# Comments on CWG-Stewardship 2nd Draft Proposal

The CWG-Stewardship has developed a template to facilitate your input on the 2nd Draft Proposal as well as subsequent review by the CWG-Stewardship. Use of the template is strongly encouraged, but not required. This template provides the opportunity for general input on the proposal as well as specific comments per section. Please note that there is no obligation to complete all of the sections – commenters may respond to as many or as few as they wish. Following your completion of the template, please save the document and submit it as an attachment to the public comment forum ([comments-cwg-stewardship-draft-proposal-22apr15@icann.org](mailto:comments-cwg-stewardship-draft-proposal-22apr15@icann.org)). The CWG-Stewardship looks forward to receiving your feedback.

1. Please provide your name: Liu Yue
2. Please provide your affiliation: Chinese Academy of Telecommunication Research
3. Are you providing input on behalf of another entity (e.g. organization, company, government)? No
4. If you answered ‘yes’ to the previous question, please list the entity on whose behalf you are submitting these questions: Chinese Internet Community representing the following entities:

**Introduction**

I am a researcher of China Academy of Telecommunication Research (CATR), as well as Vice Chair of Internet Research Area and Head of Internet Governance Team. My research areas include Internet Governance, Internet and ICT industry, policy and regulation of Internet. I joined in several ICANN meetings and have kept following up the evolution of ICANN Globalization and the progress of IANA function stewardship transition. I also provided my personal comment on ICG.

| **Item #** | **Proposal Section #** | **Proposal Section Title** | **Template Item Description** | **Annex (Item #)** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | N/A | General Comments | If you have any general comments you would like to provide on the CWG-Stewardship Proposal, please provide these here. | N/A | Core of IANA stewardship is to ensure accountability and transparency of the policy decision of root zone. The proposal defaults ICANN's decision-making positions, and gives greater authority to ICANN (ICANN could change the operator of IANA function, which is now owned by the US government). But now, ICANN does not have a consensus and effective accountability and transparency mechanism and the community cannot replace ICANN. So, it is essential that the transition should be implemented under the conditions of the approval of the CWG proposal and CCWG proposal together, which would show communities consensus on accountability and transparency mechanism design of ICANN before IANA transition. |
| 2 | III.A.i.a | Post-Transition IANA (PTI) | Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards to section III.A.i.a. - Post-Transition IANA (PTI). This section describes the proposed post-transition IANA. | N/A | 1. PTI should be the pure and simple operator of IANA functions and could be composed of one or more entities according to the demands of three communities: name, number, and protocol. 2. PTI should be chosen through international competitive bidding and transparent evaluation process with regularly re-tendering. ICANN should ensure the fairness, impartiality and openness of the bidding. It’s similar to the way that ICANN got IANA functions contract from NTIA by competitive bidding, which has been proved the feasibility. 3. PTI should sign a contract with ICANN to ensure the security and stability of IANA functions operation and qualified level of service, under the supervision according to the mechanism decided by the contract terms. The operation of PTI should be transparent and accountable for the communities. 4. IANA function contract should be made and updated under the participation and regular review of communities, collecting advices from multi-stakeholders through public comments. The principle of the separation between decision making and operation should be strictly ensured and effectively implemented. |
| 3 | III.A.i.b | Post-Transition IANA Board | Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards to section III.A.i.b. - Post-Transition IANA Board. This section describes the proposed Board for the post-transition IANA. | N/A | PTI should be selected by tender. So ICANN does not need to establish subsidiary bodies or affiliates. PTI should have no direct relationship with ICANN. ICANN could propose requirements in the tender for PTI (avoiding direct interest, information disclosure, etc.) without considering the structure mode of PTI Board. |
| 4 | III.A.ii.a | Customer Standing Committee | Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards to section III.A.ii.a. - Customer Standing Committee (CSC). This section describes Customer Standing Committee that is expected to oversee performance of the IANA Functions as they relate to naming services. | G (33) | If PTI could come from the outside of ICANN and be supervised under the contract and accountable for communities, then it should not be necessary to establish CSC. Because the members of CSC are mainly from Registries. Through various channels, Registries could make comments and provide suggestions on decisions of root zone management, design of IANA functions contract terms, operation of IANA functions, etc. as well as participate in the progress of oversight and accountability. In addition, there are contracts between gTLD Registries and ICANN, which could have mutual restraint according to the contract terms. The ccTLD operators could also possible establish binding mechanisms with ICANN and provide services based on contracts or other forms, to ensure their own interests. |
| 5 | III.A.iv.c | Regulatory and legal obligations | Do you have any specific comments or input you would like to provide with regards to section III.A.iv.c. - Regulatory and legal obligations. This section describes the regulatory and legal obligations post-transition and how these are expected to be met. | N/A | ICANN should ensure that the decisions related to IANA functions would be transparent and accountable for communities, so that decisions would not be controlled by some certain peoples or groups.  In order to better fulfill its responsibilities, ICANN should change the status subject to the laws of the United States and become a more neutral and independent international organization, which could promote ICANN to be better accountable for the community. |
| 6 | N/A |  | Are there any other comments or issues you would like to raise for the consideration of the CWG-Stewardship | N/A | 1. The CWG proposal and CCWG proposal should be considered together. The post-transition accountability and transparency mechanism of ICANN should be designed before IANA transition. If CCWG proposal does not meet the requirements of the community, it is difficult for communities to only agree with CWG proposal separately. 2. The CWG proposal and CCWG proposal should be firstly reach consensus within each community 3. US government should indicate its attitude about the CWG proposal and CCWG proposal in the GAC as soon as possible, and to comply with the consensus of GAC. |