[Internal-cg] MM combined proposal assessment

Milton L Mueller mueller at syr.edu
Mon Jul 13 21:35:16 UTC 2015

- Previous message (by thread): [Internal-cg] Draft agenda for call #20, July 15
- 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]

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?

MM response:

A1. The IANA trademark and domain are not currently handled in a fully compatible manner in my opinion. Numbers and protocols have reached agreement on a compatible solution, but names has not. If one disregards the bracketed section of the CWG proposal that deals with the topic, one could say that all 3 proposals are compatible because there really is no proposal from CWG, and thus it does not get in the way of, or propose anything incompatible with, the solution proposed by the CRISP team and the IANAPLAN WG. However, I do not think it is optimal to consider the absence of an agreed proposal from CWG to be the same thing as the names community having reached consensus around a compatible proposal. It would be better for the CWG to explicitly indicate their acceptance of the CRISP team proposal, or, if that proves to not be possible, to propose an alternative that can gain the acceptance of the numbers and protocol communities.

A2. This is not a compatibility problem, but some issues related to the legal separation of ICANN's IANA department from ICANN and the movement of its assets, personnel, etc. into PTI need to be noted. It should be clear from the CWG proposal that ALL IANA-related activities and assets, not just those related to names, will be transferred to PTI, or at least that is my understanding of it. If there is any doubt about this it needs to be cleared up. Further, both the numbers and the protocol communities, while not expressing objections to PTI, have indicated that they prefer to contract for their IANA functions with ICANN rather than doing it directly with PTI, even as ICANN contracts with PTI for the names-related IANA functions. To avoid any incompatibilities related to this, it should be made clear that ICANN will use, and is required to use, its affiliate PTI to perform the contracted IANA functions for numbers and protocols.

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?

B1. All 3 proposals rely most directly for accountability on the right of the operational community to discard ICANN and select a new entity for the performance of the IANA functions. This means that if the status of the IANA trademark and domain are not resolved properly, the combined proposal could fail to deliver an appropriate and properly supported independent accountability mechanism. Any solution that involves retention of the IANA trademark and domain by the incumbent IANA operator would make switching IANA operators much more difficult and costly, with all that that entails for accountability. Thus, the IANA trademark and domain are not just compatibility issues but accountability issues as well.

B2. I concur with the analysis of Russ Housley that "The CWG-Stewardship proposal depends on a yet-to-be-written CCWG-Accountability document." The proposal made by the CCWG on enhanced accountability must be acceptable to the entire engaged community, and fully meshed with the

CWG-Stewardship proposal, before it can be considered as delivering an acceptable level of "overall accountability."

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?

C1. I believe there are potential workability issues surrounding the revision in the role of Verisign and its cooperative agreement. The CWG-Stewardship proposal is vague about the type of relationship between PTI and Verisign post-transition; and the NTIA is rather vague about the future of the Verisign-NTIA Cooperative Agreement.

C2. I note that Section IV, which includes a subsection IV.C on the "Workability of any new technical or operational methods," is labelled as "under development" in the CWG proposal.

- Previous message (by thread): [Internal-cg] Draft agenda for call #20, July 15
- 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