical GNSO policy and analogous tasks of which we are talking now in a bottom-up, consensus-driven, and multistakeholder manner.

Therefore, we are well-equipped to work with this, in my view, the NTIA transition type of problem in a similar bottom-up multistakeholder manner as envisaged within the NTIA announcement.

The GNSO is very interested in the transition of the responsibilities from the NTIA for a whole variety of reasons and one particular noteworthy point I'd make in this context is that the registry operators are direct and regular customers and users of the IANA function. So, therefore, whilst the GNSO has well-developed procedures for developing policy in this bottom-up, open, and transparent way, it is clear that with regard to the NTIA transition, work will need to be originated across the entire ICANN community, and we have previous experience within the ICANN community this type of work, again, being done in a bottom-up manner within cross-community working groups.

Also, work on the transition from NTIA needs to be open, transparent, and inclusive and in particular explicitly recognizing at all times this is much more than an ICANN issue, a most pertinent point in this forum. Any work or process taken within the ICANN community needs to be continually cognizant of that point.

From our perspective, it is early days as we start on the work to develop the processes to develop a proposal to deal with this transition. But there is an existing proposal on the principles and mechanisms that's been published by ICANN in its capacity or as convener of the process. And I expect there will be comprehensive feedback from various groups within the GNSO.

In addition, there is the possibility of a community-initiated cross-community working group with GNSO as members but certainly not exclusive participants in such a cross-community working group.

And we are mindful of the fact that there are both direct customers and consumers of the IANA services as well as a whole range of directly and indirectly impacted parties.

Finally, there is clearly significant -- a significant accountability component to the existing NTIA role which needs work and is not addressed in this current -- in this context right here and so a place needs to deal -- needs to be found to deal with that in an integrated way. And to that extent, I was very pleased to hear Fadi's announcement at the beginning of this session. Thank you, Theresa.

THERESA SWINEHART: Wonderful. Thank you. Jorg?

JORG SCHWEIGER: My name is Jorg Schweiger. I'm the CEO of DENIC, a company managing the registry for dot de Germany. De, by the way, is the largest country code top-level domain in the world focused on a local market. And we're currently handling about 16 million domain names.

That said, for me as a ccTLD manager, the IANA function is predominantly a database administration function performing operations like name server changes on my behalf commissioned by my organization.

And like for any other I.T. system, I would require this system just to be accessible, doesn't even have to be 100% available. Let's say 99%. It's got to perform its task correctly, comprehensively and seamless, robust, secure and in a timely, predictable, trusted manner. Period. That, by

the way, even includes the ccTLD redelegation as this is handled by or in the country. And it will just result in yet another order to the database management system to be updated.

So as to a governance body that we're talking would only be needed for delegations or even for fundamental changes to be applied to the ecosystem as a whole and to further evolve it, to my point of view this governance body could be ICANN. If so, most probably some changes would be needed to apply. For example, with respect to accountability, e.g., talking about the Affirmation of Commitments. That's basically my point of view and the ccTLD points of view. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you. Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: Hi, my name is Byron Holland. I'm the President and CEO of CIRA which is the top-level domain operator for Canada, dot ca. Currently I'm currently also the chair of the ccNSO, the country code name supporting organization within ICANN, sort of a sister organization to the GNSO which you already heard about.

First I would like to say thank you to the government of Brazil who has like many things in the Internet taken a risk in being innovative in coming forward with a conference like this.

But I would especially like to call out my peers and my friends at cgi.br who operate the Brazilian registry, in particular Demi and Hartmut and Frederico and their teams who have done heavy lifting on putting on a

very complicated, complex event in a short amount of time. And I think we all owe them a significant thank you for that.

[Applause]

And I just want to point them out in particular because for many years, in fact, arguably decades, they have been an excellent example in our community of what multistakeholderism is really about, bringing the technical community, civil society, governments to the problems that needed to be solved in terms of the advancement of the Internet. They're an excellent example of how it can be done and how effective it can be. So thank you for that.

Secondly, I would like to reinforce my colleague Jorg's comments particularly around the notions of security and stability and resiliency. As domain name operators, that is job one, it's job two and it's job three. By doing that and ensuring that, we in our respective parts of the Internet ensure that you and all the end users can actually get access to the Internet and end up in the right place.

So whatever happens with the IANA transition, you can be assured, I think, that the CC operators, or the country code operators from around the world, will be particularly focused that in the face of any change -- and we believe that this change is the next logical step in the globalization of the Internet -- but in the face of any change, there is some inherent risk. And we will definitely be focused as a community on making sure that however the oversight transition happens, that we mitigate that risk and ensure continued delivery of a stable, secure and resilient network.

Finally, let me just say a few things in my capacity as the ccNSO chair. Country code operators are somewhat unique in the Internet ecosystem in that while we are day-to-day operators of a function, we also typically have elements of sovereignty that are wound in and around our organizations.

We are not all the same or homogenous by any measure. Sometimes we are run out of universities, sometimes government departments, sometimes pure private sector actors, sometimes not-for-profits. We have very different makeups, very different business models even though we have generally speaking a common goal.

But because we typically have strong relationships or at least relationships with governments, there is that notion or that element of sovereignty that we have to pay attention to. And as such, one of the manifestations of that is that country code operators, for the most part, do not have contractual relationships with ICANN or IANA. We have to work consensually within the ccNSO as well as with ICANN and the IANA function which is so critical to all of the registry operators.

And that makes how we interact in this process somewhat unique relative to the other actors in the process particularly because it has to be very consensual and respectful of the issues of sovereignty.

That said, we are operators and like our colleagues in the generic namespace as well as I would say the root zone maintainer and the root operators, we are part of a very small number or type of actual customer of IANA. So while we all need to participate in the discussion about this transition and make comment, I would also just remind this

audience and everybody in the overall conversation that there are really a very few set of customers of the IANA functions and generally speaking, our concerns are going to be twofold, one over the appropriate oversight and accountability associated with the IANA functions but, as I said, jobs typically one, two, three are going to be about the safe, secure and resilient management of the network and the IANA functions that are so core to what we do on a day-to-day basis.

We in the ccNSO community have already started making comment within the ICANN fold, and we will continue both inside ICANN and beyond.

We have identified what we believe are the actual elements of the U.S. government oversight that will need to be addressed as it withdraws its oversight function. And we have put those on record for ICANN at this point. We certainly intend to be part of any potential cross-community working groups that are relevant to this discussion and certainly intend to be a fulsome participant in the overall discussion.

So with that, I would like to say thank you very much for this opportunity and look forward to any questions later.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you, Byron.

[Applause]

That was very -- thank you.

We will hear also from Heather Dryden who's the chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee also from a governmental perspective using the opportunity of this meeting to hear from that.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you very much. Thank you. Can you hear me now? Okay. So good afternoon, everyone. As Theresa mentions, I chair the Governmental Advisory Committee to ICANN and I come from the Canadian Department of Industry. It is a pleasure to be here this afternoon and to provide a GAC perspective. And I can see many representatives from the GAC here. They have been participating in NETmundial, so that's really positive to see. Thank you to Byron for pointing out that governments have a particular interest in country code matters. I won't go into that in great deal of detail in my comments today. But I think it's important to acknowledge that.

First of all, I will talk a little bit about what the GAC is. Not everyone here might be familiar with it. And in addition, the GAC role and thoughts so far about the transition of the U.S./IANA role and what comes next for the GAC in terms of thinking about that particular matter.

So, first of all, the GAC is an advisory committee to ICANN created under the ICANN bylaws, to provide advice on public policy aspects of ICANN's responsibilities.

GAC membership consists of national governments and distinct economies recognized in international fora and mostly in an observer

capacity, multinational, governmental, and treaty organizations and public authorities.

The GAC has grown over the last few years. Currently, more than 135 governments and 30 observer organizations are members.

The GAC takes its own decisions on advice to provide to the ICANN board on issues that are within the scope of ICANN's role.

The GAC is not an exclusive channel through which ICANN deals with governments. Since ICANN also deals with governments and intergovernmental organizations in a general level through its stakeholder engagement outreach.

ICANN looks to the GAC for consensus advice on public policy aspects of specific issues for which ICANN has responsibility. The GAC also provides views about ICANN's processes, drawing on a range of public sector experience.

Over time the GAC has demonstrated an ability to be flexible and adapt as part of the ICANN framework and to be highly influential regarding ICANN's decisions. As a result, it remains important that the GAC be able to keep in step with ICANN's continued evolution.

As far as the GAC and the U.S. IANA role, the story to date is as follows. So some of you will be aware that in our outcome document, which we call a communique from the last meetings, in Singapore the GAC noted that the NTIA announcement is a timely step in the process of making Internet governance truly global and marks major progress in the development of the multistakeholder model.

Also, the GAC is willing to participate in and contribute to the process to be convened by ICANN, and underlines that the consultations and discussions should reach out to all parties, including those governments that are presently not members of the GAC and also not part of the ICANN multistakeholder community.

ICANN should make full use of existing events and fora, to ensure a broader engagement, including NETmundial and the Internet Governance Forum.

So let me expand on this a little. And you can read the transcripts from -- from the GAC discussions. All GAC sessions are generally open, with the exception of the finalization of our negotiated output documents which, as I mentioned, we call a communique.

So there was support from many GAC members for the NTIA announcement, although some were more cautious and wanted more details as the ICANN process unfolds. There were two issues that GAC members want to make sure receive particular attention.

The first of these is the importance to governments of need to maintain the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet, the DNS, and I think we've heard many colleagues here echoing precisely that thought.

And the second issue is that the interests of developing countries are fully addressed, both in the process and in the final outcomes.

So what can the GAC bring to this transition process?

ICANN's proposed process model is still out there for public comment, and the GAC has not formed a particular view on the suggested

modalities. The GAC may or may not be able to reach a consensus view on the process, but this will not prevent the GAC from being involved in a constructive way.

Individual GAC members can -- and I'm sure many will -- contribute directly to the process as interested stakeholders.

They can also use GAC structures and processes to better inform themselves, other members, and the community, to generate better public debate on the issue generally.

GAC structures and processes include face-to-face meetings, which as I have noted are generally transparent, intersessional work, and dialogue with the community as well as support from a new independent secretariat.

GAC members can bring several levels of expertise to the transition process. And whatever you may think of the role of governments in general, they do have insights on how to achieve outcomes from difficult issues that affect a large number of people.

GAC members also represent specialized areas of expertise within national governments and are knowledgeable about the specifics of the public policy aspects of the DNS and the unique ways of ICANN.

So to move forward in this process, the upcoming ICANN meetings to be held in London in June provide several opportunities for governments to continue further to the transition process. The GAC will again have this matter on its agenda and I am hopeful that the best mechanism for GAC involvement in the ICANN process will have been settled by that time.

In addition, it's important to note that the U.K. government is convening a high-level meeting during the ICANN meeting for governments that will consider both broader Internet governance issues and the role of governments and the GAC. It may be that the high-level meeting can play a role in moving forward this exercise to transition the U.S. role by exploring the link between the themes for that agenda.

So to conclude, thank you for this opportunity to talk a bit from a GAC perspective and I will hand back to you, Theresa.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

THERESA SWINEHART: So as we heard, we have a wide range of customers that have a relationship with the IANA function and there is no one size fits all. There's some clear, very active dialogues occurring in the respective communities, and the ultimate objective in ensuring a successful stewardship transition is a proposal that helps pull all of that together that meets the criteria that have been set out.

So we have a bit of work ahead but we look forward to it.

And as Fadi had mentioned, there will be launched next week the ICANN accountability process, and please, we would ask that everybody actively participate in that as that's a very, very important element that has always been part of the discussion as well.

With that, we wanted to open up for questions to the panelists, or observations, anything of that sort, and I will ask to be flagged every once in a while for remote participants.

So if I could start -- if you could introduce yourself, that would be great. Thank you.

>>

Thank you. I am Roberto Meyer, WITSA member from Brazil, and I'd like to talk on behalf of WITSA.

As you heard over the last two days, we have a number of our members here at NETmundial and we have been actively engaged in all phases of this process. We have worked on NETmundial for this opportunity for stakeholders to work together to develop as much common understanding of the outputs documents.

Regarding this stewardship role panel, we already welcome the U.S. Government position to transition the key domain name functions to the global multistakeholder community and we would like to support the first step is for ICANN to convene global stakeholders to develop a proposal to transition the current role by NTIA.

We offer some concerns and would like to make an offer.

Businesses such as our members are also highly affected, even if they are not direct IANA customers.

Such technical and important topics must be addressed with businesses, and participation by the ICT sector represented as stakeholders.

As WITSA stated in our NETmundial content submission, and has been repeated here more than once, the ICT sector is the Internet and the Internet is the ICT sector, mainly as seen by users.

We have a broad and highly representative reach into the ICT sector in 85 countries covering all the world's regions, and we look forward to engaging in this consultation and working to ensure a neutral, transparent and inclusive development of a transition process inclusive of the broad diversity of interested and affected stakeholders, along with all technical players.

Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you very, very much. That's very helpful.

I'll rotate back and forth here, so yes.

>>

Good afternoon, everybody. Good afternoon, Theresa. Thank you very much. I see still we need more gender balance on the podium. It's 2 to 9. We should have 4 to 5 or 5 to 4 in future, our expertise there. And you are a good example -- you and Heather are a good example of this expertise that you could run the meeting quite successfully. So don't count this one as a two minutes time limit now.

I'm going to ask you a very specific question. The question is that IANA, as you mentioned, timely announced the transition of stewardship. Not

in 2013 but not 2015. Instead, 2014 it make that announcement. So good time for that.

Now, what you have to do, there are four conditions for that transition and you have to fulfill those four conditions.

Let's take it from the bottom.

If you go to the IANA in 2015 and given your draft or whatever, and said that, "No, one of these conditions is not met or is not fully met," so what do you do?

So do you have any process between now and 2015 to back-and-forth check to see that if 2015 you go there and they say, "No, it is not meeting the requirement," you would have another one year or two years? No. That is very --

Now, coming to the important questions.

How you developed the models that you have to present to IANA? Because the function of the system has, in our view, two parts. Policy parts and operational parts.

Who established the policy parts?

And then once you prefer everything, you have to go to the multistakeholder and you prove that this is approved or adopted or supported multistakeholder. How you outreach all those multistakeholders? Is it just by the public announcement or you have other mechanism, other model to reach all of those people because you're dealing with very, very important issues?

And now, coming to the policy and so on and so forth and inside the ICANN, I have mentioned -- and I want to mention again -- the accountability is a system that has a separation of powers. Currently, I'm sorry to say that it is not a criticism but it is a fact that the accountability in ICANN is a self-accountability.

You are accountable to yourself. There is no entity that you are accountable to, and there is no policy that based on that policy you are accountable.

You establish the policy. You are accountable to yourself and that's all.

And what about the future? What would happen in future for this accountability actions and so on and so forth?

So these are the issues that need to be further developed, but the most important is how you outreach all those multistakeholder. Would you have a meeting? Would you have a dialogue? Would you have a passive dialogue like today that are making comment, others maybe negating my comment, they say, "No," they'll argue with that, there is no way to discuss, there is no way to debate, there is no way to come to some agreement, so what process you will use to have this multistakeholder dialogue in order to arrive --

[Timer sounds]

-- at something that you go to the IANA for the first announcement or the first evaluation. And I thank you very much.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you very much.

Would any of my colleagues care to respond to any of the points?

Okay. Then I will just very quickly, just to reiterate, the dialogue in the engagement is beyond just the ICANN community and you've heard from the different entities that are also beyond the ICANN community of discussions that they're having in their respective communities, and awareness, and we also certainly appreciate the opportunity to be having a dialogue here which is also very much outside of our traditional communities.

On the dates, it's useful to have a date. As you know, there's an opportunity to extend that contract twice. The date, though, is a good goal to have.

And in the context of the overall other questions, I think if you can make sure you put those into the process, they're very good observations and could be very good contributions to that.

So if I -- sorry. If I could have the gentleman there -- sorry, the gentleman to the far right. Yes. Thank you.

>>

Okay. I would like to thank the comments by the representatives of the ICANN on the DNS system, ecosystem.

I would like to highlight two aspects related to ccTLDs. In particular, I came here with the hope that we could discuss this.

Because they can be a natural instrument for Internet governance implementation, at least -- or exercise, at least, in the countries.

It is very difficult to have a global governance system.

We thought that as part of the civil society and the individual Internet users, we could participate in this system of -- for ccTLD management because we believe that it is necessary to highlight, as Mr. Byron Holland said, that these ccTLDs today are run by companies, corporations, NGOs, individuals, and governments, but the individual participation cannot establish governance conditions. That is why I would like to raise this issue here and I would like to ask you to please do whatever is in your power to ensure the engagement and the participation of Internet users in these definitions. Basically, going back to --

[Timer sounds]

-- principles in RFC-1591. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you. Thank you very much. Does anybody on the panel want to -

Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: I did just want to add --

And thank you for that comment because I think it raises an important issue around ccTLDs.

I'm the chair of the ccNSO. I don't claim -- and I -- this role doesn't represent other ccTLDs.

And there's another important element. We represent -- or within the organization there are about 150 ccTLD operators. That is the significant majority of operators around the world, but it is certainly not all of them, so not all CCs are members of the ccNSO.

However, we are certainly going to be doing our best to spearhead and work with the regional CC organizations to reach out to those who are not members and do everything we can to bring all of the CC community into the discussion, regardless of whether they're ccNSO members or not.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you very much.

So we had government, civil society. I'll go to technical and then do you mind if I -- then I'll go to business. So... thank you.

>>

Thanks Theresa. Jordan Carter from Internet New Zealand. Let's get the label right this time.

Thank you for the chance to speak and I just want to reflect on what Fadi said about the accountability stuff that's going to be out next week.

There's been some difficulty in the discussions on the IANA transition piece that have been generated by a lack of clarity around accountability issues and how they could be addressed, and the particular issue of the separation of operations and policy in the IANA function.

So I wanted to say thank you and to say I'm pleased to hear that's coming out next week.

I think that ICANN should prepare an overall scope document that sets out both what is going to be dealt with in that accountability thing and in the IANA transition in one place, so people can see that between the two processes, everything that needs to be dealt with is going to be dealt with. And I'd like to make an argument that we should be sure that the accountability piece is a precondition for the IANA transition.

There has to be an improved, settled accountability framework in place before the NTIA ends the contract, which I do hope we can all do before 30 September 2015. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Yes, I hope before September.

Vint, please.

VINT CERF: I'm Vint Cerf. I'm vice president of Google but I want to speak to you not with that hat on. I'd like to speak to you as the coinventor of the Internet, the former president of the Internet Society, the former

chairman of ICANN, and the former chairman of the Internet Architecture Board.

First thing I want to observe is -- and call to your attention is the incredible diversity of functions and organizations that are required to make the Internet work the way it does today.

You can see that right here in front of you, and you heard more about it for the people that these folks on the panel represent.

So keep that in mind.

Second thing, keep in mind that the historic process by which the Internet has evolved has allowed it to grow by a factor of 1 million since 1983 when it was turned on.

So keep in mind that we have a pretty good history of ability to grow this system on a global scale, with the processes that have evolved up until the present point.

The third point is that the oversight by NTIA had the benefit of two things: lightweight and simple. And as you enter into this debate and discussion about accountability, if you make things too complicated, you will make it really hard for the Internet to continue to grow and serve its users in the way that it has for the last 30 years.

The fourth point is that one of the reasons this has worked is that every one of the parties involved on that panel and their constituents and the rest of us in the room --

[Timer sounds]

-- have believed in a collaborative environment. We all wanted to make the Internet work.

Finally, last point, don't screw this up.

[Applause]

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you very much. Important points to be noted.

I'll go back over to this side. If I could have civil society. Thank you.

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon Chung here, and I made an effort to move to this side of the room, to be -- so I can speak with a civil society hat on.

Following with what Vint said, "Don't screw it up," I can't help but recognize that almost all the organs in ICANN is here in the panel except for ALAC, and I understand that you probably focus more on the customers for the IANA function, but I can talk about at least one function or at least one service that is to the public, which is the IANA WHOIS, the IANA database, the TLD database and the IP database. That is a service to an end user.

I, as an end user, would consult that service. So don't leave out ALAC and don't leave out the end users. Thank you.

[Applause]

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you. That's very important. Thank you.

We do have a few pending comments from the remote hubs, so if I may, if you don't mind, just to hold off just for a second all right. Thank you.

If we can figure out how to put those up.

>> Okay. We have a total of six comments, so I would like to know if it is reasonable to read all them or just some of them.

THERESA SWINEHART: That's a good question. Let me ask the gentleman.

Do you mind if I do three and then come to you? Is that all right? Okay. Thank you, Kurt.

>> So I'll present three.

THERESA SWINEHART: Let's do three.

>> Okay.

THERESA SWINEHART: Let's do three and then we'll go to the speaker and then we'll do the three others and then go back to the line, and then I think we're running out of time, if I'm not mistaken, so we'll cut it off after that. Thank you.

>> Okay. Thanks. So the first comment comes from remote hub at Ecuador.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Comment from Ecuador hub, representation of civil society.

We share the concerns mentioned about lack of reaffirmation of democracy as a core criteria for the Internet governance, and about the need for a deeper debate of the multistakeholder model, the potential of the model, and the limitations of the model.

So we propose to include in Section 405 of the document the following mention: We second the proposal to convene a meeting that will only deal with democracy, multistakeholderism, and the roles of multistakeholders.

>> Now we have two comments, one from Bangladesh civil society and another one from Nigeria.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: This is a comment from civil society from Bangladesh.

What initiatives are being taken to bring in more -- bring in more participation from developing countries?

Since the next 2 billion Internet users are coming from these countries, it will be unfair if these countries are not represented in proportion.

And the second comment from Nigeria reads: When Fadi says this panel will be going to other events for the next few months to discuss this issue, does it mean that this is a de facto panel that will lead the NTIA oversight transition process?

Secondly, the NRO chair says they support the ICANN proposed process globally. Can I also assume they support scoping a document as well? Thanks.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you. Does anybody want to answer any of those?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes, just to answer the question that was directed to me about the scope, yes, we are scoping of the document. And we will work best on that scope. Thanks.

THERESA SWINEHART: On the outreach, all the different organizations have events in different regions as well so there is a broad range of outreach which should reach all regions. Thank you.

Kurt?

KURT PRITZ:

Thank you, Theresa.

I'm Kurt Pritz with the Domain Name Association. First, everything that Vint said and then the Domain Name Association represents the interests of the domain name industry, including country codes, TLDs and generic TLDs, IANA's largest direct partners and customers. There will be close to 1600 TLDs in the near future representing over 1,000 IANA transactions a year. The current ICANN proposal for an oversight transition plan, however, essentially excludes gTLD operators from direct input. This proposal was written after ICANN board member Ray Plzak said in the Singapore meeting, "We don't have the equivalents from the name world sitting at the table. The point is that registries should be engaged in a much better manner than they are now. They are underrepresented in this."

I know from my own experience that the stakeholder process, the multistakeholder process, works well and it's going to work in the IANA transition. It will work because it's inclusive and because we have unfiltered access to experts in every field for the IANA transition. Those experts are IANA's customers, the RIRs, the IETF and TLDs.

Developing the transition process has to be customer focused and rely upon the expertise with those with first-hand experience.

On another note and on my own behalf, I believe the discussion of the separation of policy and operations is not of primary concern now and need not occur now. There are already separations and sets of checks

and balances in place inherent in the process that need to be understood first.

[Timer sounds.]

If I had more time I would thank the organizers and volunteers that stayed up until 2:00 in the morning working. So thank you very much.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you very much.

With that I'm going to go back to the other three remote and then I will go to civil society and then go back here. And I think we're closing off the comments then after the lady behind you.

>>

Okay, so we have three comments coming from St. Lucia, civil society, Bhimavaram Town, India, and also USA technical community.

REMOTE INTERVENTION:

The first comment reads: When Mrs. Swinehart says "community," which particular communities were you referring to?

A comment from India civil society reads: "We have already approved draft IETF protocols. Why don't we use them?"

And the final comment from the U.S. technical community reads: "Do panelists have a view on where and how ccTLDs redelegation should be addressed in the evolving Internet ecosystem?"

THERESA SWINEHART: On the community factor, that involves all stakeholders and the respective communities that work with the different customer bases of the IANA function. So it's a term that's used in that context.

Does anybody want to respond to any of the other points? Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: I'll just make a couple of comments, one in general and one a little more specific based on the comment that was just received. First is in response to, I think it was, Edmon's civil society intervention around why is civil society not on this panel.

I just want to remind civil society and also the audience in general that many or most of the ccTLD operators like our colleagues here in Brazil, like I do in Canada and many, many others have essentially multistakeholder environments in their own areas, their own territories, countries, and that civil society is generally speaking always welcome to participate in those kinds of organizations. So it may not seem like a direct drive relationship like a direct customer of the IANA function. But let me assure you in many, if not most, of the CCs there is an ability to provide input into this process.

There was a very specific question that came in regarding ccTLD delegation, redelegation, and retirement and where that should take place.

I just wanted to make note that within the ccNSO but also as a cross-community working group, the issues around those three components

are being discussed very actively and have had the involvement of GAC members, certainly country code operators and more. So there has been considerable work done on the subject, and it continues to be ongoing. Documents -- more documents than you could ever hope for on this subject are available on the ccNSO Web site.

THERESA SWINEHART: And so we have Jorg and then Russ.

JORG SCHWEIGER: I would like to comment on the specifics question about redelegation as well. To my point of view, I think that redelegation issues should be handled in respective country. And that is, as Byron already mentioned, because ccTLDs are sovereign. And as they are sovereign, there's no need for a different multistakeholder perspective within the issues that tackle (indiscernible) country, be it a delegation, redelegation or just a change of name server. So what I really do believe is that these kind of problems should be resolved in the given country.

THERESA SWINEHART: Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So we heard in the question that we have some Internet drafts in the IETF community, why don't we just use them. We're in the middle of a process as well. And one was to document how things are currently working, and that is documented in RFC6220. And so that gives us a

baseline to do the rest of this review from. And at the last IETF meeting in London, we discussed the principles that need to be maintained as we go forward and so for the protocol parameters, we now have a list of six principles. It will work from those.

And, finally, we will participate with the other folks that are involved in the names and the number space to make sure we come together with a holistic system that works for all of us. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Heather?

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you. So on the topic of country codes, I thought it would be useful to point out that the Governmental Advisory Committee has developed a set of principles concerning delegation and redelegation of country codes, and that is one of the reference documents for the initiative that Byron talked about that is being led by the Country Code Name Supporting Organization. And I think that I agree and my government colleagues would certainly agree that country code matters really are to be resolved at the national level. And I think this is a well-understood and well-recognized principle as well. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you, Heather.

I had been remiss in responding to one aspect that a remote participant had raised and that was whether this panel is actually overseeing the

NTIA stewardship transition. No. The proposal that is out for public input until the 8th of May proposes a cross-community along with all of the represented organizations that have a relationship with the IANA function, customers, a proposed kind of steering group. So please take a look at the proposed framework and process and please provide your input and thoughts and suggestions on that. And we can make sure that that's captured in there so it is very important. But this is not -- this is not the oversight mechanism for this process. Thank you.

Let me go to the gentleman there.

>>

Thank you. David Cake, civil society and from Electronic Frontiers Australia and currently one of the vice chairs of the GNSO. So I just want to reply to what Vint Cerf said. Of course, I'm not -- I'm not silly enough to disagree with Vint. But he did say that the current process is very simple and it is. I have been told by -- directly by NTIA people that the actual check they do, review process, takes about two minutes. They more or less just do say is this in line with the appropriate policy and it is. And I'm hoping that will eventually return to something that takes, you know, still 2 to 5 minutes maybe at the outcome. The difficult part is determining that everybody trusts the person that makes that call, that they're accountable, and that we all trust that the decision will always be done rightly and cannot be abused by anyone.

So it will take us a while to come up with that. But I do think we're all in agreement -- well, we can't say that everybody is in agreement. I think many of us are very much in agreement that what we need to get back

to is eventually that same simple process. It will just take a long time to get there.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you very much.

Jari wants to comment. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: So I fully agree with that comment, of course. The one thing that I wanted to add is that -- to provide some perspective. The IANA organizations, actually just ten people, ten professionals working on this task. They do great work, by the way. But you can imagine that all of us and many other organizations and meetings around the world discussing this and a hundred plus governments thinking about how to oversee this. So in addition to the great work, they also do receive quite a lot of oversight. So it's -- let's keep things in perspective and at an appropriate level. Thank you.

DAVID CAKE: Of course, when I said it is that simple, I meant only the NTIA or the oversight function, not the whole of IANA, which I understand does a great many things and does it well.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you very much. We are going until 5:00 and then we have a break. I will take the next three speakers here for the dialogue. Please.

>>

Hi. My name is James Seng from (saying name). I welcome the U.S. position, and I believe it is sincere that has given two or three of IANA at this moment in time. Given the politics that's been played in the domestic or even at the international arena, it is not certain to me that the political view would remain in September 2015.

And potentially we may be looking at extension of contract to 2017 or 2019, potentially. It is hard to say what will happen.

One of the things, we need a plan B in the event that the U.S. is not giving up or releasing control as is promised even though we have a few other requirements. And eventually it would cause some balkanization of the Internet.

I believe the unifying of the Internet is more important than what the U.S. government wants to do.

The other comment I have is on the slide where you have U.S. government in all aspects of the involvement. But it is actually very different. U.S. government involvement in protocol parameters is very different in the way that they are actually involved in the delegation of the root zone file, or the management of the root zone file.

What we are saying is that we need to be careful not to make things more important than they actually are. In fact, this is what's scaring a lot of people because it seems that the U.S. government is giving something very important away. Actually it is not. If you want a smooth transition, make it simple.

[Timer sounds.]

And make it less important.

I do want to advocate to try to keep things simple. I do support the position because if things are more complicated than it is, then somebody has to pay for it. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Next gentleman.

>>

Okay. There's a whole series of outcomes of the 2012 WTSA that are related to identifiers. They are mostly ITUT sector and WTSA outputs, but they are reflected in WTDC. ITUT study group 17's work on public key infrastructures, identity management, digital signatures. You have got a reference to eNom in IPv6 transition. You've got ITRs on integrity of numbering resources. You've got non-identification as an issue. Indirectly, you have got ITUT recommendation 1255 on digital identities.

My point is simply that these are already intergovernmental, however much they actually may be adopted. But as part of the frame of the WTSA, they were being called merely technical. That's why they are clearly under the ITUT sector's mandate. They are actually a great potential significance as related to Internet-related public policy if they were to be used as pieces of an infrastructure to validate or even enforce policies associated with identifiers.

So this is one of the most important reasons why my one contribution to your document was to recognize the general -- the universal general purpose interoperability that we already have based on the flexibility of the I.P. layer and set up a system that allows us to assess these potential things which may end up being the UNESCO's Internet universality things against their impact on the I.P. layer's flexible general purpose universal interoperability that we already have today. That's it.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you very much.

[Timer sounds.]

>> Can I make a question? A very quick one? Does anybody want to comment on: Have you heard anything about using any of this infrastructure related to public policy?

THERESA SWINEHART: I'm a little sensitive to the time right now. Does anybody want to respond to that or we'll take it -- fantastic. Yes. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Theresa. I'm Young Eum Lee. I have been on the ccNSO Council since 2003. I would like to add and compliment the comments by my colleagues Jorg and Byron as a ccNSO member.

I would like to remind everyone that the CCs existed before ICANN. Dot kr was created in the early 1980s. And when ICANN was created, ccTLDs were only a constituency under the DNSO. And I remember back in 2001, we were discussing if we were going to stay in ICANN or if we were going to form our own organization and operate independently.

However, things worked out. We have cooperated with ICANN. And, although not all the ccTLDs are now members of ccNSO, our membership is increasing. I hope in the new structure, I hope this spirit of cooperation continues. I hope that the voice of the CC operators are given the due status when discussing any changes regarding IANA, not only because the issues with sovereignty of the country code names but because the CCs have been doing a great job in managing the domain name space. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you very much. Heather mentioned that she may be able to respond very quickly to the last question that had been asked, and then we'll wrap it up. Would you like to give it a try?

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you. Since it was asked so quickly, I hope I have understood what was the issue driving the question. But I think when you look at the unique identifiers for the Internet, that among those different identifiers, the area where there are the most public policy issues is on the naming side. And I think that's very clear. And I think that's why it has become such an important point of focus for government --- to comment on the naming side via the Governmental Advisory Committee

to ICANN. The other Internet organizations or technical organizations don't have a GAC and they have ways of accommodating government inputs to their open processes. But just to say certainly in terms of the unique identifiers, it's really the naming side where the majority of the public policy issues come up and are discussed and advised on by the GAC.

THHERESA SWINEHART: Thank you very much, everybody, on the panel and also the participation and dialogue with the audience and the remote participants. You have two --

>> We have two further comments.

THHERESA SWINEHART: Okay, two further comments, okay. And then I'll say thank you very quickly. Thank you. The two.

>> So we have comment coming from civil society in Cameroon and also a comment from civil society in the USA.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Comment from Cameroon reads: Talking about independence and sovereign aspect of a ccTLD in best practices, the ccTLD manager should firstly serve the local Internet community and help develop the Internet

locally. What happens when the local Internet community is unhappy about the management of their ccTLD as far as their redelegation process is complicated and has many comprehensive requirements?

What will the global multistakeholder Internet community who will be in charge of the IANA function do? To be simple, who is the ccTLD manager accountable to?

And comment from the USA civil society reads: The question has been made but poignantly not answered. The U.S. government set fairly strict conditions on whether it actually will go ahead with transition from its control. What will be the outcome if the transition conditions are not met?

BYRON HOLLAND:

I guess that's mean. You know, that is a very serious question. There is a number of elements to it. I'm going to speak sort of on two tracks, particularly in conjunction with the comment I made earlier about what is happening on this topic in the ccNSO.

In the ccNSO, we don't decide about from whom or to whom redelegations happen. We are focused on the process to make sure it is consistent, that it is transparent, and the outcomes in a sense can be predicted once a decision has been made in country by the local Internet community and that's defined in country. And, of course, it varies from country to country.

As far as who the ccTLD manager is responsible to, as I mentioned earlier, there are a great variety of structures in terms of the

governance and businesses of the various ccTLD actors. So it's really going to be dependent on the type of organization that operates the CC within any given country.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Okay. I think with that, we're going to not abuse the time too much. Thank you very much to CGI, the local host, NETmundial and the program planners for allowing this panel session to occur. It's been very informative and a very good dialogue.

So with that, I understand there's a break. And how long is the break? Half an hour. So please come back in half an hour. And, again, thank you very much to the participants.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]