Contribution from JPNIC on the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to Develop a Proposal to Transition NTIA's Stewardship of the IANA Functions

May 8th, 2014

Japan Network Information Center (JPNIC)

JPNIC appreciates the opportunity to provide an input on principles, mechanisms and process of developing the IANA stewardship transition proposal. We would like to thank ICANN for publicly calling for comments and facilitating the process.

While JPNIC supports many points described in the draft which are posted for public comments, we would like to make five points which we consider as important.

1) The community and entity which are responsible for the respective IANA resource should consider and develop transition plans for the stewardship mechanism of IANA functions for their respective resources

As described in the Scoping Document, there are four resources which IANA manages today, namely gTLD, ccTLD, IP Address and AS Numbers, and Protocol Parameters. Each of them has its own community and/or entity which has been responsibly considering and developing the policies of its respective resource with its established and proven process. These communities and entities should be the focal point to consider and develop the transition plan for the stewardship mechanism of IANA function for the area of the respective resources. This will benefit in taking full advantage of expertise and knowledge, as well as the existing scheme and processes to consider resource policies. JPNIC fully supports IAB's comments[1] for this point, as well as the idea which proposes that "Steering Group" should take the role of coordination among the considerations made in their respective communities.

---

[1] Comments of the Internet Architecture Board (IAB) Regarding the "Draft Proposal, Based on Initial Community Feedback, of the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to Develop a Proposal to Transition NTIA's Stewardship of the IANA Functions" http://www.iab.org/wp-content/IAB-uploads/2014/04/iab-response-to-20140408-2014042 8a.pdf

2) Indirect stakeholders should be engaged in the "Steering Group" to ensure the integrated proposal to be fair and reasonable from the viewpoint of the broader Internet Community and Public Interest

As the indirect stakeholders, we suggest the representatives from general Internet users, governments who are responsible for public policies, and the Internet Infrastructure operator community

Based on the points 1) and 2), those who should be involved in the consideration of the IANA stewardship transition are listed in the table below.

Direct/Indirect to IANA	Specific areas	Community/Constituency
Direct stakeholders to IANA function	Protocol Parameters	IETF., IAB
	Number Resources	NRO(RIRs)
	ccTLDs	ccNSO, ccTLD ROs
	gTLDs	GNSO
Indirect stakeholders to IANA function	Public Policy	GAC, etc.
	Users' perspective	ALAC, etc.
	Internet Infrastructure Oparations	RSSAC, SSAC, etc.

In JPNIC's opinion, the representations of the proposed "Steering Group" is generally workable with a good balance of stakeholders.

3) Role of "Steering Group"
While JPNIC finds a good balance in the current composition of the proposed "Steering Group", we observe it has focus on ICANN's constituencies overall.
It is important that even if "Steering Group" members are selected from entities within ICANN, they should be open to inputs from the respective area (governments, civil societies, and operational communities) outside ICANN, with wider perspectives based on public interests.

As pointed out in 1), we would also like to clarify that "Steering Group" should coordinate discussions and it should not be the authority of discussions.

4) We support the care to be taken for regional representations in membership of the "Steering Group" as described.

   We believe this balance is important to ensure not to have a strong focus on a particular region or an economy, especially to address concerns expressed from some economies that the ICANN/IANA is US centric. We look forward to have the regional balance reflected in the composition of the "Steering Group".

5) We strongly support the principle of multilingual to accommodate non-English speakers to join the discussions.

   JPNIC is willing to offer support for discussions by the Japanese community in our own language.