

**AFRALO Statement on CWG Proposal**  
**19 May 2015**

-----

We Members of AFRALO community have been following closely the activities of the Cross community working group on IANA stewardship transition (CWG-Stewardship). In view of this we would like to present the following view about the second draft proposal of the CWG that is currently up for public comment:

- We observe the significant change in the overall model presented in the current draft as opposed to the first draft of the CWG proposal released for public comment in December 2014 and we welcome this change in approach.
- We understand that the proposal intends to create a new entity called the post transition IANA (PTI) that will be awarded contract by ICANN to operate the IANA function for names. However, we have the following observation about PTI:
  - It is not yet clear how PTI would be setup i.e. whether subsidiary or Affiliate to ICANN as we believe either of them comes with different sets of implications.
  - The expected composition of PTI board is yet to be defined and we see that as a critical aspect of this proposal that would determine our position regarding the whole proposal
  - We are concerned about the sustainability of PTI especially as it will rely on ICANN in terms of its resources (most especially funding)
  - Although we understand the legal separation that PTI brings, at the same time we are concerned about the structural complexity that goes along with it and wonder whether maintaining separation of IANA as a department was explored in details.
- We understand from the proposal that a customer standing committee (CSC) will be tasked with monitoring operational performance of IANA function related to names and we have the following views:
  - CSC is proposed to be largely dominated by the “so-called” direct customers, and would strongly suggest that the prerogatives of the group be strictly defined within its intent of monitoring and its report transparently available to the community.
  - We would support including a liaison to CSC from the IFRT
  - We are concerned about the escalation path of the CSC as currently proposed and we suggest that CSC escalates to PTI Board who may ask for a review (from the IFR) or any other action they judge appropriate than the “direct customers” of IANA
- We also understand from the proposal that an IANA function review team (IFRT) would be created to review activities of PTI as it concerns IANA function operation as defined in the contract and recommend renewal of PTI contract (or otherwise) to the ICANN board :

- The composition of the IFRT as proposed is acceptable, however we don't think there is need to include a CSC liaison especially as CSC is already dominated by registries and also considering that IFRT also has more seats to the so called "direct customers".
- We expect that activity of IRFT would be transparently carried out and community driven
- We will like that the scope of IFRT is clarified in ensuring that it's solely for names related function.

Finally, we will like to reiterate our support on the request from the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) to ICANN to "convene a multi-stakeholder process to develop a plan to transition the U.S. government stewardship role" with regard to the IANA Functions and related root zone management. We appreciate the direction of the CWG proposal formation and we hope our concerns will be addressed within the group. We look forward to an improved proposal that ensures participation of all relevant communities within ICANN including AFRALO (as a regional organization of At-Large)