.tw Reply on ICANN Reform

(DRAFT)

Introduction:
Internet has been developing so rapidly that most people often have a hard time facing the challenges in the changing environment of Internet. As a result of this, ICANN presented this reform proposal in hope that secure and stable Internet environment can be established to meet the demand. We appreciate ICANN and all the ICANN staffs for the contribution they have made. Although some defect may exist, what ICANN have achieved with the limited resources and divergent opinions is undoubtedly recommendable. .tw also perceive the current problems due to their long-term participation in this field and find that it’s not only ICANN but all the other stakeholders have the responsibilities to improve the situation. We know that things can not be changed overnight and that abruptly closing ICANN might not be a good option. To make the most important thing clear through multi-lateral cooperation is our first concern.

To sum up, we hope ICANN a technique-oriented and non-governmental organization, with its policies coming from all levels of work teams.

Mission:
An ideal ICANN is an independent and fair non-governmental organization from US Government, which was the guideline when ICANN was established and will be the main goal as we move on in developing it. If it is possible, all the discussions with US Government should be transparent and reported in the ICANN meetings.

ICANN should routinely keep the IANA function stable and secure as well as the mechanism of related policy-making. We hope the controversial Root server issue could be working in a transparent process and a inspection mechanism would be created. A list of related discussions on stable future DNS development should keep going. For example, we should pay more attention to IDN and IPv6.

In addition, we do not consider ICANN a government-based united nation of Internet. The reason is that most governments are not flexible and quick enough to deal with the rapid changes currently. Therefore, we prefer to maintain the principle of civil participants.
Participation:
ICANN must keep the participation fair and open to every potential candidates. Those which are associated with the ICANN-provided functions, such as ccTLD & gTLD’ registries & registrars, ISP and property right organizations, should be the participants. We think the governments have to make sure the normal and stable operation of the related ccTLD functions between administrations. But the civil organizations play more important since the governments are not entitled to present the local Internet community entirely.

As for At large, although it is a good idea, it will encounter plenty of difficulties when implemented. In spite of this, we are still happy to support and encourage individual participation on ICANN affairs, especially the participants from Taiwan.

As for the reasons of few participation of ccTLDs, first, there are many developing ccTLDs can not afford the cost to have face to face meeting. Second, since the lack of training and communication from ICANN, ccTLDs could not quite catch up with the efficiency and changing of ICANN and related discussion. Therefore, first, we would like to have a much stronger and more organized ccTLD organization like ccSO. Second, ICANN should have more full time staffs to work with ccTLDs. Third, ccSO and ICANN ccTLD staffs should work together on a program with sponsorship to assist all ccTLD for participating ICANN related activities and discussion.

Funding:
We suggest everyone should pay for the service. As a ccTLD, we hope to formalize the funding relation via certain kind of agreement with ICANN. We would support ICANN with a reasonable contribution and hope ICANN could promise the quality of the IANA function.

Board Structure:
We hope to see more ccTLD representatives as ICANN Board. Basically, we support a more efficient At Large election to elect Board from different regions. As for the relation of ICANN and government, we suggest the government representatives will still keep in GAC. The direct involvement from government to ICANN Board might not be a good option.

Conclusion:
Currently, there are many different ideas on ICANN reform come from all over the
world. But, sometimes, the endless and no-focus debate might not be productive. With cooperation and collaboration among ccTLDs, ICANN staffs and ICANN Board, we hope the ICANN reform discussion will come up with some productive and practical consensus in a timely and obvious schedule. Eventually, the stable and secure Internet is what we all need.