President's Strategy Committee Consultation with the ICANN Community Improving the Inherent Strength of the Multi-stakeholder Model

Laura ABBA, Vittorio BERTOLA, Stefano TRUMPY
Members of an Italian governmental committee on Internet Governance

July 2006

This is our input to the consultation started by ICANN on July 11th 2006, as described at http://www.icann.org/announcements/psc-consultation.htm.

Q1: What are some of the main challenges to ensuring continued stable and secure operations of the Internet's domain name and IP addressing system, and are there steps that could be taken to improve this?

R1:
- ➢ to continue relying on a standard process based on IETF;
- ➢ to maintain the concept on a unique addressing system avoiding fragmentation and implied necessity of coordination among different agencies;
- ➢ to monitor technological evolutions that could change the centrality of DNS to keep the global addressability of the Internet;
- ➢ to assure reliability, redundancy, and monitor scalability of the DNS.

Q2: The Members of the Committee accept that there are a number of administrative challenges that ICANN faces as it is a unique model of bottom up participation and coordination of policy decision making. What are examples of how other global organizations have met similar challenges? Can experiences in other organizations be applied to ICANN to inform consideration of how best to serve the global community?

R2: Examples could be found among other non-governmental international entities independent from any jurisdiction, through host country agreements (Red Cross is an example).

Q3: Is the organization's ability to scale internationally affected by its legal personality being based in a specific jurisdiction?

R3: in the medium-long term the present situation is perceived as an obstacle in several fora: ICANN should move to gain an international status (not of an intergovernmental nature).

Q4: The Given ICANN's narrow technical coordination mission and responsibilities, how should ICANN respond to relevant issues or challenges deriving from the WSIS decisions, including those related to Internet governance?

R4: ICANN is the only organization with an international approach in the Internet governance area, that has inside a representation of the governments; due to its success, ICANN model is seen and the one suited to address also themes typical of the enlarged definition of Internet governance. In this respect we think that ICANN should stick to the narrow definition of the governance and its original mission, at least until the present funding model will be changed, in order to accommodate more contributors. To our opinion, the present funding model is already critical for ICANN in order to accommodate all the expectations of the global community interested in DNS.

Q5: Specifically, how should ICANN further enhance cooperation of all ICANN stakeholders on those Internet governance issues that fall into ICANN's scope of activities?

R5:
- still advancement has to be done in order to include participation of the majority of ccTLDs;
- the domain names registrants should have more substantive representation on the decision mechanisms of ICANN, e.g. at the Board level.

Q6: What can ICANN do to further improve the value that the GAC and its individual members offer to the multi stakeholder framework and addressing public policy concerns?

R6: A good starting point is represented by the action plan prepared by ICANN Board and ICANN Governmental Advisory Committee Working Group; this initiative has to prove to be effective for the purpose we intend to achieve and could represent a concrete example of 'enhanced cooperation' that is one of the more substantive results of the Tunis summit.

Q7: What can be done to assist in the evolution of a more widely informed participation from all regions from all interested stakeholders, including governmental representatives?

R7: All the efforts that are on going will have to be intensified; this will require more personnel involved, increasing costs and possibly more voluntary contributions from the private sector. Having good results in this direction is a must, if we want that ICANN continue to acquire recognition and legitimacy; ICANN should also pursue synergism with other bodies that are sensible to "digital divide".

Q8: Are there activities or steps that would build on existing processes to continue to enhance global accessibility to the transparency of ICANN's processes and input into the decision-making processes?

R8: Opportunities for participation could be enhanced, for example by providing translations of the meetings in other languages, or by a better and timely organization of the meetings themselves. Organizing regional meetings and special training activities will also help sensibly.