


# **IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG) Update**

**ICANN 54  
October 2015**


**[ianacg.org](http://ianacg.org)**

# Work completed up to July 2015



# Public comment period: July 31-Sept 8


- 157 comments received
  - Individuals and organizations of all kinds
  - Comments in English, Chinese, Spanish, French



- Global (9%)
- North America (28%)
- Asia-Pacific (18%)
- Europe (14%)
- Africa (6%)
- LAC (3%)
- Unspecified (22%)

# Support for the proposal

- Majority of comments supportive of the proposal
  - Some qualified based on ICANN accountability dependency, RZM, IPR, other issues
- Supportive comments from individuals, OCs, SOs/ACs, businesses, civil society groups, governments, others



- Supportive (41%)
- Qualified support (24%)
- Not supportive (11%)
- Opposed to transition (9%)
- Position unclear or not specific to proposal (15%)

# Key public comment themes

- Dependency on CCWG-Accountability
- Post-Transition IANA (PTI)
  - Relationships among entities
  - PTI Board remit, membership
  - Separation processes and cooperation
- Root Zone Maintainer (RZM)
  - Lack of existing agreement between IFO and RZM
- Jurisdiction of ICANN
- ccTLD references

# Support for NTIA criteria

- Majority of commenters who addressed criteria believe criteria are either met or conditionally met by the proposal
- ICG believes criteria are met
- Outstanding RZM-related requirements needed to ensure security and stability of the DNS

## NTIA's Criteria

Support and enhance the multistakeholder model

---

Maintain the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet Domain Name System (DNS)

---

Meet the needs and expectation of the global customers and partners of the IANA services

---

Maintain the openness of the Internet

## NTIA's Expectations

Broad community support

---

Does not replace NTIA role with a government-led or an inter-governmental organization solution

# Transition proposal status

- ICG set to make remaining refinements at the end of this week.
- Dependency between CWG and CCWG is clearly listed in the proposal.
- Expecting that CCWG dependency will be the only outstanding open issue in the proposal shortly after conclusion of ICANN54.

# ICG plan going forward

- Provide status update and current proposal document shortly after this week's meetings
- Await confirmation from CWG that its requirements have been met
- Keep ICG constituted as a body until 30 September 2016
  - Maintain ICG mailing list
  - Ensure communities know how to get in touch with us
  - Schedule calls/meetings only as needed
- Currently discussing need for implementation-related work, if any



# Q&A