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*Proposal title:* Draft Response to the Internet Coordination Group Request for Proposals on the IANA protocol parameters registries draft-ietf-ianaplan-icg-response-09

*Date when the ICG received the proposal:* January 6, 2015

*Reviewer Names:* This version was produced by Jari Arkko. This version includes input made by Milton Mueller and Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

*Date review was completed:* <to be completed>

*What role, if any, the reviewer had in the development of the proposal:*

There were <to be completed> reviewers. One of the reviewers, Jari Arkko, was active in the development of the proposal, and formally responsible for the process in the IETF. Another reviewer, Dr. Milton Mueller, participated in the IANAPlan list during the development of the proposal. The third reviewer, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, reviewed the result as someone who has not participated in the IETF discussion.

1. ***Consistency with RFP[[1]](#footnote-1) requirements of openness and inclusiveness.***
   1. *Were any process concerns highlighted to the ICG by participants in the proposal development process?*

Yes. A message from Richard Hill to the ICG dated 8 January 2015 claimed that “when it was clear that there was not full consensus, the co-chairs of the IETF group who prepared the proposal declared that rough consensus had been achieved. However, the co-chairs did not provide a justification for their decision.”

* 1. *If so, were input/comments the ICG received directly shared with the operational community? Were they considered or addressed by the operational community? How were they considered or addressed?*

The comments were shared with the IANAPLAN list on January 19, 2014, as well as earlier in the IETF process. Over time, there has been extensive discussion on the list, some of which expressed the view that a justification had already been supplied by means of the shepherd’s writeup or and other messages on the list. Decisions by working group chairs in the IETF generally do not include point-by-point summary of the discussion, but rather make conclusions about the state of community opinion, which itself is available as mailing list archives and meeting minutes. Similarly, in this case there is no single message that documents the rationale.

On January 26 Jari Arkko promised to “produce an informal explanation of the process that helps provide visibility to people at large about what happened in the development of the IETF proposal from IANAPLAN WG.” This response suggests that the problem is not the absence of a justification but, on the part of the challengers, perhaps a lack of understanding of IETF process, or disagreement with that process. For more about this, see the discussion under question 4.

* 1. *How did the community define consensus in its community process?*

The IETF followed its usual process, as described in Section 2, part VI of the proposal. The definition of consensus was the same as used in other IETF work, i.e., rough consensus.

The IETF established a new working group, IANAPLAN, after a Birds-of-a-Feather (BoF) session that took place in Toronto, Canada on July 24th, 2014 (<http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/90/minutes/minutes-90-ianaplan>). Subsequent discussion on mailing lists led to a proposal to form a working group on August 25th, 2014 (<http://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/ietf-announce/QsvU9qX98G2KqB18jy6UfhwKjXk>). Further mailing list discussion led to a decision by the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) formally approving the working group on September 8th, 2014 (<http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ianaplan/current/msg00190.html>).

The working group proceeded to work according to the usual RFC 2026 and RFC 2418 rules for working groups, and a draft for the response to the ICG RFP was developed. This draft first appeared as an individual draft, was later formally adopted as a working group proposal, extensively discussed, revised multiple times, and finally declared as having rough consensus of the working group on November 26th, 2014 (<http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ianaplan/current/msg01401.html>, <http://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-ianaplan-icg-response/shepherdwriteup/>).

Also on November 26th, after learning about the chair’s conclusion and having received the last edits agree during the discussion, the IESG initiated the usual IETF-wide Last Call of this proposed response, 2014 (<http://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/ietf-announce/i5rx6PfjJCRax3Lu4qZ_38P8wBg>), as defined in RFC 2026. Eventually, on December 18th, 2014, the IESG concluded that there was rough community consensus sufficient to approve the proposal. There were a few additional editorial modifications in the coming weeks, as well as discussion about the summary of the last call commentary, and the proposal was finally formally approved on January 6th, 2015. The final summary about the changes and discussion was posted on the same day (<http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ianaplan/current/msg01500.html>), although some further questions have been discussed since then.

* 1. *Did the proposal obtain community consensus (as defined in the community’s process) among those who participated in the community process?*

A rough consensus was achieved, however almost all of the parties in the rough part of the “rough consensus” were WG participants who were not longstanding participants of IETF.

The RFP said that “Proposals should be developed through a transparent process that is open to and inclusive of all stakeholders interested in participating in the development of the proposal." The ICG also said: "Communities are asked to adhere to open and inclusive processes in developing their responses, so that all community members may fully participate in and observe those processes. Communities are also asked to actively seek out and encourage wider participation by any other parties with interest in their response."

At least one assessment considered that legitimate questions could be raised about the inclusiveness of the IETF process. During debates over the presence of consensus, there were several IETF participants, who expressed the view that familiarity with the protocol parameters and IETF processes was necessary. A key change in the proposal emerged out of a face-to-face IETF meeting. This meeting was not attended by any of the non-IETF participants, even though remote participation was made possible and, consistent with normal IETF operating methods, discussion continued on the mail list after the meeting.

Nevertheless, the proposal did attain rough consensus of the IETF IANAPLAN Working Group and of the IETF community as a whole, after some changes proposed post-Honolulu by WG co-chair Leslie Daigle. The changes accommodated some of the concerns voiced by some of the critics of the proposal. Rough consensus was judged first by the working group chairs and then by the sponsoring Area Director, and then by the IESG in accordance with [RFC2026].

Note that, as is intrinsic in the definition of rough consensus, while there was broad agreement about the goals of the proposal, some issues did not meet unanimous agreement. While the desire to accommodate all participants and all views is important, it is not possible nor appropriate to favor an opinion from any subset of participants if the overall community opinion is different.

The process has been open to every interested party, including for instance, allowing anyone joining all discussions without prior arrangement and being taken into account while forming the group opinion, having discussions on the open mail lists, having remote attendance options in our meetings, and all discussions from meetings continuing on the mail list. Any interested party has been able to have a say, and not merely observe. Of course, coming to a consensus (even rough consensus) in a large community requires broad agreement. That everyone is invited to participate does not mean that everyone is 100% satisfied with the outcome. Rather, everyone has the opportunity to take part in the process, sharing their perspective and background. In a community-driven organisation, the leadership doesn't get to favour any particular perspective over others.

The shepherd writeup (<http://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietfianaplan-icg-response/shepherdwriteup/>) identified two specific issues that caused debate in the working group:

* whether the draft should require a transfer of the iana.org domain name and the IANA trademark currently registered to ICANN to IETF control;
* whether the draft should contain more legally binding agreement terms for the IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC) to establish or change with ICANN’s status as the protocol-related IANA functions.

Most members of the WG reached rough consensus on the idea to not include such statements in the WG output. It was instead proposed to rely on the IAOC and Internet Architecture Board (IAB) oversight roles where they are expected to continuously review and, if needed, update IETF’s agreements with other entities. With respect to the Service Level Agreement with ICANN on IANA functions, for instance, there have been yearly updates for as long as the agreement has existed. In principle, then, the IAOC could take up the contentious issues with ICANN if it deemed it necessary; the rough consensus was that the WG should not give it instructions to do so nor to specify terms and conditions.

***B. Meeting RFP requirements.***

1. *Completeness – are any RFP components are missing? Please refer to the RFP sections: (0) Proposal Type, (1) Description of Community’s Use of IANA Functions, (2) Existing, Pre-Transition Arrangements, (3) Proposed Post-Transition Oversight and Accountability Arrangements, (4) Transition Implications, (5) NTIA Requirements, (6) Community Process.*

Yes, although one part of the response should be highlighted. The answer to part II, B, asks for information about the “Jurisdiction(s) in which the [oversight] mechanism applies and the legal basis on which the mechanism rests.” The proposal only states that “This mechanism is global in nature. The current agreement does not specify a jurisdiction.”

The question is whether this is a sufficient answer for the legal basis of the accountability mechanism (RFC 2860) as requested in the RFP. Some members of the Working Group noted this during the deliberations, and there have been extensive discussions about this aspect on the mail list during the working group’s process. The informed working group opinion was as documented on the final proposal document. Some of the rationale leading to this decision includes:

* RFC 2860 provides final authority in disputes to IAB.
* The details of agreements between the IETF and other parties are up to the IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC), and subject to discussions with IETF legal counsel.

All other components of the RFP have responses under Section 2, parts 0, I, II, III, IV, V, and VI.

1. *Clarity – does anything in the proposal not make sense or require clarification from the operational community?*

The new arrangements in Section 2, part III of the proposal were left for future negotiations between IAOC and ICANN.

Aside from that, the proposal is clear. With the exception of few new arrangements listed in Section 2, part III, the proposal describes existing practices with a history of working well for the Internet community.

1. *NTIA criteria – does the proposal fulfill the NTIA criteria?*
   1. *Support and enhance the multistakeholder model*

As Section 2, part V notes: participation in the IETF is open to all individuals regardless of which stakeholder group or sector they may be from. The proposal supports and enhances the multistakeholder model by relying on IETF processes and voluntary agreements between IETF and ICANN for the performance of the IANA functions related to protocol parameters. IETF processes could be used to amend governance of the protocol parameters function in the future. As mentioned previously, anyone may propose amendments to those processes, and anyone may take part in the decision process.

* 1. *Maintain the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet DNS*

As Section 2, part V notes: No changes are proposed that affect the security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS. The requirement is based on the assumption that the existing arrangements are secure, stable, and reliable, and the proposal makes no structural changes in the existing processes.

* 1. *Meet the needs and expectation of the global customers and partners of the IANA services*

As Section 2, part V notes: Implementers and their users from around the world make use of the IETF standards and the associated IANA protocol parameters registries. The current IANA protocol parameters registries system is meeting the needs of these global customers. The proposal continues to meet their needs by maintaining the existing processes that have served them well in the past.

* 1. *Maintain the openness of the Internet*

As Section 2, part V notes: The proposal maintains the existing open framework that allows anyone to participate in the development of IETF standards, including the IANA protocol parameters registries policies. Further, an implementer anywhere in the world has full access to the protocol specifications published in the RFC series and the protocol parameters registries published at iana.org. Those who require assignments in the IANA protocol registries will continue to have their requests satisfied, as specified by the existing policies for those registries.

* 1. *Does not replace NTIA role with a government or inter-governmental organization*

The proposal relies on voluntary agreements between IETF, ICANN, implementers and their users for the stewardship of the IANA functions related to protocol parameters.

1. <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rfp-iana-stewardship-08sep14-en.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)