

1 CWG-Stewardship 2nd Draft Proposal Input Template

2
3 The CWG-Stewardship has developed a template to facilitate your input on the 2nd
4 Draft Proposal as well as subsequent review by the CWG-Stewardship. Use of the
5 template is strongly encouraged, but not required. This template provides the
6 opportunity for general input on the proposal as well as specific comments per section.
7 Please note that there is no obligation to complete all of the sections – commenters
8 may respond to as many or as few as they wish. Following your completion of the
9 template, please save the document and submit it as an attachment to the public
10 comment forum (comments-cwg-stewardship-draft-proposal-22apr15@icann.org). The
11 CWG-Stewardship looks forward to receiving your feedback.

12
13 1. Please provide your name:

14 [Alan Greenberg](#)

15 2. Please provide your affiliation:

16 [Chair, At-Large Advisory Committee \(ALAC\)](#)

17 3. Are you providing input on behalf of another entity (e.g. organization, company,
18 government)? Yes/No

19 [Yes](#)

20 4. If you answered ‘yes’ to the previous question, please list the entity on whose behalf
21 you are submitting these questions:

22 [ALAC](#)

23 General Comments

24 5. If you have any general comments you would like to provide on the CWG-
25 Stewardship Proposal, please provide these here.

26 [The ALAC is generally supportive of the Draft Proposal. That being said, the ALAC](#)
27 [does have a number of critical concerns.](#)

28
29 [As detailed under the comment on section III.A.i.a, the ALAC would prefer an IANA](#)
30 [wholly integrated into ICANN, but is willing to accept a compromise of a separate](#)
31 [legal entity if the details of its organization and governance are satisfactory.](#)

32
33 [We do have:](#)

- 34 [• one very major concern that we believe must be addressed by the CWG,](#)
35 [specifically the lack of multi-stakeholder oversight involvement and we will](#)
36 [offer guidance as to how this might be addressed;](#)
- 37 [• one area where the ALAC had not yet reached consensus, but we have some](#)
38 [concerns over the current direction of the CWG, specifically the Board \(or](#)
39 [other controlling entity\) of the Post-Transition IANA \(PTI\); and](#)
- 40 [• a number of lesser concerns and requests for clarification.](#)

41 **Section I - The Community's Use of IANA**

42 6. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
43 to section I - The Community's Use of the IANA? Section I lists the specific, distinct
44 IANA services or activities the naming community relies on.

45 [No.](#)

46 If so, please provide your comments here.

47

48 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

49

50

51 **Section II - Existing Pre-Transition Arrangements**

52

53 7. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
54 to section II - Existing Pre-Transition Arrangements? This section describes how
55 existing IANA-related arrangements work, prior to the transition.

56 [No.](#)

57 If so, please provide your comments here.

58

59 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

60

61

62 **Section III - Proposed Post-Transition Oversight and Accountability**

63 8. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
64 to section III.A - Elements of this Proposal? This section describes in short the main
65 elements of the proposed post-transition oversight and accountability.

66 [No.](#)

67 If so, please provide your comments here.

68

69 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

70

71

72

73 9. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
74 to section III.A.i - Proposed Post-Transition Structure. This section provides an
75 overview of the different elements of the proposed post-transition structure.

76 [No.](#)

77 If so, please provide your comments here.

78

79 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124

10. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards to section III.A.i.a. - Post-Transition IANA (PTI). This section describes the proposed post-transition IANA.

Yes.

If so, please provide your comments here.

The ALAC believes that there is significant cost and complexity associated with establishing IANA as a legally entity separate from ICANN. There are several reasons:

- PTI will ultimately be completely controlled by ICANN, so the legal division will not have any real effect;
- The benefit of the pre-defined boundaries and budgets can be achieved far easier by simply requiring ICANN to establish them in association with IANA as a division;
- The benefit of a “contract” between ICANN and IANA is dubious. It is technically legally enforceable, but the concept of ICANN suing PTI or vice-versa defies logic, since ICANN is in full control of PTI.
- The possible reduction of liability in the case of PTI as a Public Service Corporation and ICANN being forced into bankruptcy may have some merit, but it is unclear whether the courts would treat this if it really happened.
- The complexities of establishing an acceptable PTI governance plan, including its Board if there is one has so far stymied the CWG and it is unclear how to proceed.

That being said, IF we can address the above complexities and governance issues to our satisfaction, and IF the costs are not outrageous, the ALAC is willing to accept this type of compromise.

Presuming this legally organized PTI, questions of what power the Board has, who manages PTI staff (including the senior executive), and how the extra budget requirements will be met must be addressed.

If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

11. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards to section III.A.i.b. - Post-Transition IANA Board. This section describes the proposed Board for the post-transition IANA.

Yes.

If so, please provide your comments here.

There have been discussions on the size and responsibilities of the PTI Board. The ALAC believes that the PTI Board must be able to exercise control over PTI and must have the necessary resources and skills to do so. If everything is going well, this

125 Board will have little to do other than the normal corporate oversight responsibilities
126 (appointing auditors, approving budgets, setting executive remuneration, selecting the
127 senior executive if necessary).

128
129 However, if things are not working well and the PTI staff have not or cannot resolve
130 the issue, then the PTI Board should be the next level of recourse, and it must be
131 equipped with the proper management skills and other resources to carry out this
132 responsibility.

133
134 The ALAC is still discussing the size of the Board and who should sit on the Board,
135 but it is very clear that this must not largely be representatives of registries. Although
136 it is clear that registries must have significant input into IANA's operations, PTI is
137 ultimately there to serve the overall Internet community and registries are just a part
138 of that. Moreover, PTI will serve communities other than just the names function and
139 the PTI Board must not have a bias toward any of these communities.

140
141 Ultimately, as the owner or sole member of PTI, ICANN and its MS community will
142 be able to exercise full control over PTI, but PTI must be given the wherewithal to
143 properly serve Internet users as the IAN Functions Operator.

144
145 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

146
147
148

149 12. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
150 to section III.A.i.c. - IANA Statement of Work. This section describes the proposed
151 IANA Statement of Work, including proposed carryover provisions.

152 No.

153 If so, please provide your comments here.

154
155
156
157
158

159 13. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
160 to section III.A.i.d. - IANA Function Review. This section describes the proposed
161 periodic as well as special review of the IANA Function.

162 Yes.

163 If so, please provide your comments here.

164
165
166

167 The IFR must also be allowed to review the CSC and its effectiveness as well as
168 recommend changes to its composition and charter.

169

170 As an integral and extremely important part of the overall transitioned IANA, the
171 CSC cannot be exempted from the periodic review that the CWG has wisely
172 mandated.

173
174 The composition of the IFRT is problematic in that it is envisioned as a relatively
175 extensive process and allowing only 1 person per most stakeholders can have
176 continuity implications. At the very least, the composition must allow at least one
177 Alternate per stakeholder.

178
179 It is unclear whether the mandate of the IFR is purely the names component of IANA,
180 or will cover the entire range of IANA operations. Related to this, it is unclear what
181 organizations outside of ICANN might be included in the IFRT.

182
183 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

- 184
185
186
187 14. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
188 to section III.A.ii.a. - Customer Standing Committee (CSC). This section describes
189 Customer Standing Committee that is expected to oversee performance of the IANA
190 Functions as they relate to naming services.

191 Yes.

192 If so, please provide your comments here.

193
194 The ALAC presumes that all the deliberations and output of the CSC will be
195 completely transparent. Any exclusions must be explicitly documented.

196
197 The following comments here also apply to Annex J.

198
199 The ALAC does not believe that the ccNSO or the GNSO are the appropriate bodies
200 to which the CSC should escalate problems. There are several reasons for this.

- 201 • The ccNSO and GNSO are policy bodies. As such, they should not be in the
202 direct path to address IANA operational issues. That violates one of the prime
203 principles of IANA being operated under the auspices of ICANN.
- 204 • The GNSO does not have the processes to investigate or otherwise address
205 operational issues with PTI. The staff assigned to the GNSO are explicitly
206 Policy staff.
- 207 • Although the GNSO is a multi-stakeholder body, it has a restricted number of
208 multistakeholders, and assigning escalation to the GNSO would put these
209 stakeholders in a privileged position relative to the rest of those within and
210 outside of ICANN.
- 211 • Annex J implies that the only real recourse that the GNSO or the ccNSO
212 would have would be to invoke the community empowerment mechanisms
213 being designed by the CCWG. It makes no sense to first go to the one or two
214 registry SOs instead of going to a community-wide group that actually has the

215 power to take action. This intermediate step will only delay and possible
216 action.

217
218 The concept of the Multistakeholder Review team from the original Contract Co
219 model indeed made sense. In this model, it would simply be the empowered group
220 of stakeholder representatives who actually have the power to act on a CSC
221 concern. This group must be provided with staff resources to allow it to function
222 properly.

223
224 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

225
226
227
228

229 15. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
230 to section III.A.ii.b. - Service Level Expectations. This section describes the proposed
231 service level expectations post-transition.

232 No.
233 If so, please provide your comments here.

234
235 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

236
237
238

239 16. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
240 to section III.A.ii.c. - Escalation mechanisms. This section describes the different
241 proposed escalation mechanisms as they relate to the naming services.

242 No.
243 If so, please provide your comments here.

244
245 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

246
247
248

249 17. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
250 to section III.A.ii.d. - Separation review. This section describes the separation review
251 that can be triggered by an IANA Function Review if needed

252 Yes.
253 If so, please provide your comments here.

254 It is unclear what is to be “separated” from what. This is an important issue, and
255 given previous versions of this proposal have had VERY different meanings for the
256 word, this proposal must be explicit as to the type or types of separation
257 contemplated.

258
259 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302

18. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards to section III.A.ii.e. - Framework for transition to successor IANA Operator. This section describes the proposed framework for a transition to a successor IANA Operator to ensure continuity of operations.

No.

If so, please provide your comments here.

If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

19. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards to section III.A.iii.a. - Proposed changes to root zone environment and relationship with root zone maintainer. This section describes the proposed changes to the root zone environment and the relationship with the Root Zone Maintainer.

No.

If so, please provide your comments here.

If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

20. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards to section III.A.iv.a. - ccTLD Delegation Appeals. This section describes the proposed recommendation in relation to a ccTLD delegation appeals mechanism.

No.

If so, please provide your comments here.

If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

21. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards to section III.A.iv.b. - IANA Budget. This section describes the recommendations in relation to the IANA Budget.

Yes.

If so, please provide your comments here.

The Annex N, 2.c comment on the need for budget to support R&D should be

303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330

331

332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340

341

[included here.](#)

If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

22. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards to section III.A.iv.c. - Regulatory and legal obligations. This section describes the regulatory and legal obligations post-transition and how these are expected to be met.

[No.](#)

If so, please provide your comments here.

If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

23. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards to section III.B. - Implications for the interface between the IANA Functions and existing policy arrangements. This section describes the expected implications for the interface between the IANA Functions and existing policy arrangements as a result of the proposed transition arrangements.

[No.](#)

If so, please provide your comments here.

If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

Section IV - Transition Implications

24. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards to section IV. - Transition Implications. This section is expected to describe the CWG-Stewardship views as the implications of the changes it proposed in Section III.

[No.](#)

If so, please provide your comments here.

If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

Section V - NTIA Requirements

342 25. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
343 to section V. - NTIA Requirements. This section is expected to describe how the
344 proposal community's proposal meets these requirements and how it responds to
345 the global interest in the IANA functions.

346 [No.](#)

347 If so, please provide your comments here.

348

349 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359 **Section VI - Community Process**

360 26. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
361 to section VI. - Community Process. This section is expected to describe This section
362 should describe the process the community used for developing this proposal.

363 [No.](#)

364 If so, please provide your comments here.

365

366 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

367

368

369 **Annexes**

370 [No to all except Annex G. Other relevant comments already included in appropriate](#)
371 [sections of the main text.](#)

372

373 27. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
374 to section Annex A - The Community's Use of the IANA - Additional Information.

375

376 If so, please provide your comments here.

377

378 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

379

380

381

382 28. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
383 to section Annex B - Oversight mechanisms in the NTIA IANA Functions Contract.

384
385 If so, please provide your comments here.

386
387 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

388
389
390
391 29. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
392 to section Annex C - Principles and criteria that should underpin decisions on the
393 transition of NTIA Stewardship for names functions.

394
395 If so, please provide your comments here.

396
397 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

398
399
400
401 30. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
402 to section Annex D - Xplane Diagram.

403
404 If so, please provide your comments here.

405
406 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

407
408
409
410 31. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
411 to section Annex E - IANA Contract provisions to be carried over post-transition.

412
413 If so, please provide your comments here.

414
415 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

416
417
418
419 32. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
420 to section Annex F - IANA Function Reviews.

421
422 If so, please provide your comments here.

423
424 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

425

426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470

33. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards to section Annex G - Proposed charter of the customer standing committee (CSC).

Yes.

If so, please provide your comments here.

Page 60, Annex G

Although it may not hurt, the concept of a unaffiliated registry being allowed to be a Liaison does make sense as Liaisons are from groups that are explicitly not registries.

The proposal says that Members and Liaisons “will be appointed by their respective communities in accordance with internal processes”, but also that “the full membership of the CSC must be approved by the ccNSO and the GNSO”. Those two specifications conflict with each other. Similarly, it is unclear how the ccNSO and GNSO will address geographic diversity or skill sets while honoring the first premise. If stakeholders appoint their own Members or Liaisons, no further approval is needed.

Do the term limitation and staggered appointment rules apply just to Members (which makes sense) or also Liaisons (which doesn't).

Page 61, Annex G

CSC Charter changes should be approved by the Community and not just the ccNSO and GNSO. The proposal puts the non-Registry parts of the GNSO in an inappropriately privileged position compared to stakeholders that are not part of the GNSO.

Page 62, Annex G

Same comment in relation to the review of the CSC.

If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

34. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards to section Annex H - Service level expectations.

If so, please provide your comments here.

If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

471 35. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
472 to section Annex I - IANA Customer Service Complaint Resolution Process for Naming
473 Related Functions.

474
475 If so, please provide your comments here.

476
477 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

478
479

480
481 36. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
482 to section Annex J - IANA Problem Resolution Process (for IANA naming services
483 only).

484
485 If so, please provide your comments here.

486
487 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

488
489

490
491 37. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
492 to section Annex K - Root Zone Emergency Process.

493
494 If so, please provide your comments here.

495
496 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

497
498

499
500 38. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
501 to section Annex L - Separation Review.

502
503 If so, please provide your comments here.

504
505 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

506
507

508
509

510
511

512
513

514 39. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
515 to section Annex M - Framework for transition to a successor IANA operator.

516
517 If so, please provide your comments here.

518
519 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

520

521

522

523

524 40. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
525 to section Annex N - Proposed changes to root zone environment and relationship
526 with root zone maintainer.

527

528 If so, please provide your comments here.

529

530 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

531

532

533

534 41. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
535 to section Annex O - ccTLD Appeals Mechanism Background and Supporting
536 Findings.

537

538 If so, please provide your comments here.

539

540 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

541

542

543

544

545 42. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
546 to section Annex P - IANA Operations Cost Analysis.

547

548 If so, please provide your comments here.

549

550 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

551

552

553

554

555

556

557 43. Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards
558 to section Annex Q - IANA Budget.

559

560 If so, please provide your comments here.

561

562 If applicable, please reference the sub-section your comment relates to.

563

564

565

566 **Other Comments**

567 44. Are there any other comments or issues you would like to raise for the consideration
568 of the CWG-Stewardship?