



ICANN and NTIA representatives testify at Cruz-led Senate Judiciary Committee hearing on transition implications

Details of ICANN and NTIA testimonies at the “Protecting Internet Freedom: Implications of Ending US Oversight of the Internet” hearing

Witness	Position	Testimony main points
<p>Lawrence E. Strickling</p> 	<p>Asst. Secretary for Communications and Information and Administrator, NTIA, US Dept. of Commerce</p>	<p>The US does not control the Internet. Private-sector, multistakeholder Internet governance strengthens the Open Internet and promotes innovation. Continuing the ICANN-US contract could actually encourage authoritarian regimes to advocate for government management of the Internet and threaten its freedom. Transition is 20 years in the making.</p>
<p>Göran Marby</p> 	<p>CEO & President, ICANN</p>	<p>There is no single point of control of the Internet; ICANN functions cannot regulate Internet content. The transfer will ensure the interoperability of the Internet. Failure to transfer will fuel authoritarian regime efforts to assert control. No government gains power through the transition</p>

Sources: “Protecting Internet freedom: implications of ending US oversight of the Internet,” Senate Committee on the Judiciary, September 14, 2016.

Cruz leads Senate Judiciary Committee hearing on implications of ICANN transition

Details of who testified at the “Protecting Internet Freedom: Implications of Ending US Oversight of the Internet” hearing

Witness	Position	Testimony main points
Berin Szoka	President, TechFreedom	Transition should take place but many officials downplay concerns of others for the sake of expediency. Unsure multistakeholder model can adequately replace US oversight, worried about authority of other countries. Supports a partial, staggered transition as a safety net. NTIA is violating congressional instruction. IANA function may be government property.
Jonathan Zuck	President, ACT The App Association	ICANN’s transition framework is robust, will ensure transparency. There is an exhaustive number of checks and balances in the new framework that prevent undue government influence. Delaying the transition can damage trust and allow a shift to governmental control.
Dawn Grove	Corporate Counsel, Karsten Manufacturing	ICANN acts as a monopoly , concerning implications if Dept. of Commerce abdicates oversight. Foreign governments will have expanded role after a transition. NTIA should renew contract.
J. Beckwith Burr	Deputy General Counsel & Chief Privacy Officer, Neustar	Multistakeholder model is the best way to coordinate the DNS, ICANN ready for the transition. Governmental authority will remain constrained. No giveaway of US property involved.
John Horton	President & CEO, LegitScript	ICANN has not demonstrated the transparency or accountability needed to act without US oversight. ICANN’s responsibilities aren’t only technical, has regulatory role .
Steve DelBianco	Executive Director, NetChoice	US oversight of ICANN has never been strict, unnecessary to retain and actually increases the risk of Internet fragmentation and governmental overreach. US reluctance toward the multistakeholder model encourages other countries not to trust it either.
Paul Rosenzweig	Former Deputy Asst. Secretary for Policy, US Dept. of Homeland Security	Transition is a “leap in the dark” – there is no certainty over how it will turn out. After the transition, other governments will have increased influence. A trial period is needed and US oversight should be maintained for two more years until all implications are understood.

Sources: “Protecting Internet freedom: implications of ending US oversight of the Internet,” Senate Committee on the Judiciary, September 14, 2016.