

Name: Yrjö Länsipuro

Organization: ISOC Finland

Submission ID: 132

Questions Concerning the Proposal as a Whole

1) Completeness and clarity: Is the combined proposal complete? Each of the operational community proposals contains aspects to be completed in the future when the proposal is implemented. Is the combined proposal specified in sufficient detail such that it can be evaluated against the NTIA criteria?

2) Compatibility and interoperability: Do the operational community proposals work together in a single proposal? Do they suggest any incompatible arrangements where compatibility appears to be required? Is the handling of any conflicting overlaps between the functions resolved in a workable manner?

3) Accountability: Do the operational community proposals together include appropriate and properly supported independent accountability mechanisms for running the IANA functions? Are there any gaps in overall accountability under the single proposal?

4) Workability: Do the results of any tests or evaluations of workability that were included in the operational community proposals conflict with each other or raise possible concerns when considered in combination?

Questions Concerning NTIA Criteria

5) Do you believe the proposal supports and enhances the multistakeholder model? If yes, please explain why. If not, please explain why and what proposal modifications you believe are necessary.

6) Do you believe the proposal maintains the security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS? If yes, please explain why. If not, please explain why and what proposal modifications you

believe are necessary.

7) Do you believe the proposal meets the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of the IANA services? If yes, please explain why. If not, please explain why and what proposal modifications you believe are necessary. Please indicate if you are a customer or partner of the IANA services.

8) Do you believe the proposal maintains the openness of the Internet? If yes, please explain why. If not, please explain why and what proposal modifications you believe are necessary.

9) Do you have any concerns that the proposal is replacing NTIA's role with a government-led or inter-governmental organization solution? If yes, please explain why and what proposal modifications you believe are necessary. If not, please explain why.

10) Do you believe that the implementation of the proposal will continue to uphold the NTIA criteria in the future? If yes, please explain why. If not, please explain why and what proposal modifications you believe are necessary.

Questions Concerning ICG Report and Executive Summary

11) Do you believe the ICG report and executive summary accurately reflect all necessary aspects of the overall proposal? If not, please explain what modifications you believe are necessary.

General Questions

12) Do you have any general comments for the ICG about the proposal?

ISOC Finland commends the IGC, CWG, IANAPLAN and CRISP Team for their intensive work over recent months, the result of which is an impressive example of what can be achieved by multistakeholder approach in a short time span. Their work has brought the long transition process begun in 1998 close to completion, and hopefully created conditions for laying to rest some of the politically motivated internet governance disputes that started more than a decade ago, which should be positively noted also at the WSIS+10 review in December.

Associating itself with the comments by Mr Konstantinos Komaitis on behalf of the Internet Society, ISOC Finland states its strong support for the IGC proposal. In general, our answer to all points of the questionnaire is affirmative. The IGC proposal reflects a consensus of the three communities where remaining compatibility and interoperability details can be settled in the implementation phase. On this connection, the clarification of the CWG position on IANA trademark issue, as expressed in the comment by the CWG co-chairs earlier today, can be welcomed.. Going forward into the implementation phase, it is important that principles commonly agreed in the beginning of the process are respected, complexity is not increased and accountability rests in the first place on community-based multistakeholder consensus instead of judicial redress.