

**Name:** ICANN At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

**Organization:** ICANN At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

**Submission ID:** 88

Dear All,

Kindly find attached the ALAC Statement on the IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal.

On 08 September 2015, Staff confirmed that the online vote resulted in the ALAC endorsing the Statement with 11 votes in favor, 0 vote against, and 0 abstention. You may view the result independently under:

<https://www.bigpulse.com/pollresults?code=5006gBrAh2RzsUXX5eGPG5NE>.

Regards,

Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Gisella Gruber, Nathalie Peregrine and Terri Agnew

ICANN Policy Staff in support of ALAC

E-mail: [staff@atlarge.icann.org](mailto:staff@atlarge.icann.org)

Facebook: [www.facebook.com/icannatlarge](http://www.facebook.com/icannatlarge)

Twitter: @ICANNAtLarge



AL-ALAC-ST-0915-03-00-EN

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: 08 September 2015

STATUS: Final

## AT-LARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### ALAC Statement on the IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal

#### Introduction

Olivier Crépin-Leblond, ALAC member of the European Regional At-Large Organization (EURALO), ALAC Vice Chair, and ALAC member in the Cross Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions (CWG-IANA) developed an initial draft of the ALAC Statement.

On 25 August 2015, the first draft of the Statement was posted on the [At-Large IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal Workspace](#).

On that same day, Alan Greenberg, Chair of the ALAC, requested ICANN Policy Staff in support of the ALAC to send a Call for Comments on the Statement to all At-Large members via the [ALAC-Announce Mailing List](#).

On 03 September 2015, a version incorporating the comments received was posted on the aforementioned workspace and the Chair requested that Staff open an ALAC ratification vote on the proposed Statement.

On 08 September 2015, Staff confirmed that the online vote resulted in the ALAC endorsing the Statement with 11 votes in favor, 0 vote against, and 0 abstention. You may view the result independently under: <https://www.bigpulse.com/pollresults?code=5006gBrAh2RzsUXX5eGPG5NE>.

## IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal - Public Comment Form

*Disclaimer: The ICG will not use the information collected for any purpose other than analyzing public comments. Submitters' names, affiliations, and comments will be public.*

### Identifying Information

*\* Indicates required field*

First Name [Olivier](#)

Last Name [Crépin-Leblond](#)

Email Address **REDACTED**

Country/Economy [N/A](#)

Organization [ICANN At-Large Advisory Committee](#)

### 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?

[Yes](#)

- 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?

[Pending arrangements to be made about Intellectual Property issues around IANA and IANA.ORG, the ALAC believes that the proposals are compatible with each other.](#)

[The ALAC will support any mechanism which preserves the existing rights of the naming community and has the agreement of the three operational communities.](#)

- 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?

[The ALAC believes that issues of operation accountability have been suitably addressed within the mandates of the operational community to develop their proposals.](#)

Note that as in its response to Q6 on Stability, the ALAC has related concerns on the accountability mechanisms as they coordinate with each other in each of the operational communities.

- 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?

The ALAC does not believe that there are conflicts resulting from tests or evaluations of workability that were included in the operational community proposals.

#### **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.

The ALAC believes that the proposal supports the Multistakeholder model.

- 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.

The ALAC is particularly concerned about maintaining the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS as every single Internet End User around the world relies on a stable DNS for their Internet use.

At present, all three IANA functions are undertaken by one IANA Functions Operator, currently ICANN. Any potential split resulting in IANA functions being undertaken by more than one IANA Functions Operator will likely introduce instability. Although the IANA Coordination Group has not introduced any measure to increase direct operational coordination between the operational communities, the ALAC recommends that such coordination should be promoted at the Implementation Phase, with the aim to reduce and/or prevent the likelihood of a split in the IANA Functions Operator. This direct operational coordination should take place as operational communities enhance communications and continue dialogues with each other.

In the event that an operational community reaches the decision to replace their IANA Functions Operator, they should discuss their decision with other operational communities prior to proceeding forward, seeking all means to keep all of the IANA functions undertaken by a single IANA Functions Operator.

- 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.

The ALAC believes that the proposal meets the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners 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.

The ALAC believes that the proposal indeed maintains the openness of the Internet. It keeps the processes by which the IANA functions are performed as close as possible to the current operational status, which is more than satisfactory as agreed by all parties.

- 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.

The ALAC believes that the proposal is in no way replacing the NTIA's role with a government-led or inter-governmental organization solution.

- 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.

The ALAC does not foresee any divergence from the NTIA criteria in the future.

#### **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.

Yes.

#### **General Questions**