**ICANN Board  Comments  on**

**Cross Community  Working  Group  (CWG)  Draft  Transition  Proposal  for**

**Naming Related  Functions**

COMMENTS

The acronym for the above-mentioned group is CWG and not CCWG

TheICANN  Board  has  been  observing  the  development  of  the  proposal  within  the  Cross  Community  Working  Group  (CWG)  on  Naming  Related  Functions.  We  thank  the  CWG  for  the  work  that  has  gone  into  the  development  of  its  draft  proposal  and  the  opportunity  to  participate  in  the  public  dialogue.

We  have  been  conscious  of  two  guideposts  during  this  process:  to

remain  fairly  silent  so  as  not  to  attempt  or  seem  to  be  attempting  to

inappropriately  influence  the  process,  and,  at  the  same  time  to  share

our  thinking  with  the  community.    The  latter  is  particularly  important  since  we  will  be  called  upon  to  do  so  when  the  final  proposal  emerges  from  the  ICG.    The  final  proposal  will  be  forwarded  to  NTIA  without  modification  but  with  our  comments  and  recommendations,  and  NTIA  has  made  it  clear  that  consensus  from  the  community  includes  the  ICANN  Board.

 We  are  in  full  support  of  the  consultative  process,  and  we  have  committed  to  share  our  views  with  the  community  in  a  timely  fashion.    More  specifically,  we  appreciate  that  we  should  try  to  avoid  introducing  new  issues  after  the  ICG  has  coordinated  the  inputs  it  receives.

,  and  NTIA  has  made  it  clear  that  consensus  from  the  community  includes  the  ICANN  Board

Comments

Where and in what context IANA has mentioned that that  consensus  from  the  community  includes  the  ICANN  Board??

In this  regard:

  Members  of  the  Board  are  active  participants  in  the  work  of  the  IETF,  the  Regional  Internet  Registries,  the  ccTLDs,  ccNSO,  and  GNSO.  We  expect  to  be  active  within  these  stakeholder  groups  in  providing  input  on  the  IANA  Stewardship  transition.

Comments

ICANN is also participating in the works of CWG and expected to provide its comments to that group during the elaboartion of all involved and relevant issues • We  expect  that  any  issues  that  the  Board  may  identify  will  be

rsed  early  and  dealt  with  during  the  process  of  formulating  the  final  proposal.  The  work  in  front  of  us  is  how  to  ensure  the  IANA  function  continues  to  be  performed  in  a  stable,  secure,  and  transparent  manner,  how  to  make  sure  all  policy  related  matters  are  handled  outside  of  the  IANA  function  operation,  and  how  to  enhance  ICANN’s  accountability  towards  all  stakeholders.   c

**Accountability**

We  appreciate  there  are  concerns  about  how  to  improve  ICANN’s

accountability.    This  is  the  explicit  purpose  of  the  Cross  Community  Working  Group  (CCWG)  on  Enhancing  ICANN  Accountability.  The  work  of  the  CCWG  has  started,  and  the  output  of  Workstream  1  –

COMMENTS

The acronym for the above-mentioned group is CWG and not CCWG

 that  is  Accountability  in  relation  to  ICANN’s  changing  historical  relationship

with  the  US,  is  directly  linked  to  the  transition.  As  also  stated  by  NTIA,

“The  two  work  streams  on  the  IANA  transition  and  enhanced  accountability  are  directly  linked  and  NTIA  has  repeatedly  said  that  both  issues  must  be  addressed  before  any  transition  takes  place.1  The  topic  of  broader  accountability,  and  subtopics  such  as  capture,  or  checks  and  balances,  or  oversight,  or  backstop,  are  important  and  need  to  be

appropriately  addressed  in  Workstream  1  of  the  Enhancing  ICANN  Accountability  process.  The  ICANN  Board  agrees  that  there  is  inherently  an  important  linkage  between  the  evaluation  of  the  transition  proposals  arising  out  of  the  IANA  Stewardship  Coordination  Group  and  the  outcomes  of  that  Workstream  1,  and  we  stress  that  we  acknowledge  that  ICANN  accountability  is  a  fundamental  concern  of  the  community.  We  are  not  seeking  to  make  light  of  it  or  dismiss  it,  but  ask  the  CWG  to  distinguish  the  broader  accountability  questions  from  the  issues  of  the  performance  of  the  IANA  Functions  and  concerns  about  addressing  the  possibility  of  improper  activity  within  the  performance  of  the  IANA  Functions.

Comments

I think the CWG is fully aware of that and thus such warning is redundant and unnecessary .I

**IANA  functions**

With  respect  to  operation  of  the  IANA  functions,  we  believe  that  the  creation  of  a  separate  ‘contracting’  entity  not  only  poses  risks  when  weighed  against  the  NTIA  Criteria,  including  potential  future  DNS

security  and  stability  risks,  it  also  overreaches.    The  operationalization  of

multiple  entities  would  raise  questions  about  the  accountability  and

transparency  of  each,  as  well  as  possible  duplication  of  existing  mechanisms  and  the  imposition  of  cost  and  complexity  on  necessary  processes.    More  to  the  point,  however,  is  that  ICANN  was  created  and  purpose-­‐built  to  be  the  permanent  and  robust  home  of  the  IANA  functions.    Additionally,  ICANN  was  structured  from  its  inception  to  be

1 http://www.ntia.doc.gov/speechtestimony/2014/remarks- assistant-secretary-strickling-plifcba-telecommunications-policy- regular inclusive, transparent  and  accountable.

Comments

This issue is misinterpreted or misunderstood by the Board However, raising it does not create any difficulty but it should have been directly raised by the Board Liaison member at CWG Issuance of such views as public comment rather than sharing it directly with CWG would create / has created an atmosphere of divergence and biasing the public view

There would be no duplication at the end of the process.

We are confident that CWG will carefully review the matter and eliminate any possible duplication

The  ICANN  Board  is  both  open  to  and  encouraging  of  any  improvements

that  bring  greater  visibility  and  understanding  and  greater  assurance  to  the  broad  community  that  the  IANA  functions  are  performed  in  an  absolutely  reliable  and  accurate  fashion  for  the  benefit  of  all  Internet  users.

Comments

The issue is not openness or otherwise of the ICANN ,the issue is the transition of IANA functions which is on the Table and that process needs to be carefully reviewed ,examined ,scrutinized and improved or changed , if necessary e

It  has  taken  since  1998  to  bring  ICANN  to  a  place  where  the  NTIA  was

prepared  to  announce  an  intention  to  transfer  the  stewardship  of  the

IANA  Functions  –  a  transition  that  was  initially  anticipated  to  occur  in

2000.  This  is,  in  large  part,  what  ICANN  was  designed  to  do,  and  we

believe  the  considerable  effort  to  date  has  yielded  compelling  results.    Through  this  transition  work,  we  have  the  opportunity  to  consider  how  to  make  the  processes  continue  to  work  in  an  integrated  fashion,  as  well  as  having  the  opportunity  to  establish  and  enhance  mechanisms  to  hold  the  ICANN  Board  accountable  if  it  were  ever  to  interfere  with  the  IANA  Functions’  operational  role  in  performing  actions  based  on  policies  developed  by  the  community

Comments,

Yes and No

Yes, because it was intended to do so

No, because it has not happened till recent announcement and now ICANN not say that it was part of traditional and day-to day activities of ICANN .It happened after the famous revelations in 2013 and declarations and statements of some Head of States in UN General Assembly. Then let us not discuss why and how the transition has been decided but take it that it has been decided as such.

It  is  useful  here  to  define  the  essential  “IANA  function,”  as  distinct  from

ICANN’s  policy  responsibilities.  It  is  fundamentally  clerical  in  nature.    It  is  the  publication  of  information  provided  by  the  creators  of  the  information,  with  strong  emphasis  on  accuracy,  timeliness,  and  global  availability.

• For  the  protocol  parameters,  the  information  is  created  by  the  IETF

community.

• For  numbers,  the  RIRs,  in  conjunction  with  their  communities,

determine  the  policies  related  to  allocation  of  address  blocks  and

autonomous  system  numbers.

For  names  in  the  DNS  root  zone,  the  gTLD  and  ccTLD  managers

provide  information  about  their  TLD  to  IANA  for  either  publication  as

WHOIS  information,  or  for  entry  into  the  root  of  the  DNS.    Decisions

about  allocation  of  generic  top-­‐level  domains  (gTLDs)  are  managed  by  the  Global  Domains  Division  of  ICANN  executing  policies  determined  by  the  GNSO.    Decisions  about  allocation  of  country

code  top-­‐level  domains  (ccTLDs)  are  documented  in

[http://www.iana.org/domains/r](http://www.iana.org/domains/root)oot.

Comment

Thank for such refreshment but it is a known facts and need not to be reaped.

Whilewe  have  identified  these  concerns  for  CWG  consideration  in  the  next  iteration  of  the  proposal,  the  Board  is  supportive  of  many  of  the  principles  within  the  CWG  proposal.    For  example,  clear  performance  metrics  and  expectations  are  necessary  for  the  proper  operation  of  the  IANA  Functions  operation,  and  the  CWG  proposal  is  impressive  in  its  comprehensive  identification  of  the  services  that  are  now  housed  within  the  IANA  Functions  Contract.    As  stated  above,  we  agree  with  the  principle  of  the  functional  separation  between  policy  development  and  the  execution  of  the  IANA  Functions  Contract  and  we  agree  that  a  committee  should  be  established  to  evaluate  on  an  ongoing  basis  how  the  naming  aspects  of  the  IANA  Function  are  being  performed.  This  committee  should  be  composed  of  people  who  understand  the  technical  and  operational  issues  across  the  ICANN  community,    with  an  emphasis  on  maintaining  the  security,  stability,  and  resiliency  of  IANA  operations  and  oversight.

Comments

If ICANN knew all these, why no actions were taken place till now?

Then what is the purpose of providing this type of statement?

Again, we  look  forward  to  the  continued  dialogue,  and  appreciate  all  the

Work and  efforts  undertaken  by  the  community

Comments

The ICANN intention look forward to continued dialogue  and  appreciate  all  the  work and  efforts  undertaken  by  the

Community does not require to have published it. Unless there is a doubt that ICANN does not have any intention or less comfortable to cooperate

It is not clear why ICANN making the proposal that “should  be  composed  of  people  who  understand  the  technical  and  operational  issues  across  the  ICANN  community,    with  an  emphasis  on  maintaining  the  security,  stability,  and  resiliency  of  IANA  operations  and  oversight.

Shouln’t this issue be left to CWG and if ICANN has any thing to say , why it has not said that in CWG through it Liaison

General Comments on the Announcement

It seems to me that the main objectives of the public announcement was

1. To defend the ICANN position
2. To indicate that CWG creating duplication of works and confusing the process
3. There was no need to change anything since ICANN Board carefully controlling everything today