[Internal-cg] Combined Proposal Assessment by Xiaodong Lee

Xiaodong Lee xl at cnnic.cn
Tue Jul 14 14:56:16 UTC 2015

- Previous message (by thread): [Internal-cg] Status of IPR topic in the CWG
- Next message (by thread): [Internal-cg] Comment received on the ICG Forum
- **Messages sorted by:** [date] [thread] [subject] [author]

Dear Colleagues,
Please check my assessment.
Proposal title: Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions from the U.S. Commerce Department's National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) to the Global Multistakeholder Community
Reviewer Name: Xiaodong Lee
Date review was completed: July 14, 2015 at Beijing Time

A. Compatibility and interoperability

1. Do the proposals work together in a single proposal?
Yes, all proposals follow the RFP structure with readable components and sections; together they offer a very clear picture of the transition of the three major IANA functions.
2. Do they suggest any incompatible arrangements where compatibility appears to be required?
No real incompatibility is foreseen. Only as three communities reach different decisions regarding the identity of the IANA Function Operator (IFO), I believe efforts to facilitate further communication and coordination should be undertaken by the affected communities at present in preparation for implementation.
3. Is the handling of any conflicting overlaps between the functions resolved in a workable manner?
No real conflicting overlaps are identified. The arrangements mentioned above require further communication and coordination.
B. Accountability
1. Do the proposals together include appropriate and properly supported independent accountability mechanisms for running the IANA function?
Not completely.
Numbering and protocol parameter proposals have included appropriate accountability mechanisms with the vision of NTIA's absence and are properly supported.
The proposal of the naming community is not yet completed with a dependence on the mechanisms for the accountability of ICANN that are being developed in the CCWG-Accountability. I can't say it's properly supported until this work is stable.
2. Are there any gaps in overall accountability under the single proposal?
The picture I get so far is that numbering and protocol parameter will rely on the independent contractual arrangements and review mechanism to keep the service accountable while the naming service will be under the oversight of ICANN's accountability mechanism.
Since responsibilities are carefully delineated in three proposals and there is no shared responsibility for a single registry across multiple

organizations, there will be no gap exists in overall accountability provided that every service is kept accountable to its customers. Even so, coordination and communication are required for the IANA functions as a whole to satisfy the needs of the IANA users.

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?

As was mentioned above, it is observed that both Internet Number and Protocol Parameter communities' proposals call for ICANN to continue as the IFO by means of a service level agreement or MOU, and thus rely upon the contractual measures with ICANN for oversight of the provision of services. On the other hand, however, naming community chooses to rely upon the proposed PTI separation from ICANN for provision of IANA naming services and to enhance ICANN's accountability mechanisms for oversight of PTI.

The question here is if the formation of PTI would result in non-naming IANA functions also being moved into PTI? If the answer is no, there will be a need to separate the existing IANA department, operations and assets into parts. In this case, concern is likely to be raised:

1. Even if responsibilities are carefully delineated in three proposals, IANA function is an organic whole and changes to one function may have impact on the operation of the other functions. Therefore, the separation of the operational assets raises a problem about how do three functions interoperate and interact with each other to keep the stability of the IANA function.
2. As is known, IANA department within ICANN is relatively small, the separation raise another concern regarding complementarities and economies in the provision of these services across names, numbers and protocols that deserve our attention and discussion as an implementation issue.
3. If the case is to separate only the names-related functions to PTI, ICANN's role as IFO for numbering and Protocol parameter continues while serving as the oversight body for another IFO (PTI), the feasibility and rational of that need to be discussed and made clear to the community.

---------- next part ----------
An HTML attachment was scrubbed...
URL: <http://mm.ianacg.org/pipermail/internal-cg_ianacg.org/attachments/20150714/d751f053/attachment.html>

- Previous message (by thread): [Internal-cg] Status of IPR topic in the CWG
- Next message (by thread): [Internal-cg] Comment received on the ICG Forum
- **Messages sorted by:** [date] [thread] [subject] [author]

More information about the Internal-cg mailing list