

## IGF 2016 Workshop (no. 64) : A Post IANA Transition ICANN

Session Title	A Post IANA Transition
Date	Wednesday December 7, 2016
Time	16.30 -18:00
Session Organizer	Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN)
Chair/Moderator	Matthew Shears (CDT)
Rapporteur/Notetaker	Nigel Hickson – ICANN
List of Speakers and their institutional affiliations	<p>Badii, Farzaneh - Humboldt Institute for Internet and Society  Cavalli, Olga – Argentina, GAC  Nguyen, M-H Carolyn - Microsoft  Okutani, Izumi - JPNIC  Olufuye, Jimson – Africian ICT Alliance  Sanchez, Leon – CCWG Accountability  Lousewies van der Laan – ICANN Board  Tatiana Tropina (Dr) - Max Planck Institute, NCUC</p>
Key Issues raised (1 sentence per issue):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The history of the IANA transition process was explained as were the IANA’s functions and the new arrangements post transition.</li> <li>• The second part of the workshop consisted of panellists’ experiences from the IANA Transition process, focussing on challenges, and positive and negative experiences. In most cases, the speakers agreed with other panellists and reiterated points such as the added value of the multistakeholder model (different views and knowledge), the useful and proactive role of coordination bodies, and the dedication of the communities to finish the task.</li> <li>• Internet Society – Argentina, identified the diversity as a challenge and pointed out that the representation of some regions was unbalanced.</li> <li>• Microsoft, suggested that the success of the IANA transition process confirmed the value of multistakeholderism.</li> <li>• Japan Network Information Center (JPNIC), identified some success factors of the transition: people who represented various groups did not have predefined positions; the communities respected each other’s expertise; and the process requested each of the three operational communities to develop its own part of the proposal and not to try to draft everything.</li> <li>• African ICT Alliance, appreciated the consistent feedback from working groups. He asked for more outreach, in order to include more people and to build better knowledge capacity in the people engaged in the process.</li> <li>• ICANN Board,, reported that the process was very transparent and easy to understand. Even a newcomer to the process felt included.</li> <li>• NetChoice, named three success factors: first, the importance of the task itself; second, it was the Community that gave rise and initiated</li> </ul>

	<p>the entire accountability plan, not the ICANN Board or the NTIA and third, the political deadline of the end of the Obama administration in 2016.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tatiana noted the how complex issues on human rights were worked through.</li> </ul>
<p>If there were presentations during the session, please provide a 1-paragraph summary for each Presentation</p>	<p>Mr Leon Sanchez, (a co-chair of the CCWG Accountability) went through the history of the IANA transition process, explained what the process means, and described IANA’s functions. He highlighted some important conditions of the process. The proposal for the transition had to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• receive wide support from the community;</li> <li>• foster and enhance the multistakeholder model;</li> <li>• maintain or guarantee the security, stability, and resiliency of the Domain Name System;</li> <li>• satisfy the expectations of the IANA services clients; and</li> <li>• maintain the nature of the Internet as a free and open resource.</li> </ul> <p>Sanchez stressed the important role of all communities that took part in the process and of the bodies that steered the whole process – the Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) and the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG).</p>
<p>Please describe the Discussions that took place during the workshop session: (3 paragraphs)</p>	<p>In addition to reviewing the IANA Transition process (including the Accountability arrangements) the Session also allowed some useful reflections on the challenges and difficulties of such a complex process and how these were overcome (not least by changes in attitude of the ICANN Board). There was also a useful exchange of the nature of the multi-stakeholder process used and how “transportable” this was to resolution of other IG processes such as those discussed in UN bodies (such as the ITU) and in other bodies (including I* partners. On this latter point there were interesting but differing views.</p>
<p>Please describe any Participant suggestions regarding the way forward/ potential next steps /key takeaways: (3 paragraphs)</p>	<p>There were no specific take-aways as such, as this session was essentially for information and dialogue on a process that had taken place.</p> <p>Those interested, however, in being involved in the on-going Accountability work at ICANN (or in any other capacity) would be most welcome. Please go to ICANN site (<a href="http://www.icann.org">www.icann.org</a>) or mail Nigel Hickson (<a href="mailto:nigel.hickson@icann.org">nigel.hickson@icann.org</a>).</p>

