[Internal-cg] Combined proposal assessment

Lynn St.Amour Lynn at LStAmour.org
Tue Jul 14 23:08:03 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]

…and here are my thoughts.

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?

I believe the proposals work together in a single proposal, and the arrangements are compatible. This is significantly aided by the fact that the policy and oversight for all three areas: Numbers, Protocol Parameters, and Names are developed/managed through three distinct Operating Communities (and not one "ICANN community"), hence little real overlap.

Further, there seems to be wide acceptance that the current IANA department in ICANN will move to the PTI, and all three operating communities will be served through the PTI, whether directly contracted or sub-contracted as a result of existing contractual relationships with ICANN. Hence, do not foresee any incompatibilities inherent in the implementation aspects of the IANA Functions.

There remains though one open area to be resolved: IPR re the IANA trademark and name. The RIR and IETF communities are aligned on a desired outcome, while the Names community continues to evaluate alternatives. It is too early to tell how this will be resolved and await further deliberations.

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?

I believe the proposals taken together include appropriate and properly supported independent accountability mechanisms for running the IANA function. In particular, the RIRs and IETF have operated "independently" for many years. Their processes are developed in consensus based, open environments, and have shown their resilience and effectiveness, evolving as required. Their proposals build on long-standing accountability mechanisms.

In the same vein, the accountability mechanisms for the Names community have also been in development/practice for quite a long time (some pre-dating ICANN). They have seen quite significant alterations in the past and will continue to evolve and mature. The steps envisioned support this, even while we recognize that this "dependency loop" is not yet closed as we await the work of the CCWG - Accountability, and the confirmation of the CWG that their needs have been met. If these needs are "not implemented as contemplated by the CWG-Stewardship proposal", the CWG has indicated they will need to revise their proposal.

There are a number of changes required to replace the oversight and accountability performed by the NTIA through the current NTIA-IANA Functions Contract and their role as Root Zone

Management Process Administrator for the naming functions. I believe these have been addressed in both the CWG proposal and the SSAC review of the CWG proposal and in particular appreciate the thorough review, guidance, and recommendations from the SSAC (and await further clarification on text from Russ Mundy on this point).

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?

I believe the proposals taken together are workable (even if somewhat "busy"), and this also seems to be supported by the community as a whole given the comments/lack of significant objections during the working phases and public comment periods.

- 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