

Name: Boyoung Kim

Organization: Korea Internet Governance Alliance(KIGA)

Submission ID: 66

Dear,

On behalf of the Korea Internet Governance Alliance(KIGA), please find attached our comments on the ICG proposal.

Best regards,

Boyoung Kim

Internet Governance Division, KISA(Korea Internet & Security Agency)

CWG Participant

- 김보영 주임연구원
- 정책협력본부 인터넷거버넌스단 거버넌스협력팀
- Tel 02-405-6423 | Fax 02-405-5519 | www.kisa.or.kr
- Mobile REDACTED

Korea Internet Governance Alliance(KIGA)'s Comments on the ICG Proposal

Sep. 8th, 2015

Korea Internet Governance Alliance(KIGA) welcomes the opportunity to provide comments to the 'Proposal to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority(IANA) Functions from the U.S. Commerce Department's National Telecommunications and Information Administration(NTIA) to the Global Multistakeholder Community'. We would also like to express our appreciation to the ICG, CWG, CRISP and IANAPLAN groups for their assiduous efforts to deliver their proposals for the transition within the limited time frame.

The followings are our comments ;

Overall, we support the ICG proposal. We believe that the individual proposals were developed in an open and inclusive manner and that each proposal achieved consensus as defined by each community.

Also we believe that ICG proposal meets the NTIA criteria such as :

- ① broadening community support
- ② supporting and enhancing the multistakeholder model
- ③ maintaining the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet DNS
- ④ meeting the need and expectations of the global customers and partners of the IANA services
- ⑤ maintaining the openness of the Internet
- ⑥ not replacing NTIA role with a government or inter-governmental organization.

However, we would like to see the following issues addressed before actual transition takes place.

1. Dependencies on ICANN-level accountability mechanisms.

We notice that the names proposal is complete on the condition that dependencies on ICANN-level accountability mechanisms are concluded as specified in the names proposal. Accordingly, it is necessary to seek confirmation from the CWG that its requirements have been met and ICANN-level accountability mechanisms must be implemented for transition

2. IANA intellectual property (IANA trademarks and the iana.org domain name)

We believe that the IANA IPR should lie with an entity that is neutral and separate from the current IANA functions operator. We firmly believe that the IANA IPR should be considered to be assets that should benefit the entire multistakeholder global community and that it should be able to be used in a non-discriminatory manner. Thus, we agree with the proposal of the CRISP team that the IANA IPR be transferred to a neutral organization such as the IETF trust.

3. Root zone Management

The transition model proposed by the ICG does not address the fact that the physical management of the Root Zone is being carried out by Verisign according to the cooperative agreement with NTIA. Also, no agreement currently exists between the Root Zone Maintainer and the IANA functions operator for the Root Zone Management process. We are aware that NTIA has recently asked Verisign and ICANN to submit a proposal detailing how best to deal with this in a manner that maintains the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS, but we would like to be assured that a new arrangement will be established in consultation with the global multistakeholder community before the actual transition takes place.

4. Composition of the Independent Functions Review Team

The CWG proposal for the composition of the IANA Functions Review team recommends that 2 ccNSO members and 1 non-ccNSO ccTLD member be appointed. Although we support the principle of designating one member to represent the ccTLDs that are not a member of the ccNSO, we would like to propose that the recommendation be changed to make the 1 non-ccNSO ccTLD member recommendation be an option rather than a mandate for the following reasons.

- i) Although specifying non-ccNSO ccTLD members is important because we would like to encourage the participation of the non-ccNSO members, the ultimate goal of the new model should be to gain the trust of all ccTLDs so they will eventually join the newly forming global multistakeholder community. Given that goal, we should expect to see the number of non-ccNSO ccTLDs decrease in the future. Thus, this requirement should be mentioned, but should be an option.
- ii) In our response to the CWG proposal in May the Internet community of Korea had stressed that regional balance should be considered an important criteria. We appreciate the recognition of this principle in the June CWG report, but we feel that this adjustment in the IFRT composition would be an additional means for addressing this concern.

Korea Internet Governance Alliance(KIGA) shares the expectation as well as the desire of many other communities that have participated in this process for a successful transition of the IANA functions to the global multistakeholder community that maintains the security, stability, resiliency of the Internet DNS and the openness of the Internet. Thank you.

< IANA Transition Working Group Members of KIGA¹ >

- ◆ Boknam Yun²(Hankyul Law Group)
- ◆ Dongman Lee(KAIST, Korea Institute of Science and Technology)
- ◆ Young-eum Lee(ICANN ccNSO Council Member, Korea National Open University)
- ◆ Byong-il Oh(Korea Progressive Network Jinbonet)
- ◆ Eungjun Jeon³(You Me Patent & Law Firm)
- ◆ Kishik Park(ETRI, Electronics and Telecommunications Research Institute)
- ◆ Minsoo Lee(Gabia, Registrar)
- ◆ Insook Kim(Korea Consumer Agency)
- ◆ Sunyoung Han(Konkuk University)
- ◆ Hyeyoung Kang(KISA, Korea Internet & Security Agency)
- ◆ Minjung Park(KISA, Korea Internet & Security Agency)
- ◆ Boyoung Kim(KISA, Korea Internet & Security Agency)

¹ Korea Internet Governance Alliance(KIGA) is a private organization which systematically deals with issues of Internet governance. KIGA consists of domestic industry, academia, civil society, technical and government.

² It may not reflect the views and opinions of Hankyul Law Group or any other attorney at Hankyul.

³ It may not reflect the views and opinions of You Me Patent&Law Firm or any other attorney at You Me Patent&Law Firm.