[Internal-cg] Combined proposal assessment

Manal Ismail manal at tra.gov.eg
Tue Jul 14 09:14:09 UTC 2015

- Previous message (by thread): [Internal-cg] combined proposal assessment
- Next message (by thread): [Internal-cg] FW: Our views on the Proposed Future Governance of the Internet unique identifiers " for ICG
- **Messages sorted by:** [date] [thread] [subject] [author]

Responses to assessment questions inline below ..
Kind Regards
--Manal

A. Compatibility and interoperability: Do the proposals work together in a single proposal? Do they suggest any incompatible arrangements where compatability appears to be required? Is the handling of any conflicting overlaps between the functions resolved in a workable manner?

* IANA trademark and domain name: Both the RIRs and the IETF communities made their proposals compatible. It was clarified that the relevant text in the Names community proposal is just a placeholder. Hence there is no incompatibility per se but it is still an open issue, not addressed by the names proposal. This needs to be resolved among the 3 operational communities prior to proposal finalization. Reference the CWG co-chairs reply dated 2nd of July, in particular the paragraphs stating: "In effect, the Final Proposal does not make a specific proposal with regard to the IANA trademark. Therefore it is our firm view that it is specifically not in conflict with either of the CRISP & IANAPLAN proposals on this subject. To reaffirm this, and to discuss a potential consolidated position, we have extended an offer to the leadership of the other two operational communities for a call on Tuesday, 7 July. We then intend to provide an update for discussion to the CWG-Stewardship at our next meeting on Thursday, 9 July. We are happy to provide you with a subsequent update on the outcomes of both discussions.", it's important to know the results of both such discussions to be able to conclude on the topic.

* Post-Transition IANA (PTI): My understanding is that the 3 OCs will ultimately be served by PTI whether directly (the Names) or indirectly (Numbers & Protocol Parameters), right? If yes, then what if the Names IANA Function Review (IFR) decides separation is needed? Would this be an issue that needs to be tackled? Appreciate being guided by colleagues who were more involved in the drafting of the proposals.

B. Accountability: Do the proposals together include appropriate and properly supported independent accountability mechanisms for running the IANA function? Are there any gaps in overall accountability under the single proposal?

* Dependency on CCWG proposal: "The CWG-Stewardship proposal is significantly dependent and expressly conditioned on the implementation of ICANN-level accountability mechanisms by the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (CCWG-Accountability)". Worth noting that it was agreed by the ICG at its meeting in Buenos Aires that once CCWG Workstream1 output is sent to SOs/ACs for approval, the ICG will seek confirmation from the CWG that the CCWG's work meets its requirements. Hence final transition proposal is pending CWG confirmation that CCWG final proposal meets its requirements.

C. Workability: Do the results of any tests or evaluations of workability that were included in the component proposals conflict with each other or raise possible concerns when considered

in combination?

* The proposal is workable conditioned by the above points.

-------------- next part --------------
An HTML attachment was scrubbed...
URL: <http://mm.ianacg.org/pipermail/internal-cg_ianacg.org/attachments/20150714/841b49f3/attachment.html>

- Previous message (by thread): [Internal-cg] combined proposal assessment
- Next message (by thread): [Internal-cg] FW: Our views on the Proposed Future Governance of the Internet unique identifiers " for ICG
- **Messages sorted by:** [date] [thread] [subject] [author]

More information about the Internal-cg mailing list