

## CCWG Comments

- *From: Frank Simons*
- 

Dear CCWG,

As former staff having witnessed the decision processes inside ICANN I completely agree with all CCWG's recommendations and urge the Board - and the community at large including the ITU - to not reduce community oversight or powers in any way. Any changes should trigger full reviews of CWG and other plans.

Simply, the current management hierarchy, including that reaches into IANA, has proven to be directed by ICANN executive goals - not those of the community - and way beyond those in the original bylaws. The direction has been totally counter to transparency, responsiveness, and overall Internet stability. If this is true now, why would it change for a PTI unless there were strong community controls on ICANN?

Mechanisms like community oversight via the Sole Member model are essential. We have the RIRs overseeing ICANN numbers management, the IETF overseeing ICANN parameter, but we have ICANN overseeing ICANN names management.

This cannot work without either fully separating PTI from ICANN (e.g., different boards and finances) or strong external controls like numbers and parameters have. The latter two can seek to contract PTI services elsewhere without the byzantine process for attempting to do so for names. Remember, anyone can create (in a day or two) and manage an alternate root for the Internet should ICANN make it too difficult without following any of the processes we have created. The ITU and many member states do not care and are not bound by any of this. The only thing we might have is trust and transparency. Let's not screw this up.

This is the only opportunity to truly embrace the multi-stakeholder model instead of the window dressing that "all is well" (when it is not) that we have had to this point. There will be no incentive for a ICANN, post transition, to relinquish any control.

FS

