FRED UPTON, MICHIGAN
CHAIRMAN

FRANK PALLONE, JR., NEW JERSEY
RANKING MEMBER

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE
2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515–6115
Majority (202) 225–2927
Minority (202) 225–3641

April 8, 2016

Dr. Alissa Cooper
Chair
IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group
801 Church Street
Mountain View, CA 94041

Dear Dr. Cooper:

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology on Thursday, March 17, 2016, to testify at the hearing entitled "Privatizing the Internet Assigned Number Authority."

Pursuant to the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the hearing record remains open for ten business days to permit Members to submit additional questions for the record, which are attached. The format of your responses to these questions should be as follows: (1) the name of the Member whose question you are addressing, (2) the complete text of the question you are addressing in bold, and (3) your answer to that question in plain text.

To facilitate the printing of the hearing record, please respond to these questions with a transmittal letter by the close of business on Friday, April 22, 2016. Your responses should be mailed to Greg Watson, Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515 and e-mailed in Word format to Greg.Watson@mail.house.gov.

Thank you again for your time and effort preparing and delivering testimony before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,

Greg Walden
Chairman
Subcommittee on Communications and Technology

cc: Anna G. Eshoo, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology

Attachment

Attachment —Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable Greg Walden

1. The GAC neither approved nor objected to the transition proposal. Which governments had reservations about the transition plan?

The Honorable Renee Ellmers

1. ICANN is a global organization to provide policy and protection for all citizens throughout the world. As threats to our nation's cybersecurity increasingly grow more frequent and more complex, without accountability to the United States, how can we ensure that the leadership inside ICANN would not be unduly influenced or implement policy that could negatively impact every company and individual in the United States who rely upon fair and open access of the internet each and every day? For example, the staff of ICANN make decisions every day impacting companies and their very business models such as how to implement policy relating to the new gTLD program or enforcing requirements that protect people from bad actors using domain names or web sites to cause harm to others.

2. The transition plan asks for the U.S. government to place trust in an organization governed by volunteers who self-select leaders rather than elect or appoint leaders. In some cases leaders may or may not be qualified, and in some cases may clearly have financial or other interests influencing their decision making and approach to developing policy for everyone. When the internet is so central to how our people and companies live and thrive, can we really simply trust that this will be done fairly and appropriately, particularly given the political volatility in today's climate? What safeguards can we instill to insure fair decisions for all?

3. Why the need to transition from the United States before the Accountability workstream 2 is completed? With so much at stake and so many potential threats to the US economy, safety and security driven by potential bad actors on the internet ranging from the North Koreans, Chinese, Russians and ISIS/ISIL, why risk this to a group of volunteers without accountability back to the United States?