



ITU-T and ICANN Reform ccTLD issues

Telecommunication Standardization Bureau
International Telecommunication Union



Outline

- About the ITU
- Some issues regarding ICANN Reform
- What have ccTLDs said
- What is ITU's position
- CENTR members' Questions and my Answers
- Proposals
- Conclusion



What is ITU?

- International treaty organization founded in 1865 to facilitate international interconnection of telegraphy
- Unique partnership of industry and governments
- Three sectors:
 - Development (aid to developing countries)
 - Radio (radio spectrum and satellite slot allocations)
 - Standardization (formerly CCITT, for example modem standards) (now called ITU-T; secretariat is called TSB)
- In ITU-T industry and government work together to develop mutually agreed non-binding Recommendations



An example of ITU-T work

ENUM is an IETF protocol for mapping telephone numbers into the DNS. IETF asked ITU to facilitate government approval of ENUM implementations, given that telephony is still regulated in most countries

- No real technical issues
- Complex regulatory issues
- After considerable discussion, most determined to be national matters
- Under agreed procedures
 - RIPE NCC will ask TSB if country approves ENUM delegation request
 - If yes, it proceeds
 - If no or no answer from country, it does not proceed (TSB objects)
- TSB does not itself evaluate requests in any way. RIPE NCC checks technical aspects of requests

See <http://www.itu.int/ITU-T/inr/enum/index.html>



What ITU-T is not

The ITU-T does not do the following:

- World-wide regulation
- Consider issues that are national matters
- Binding recommendations
- Top-down decisions
- Impose contractual terms or operating rules on private companies
- Work in non-transparent ways
- Act bureaucratically
- Have staff that decides policies
- Collect fees other than membership fees (with the exception of minor cost-recovery activities)



Some ICANN Reform issues

The President of ICANN has stated that ICANN cannot fulfill its mission and has called for reform, and has called for:

- Greater government involvement
- Increased funding

Among the specific problems identified, we mention:

- ICANN has been too slow to address and resolve issues
- ICANN lacks clear, stable, and accepted processes and procedures
- ICANN has not yet created an adequate industry-government partnership



Specific ccTLD issues

- Most ccTLD managers have not signed the contracts proposed by ICANN
- Some ccTLD managers have stated that they are not satisfied with the services provided by ICANN
- There are tensions between some ccTLD managers and their governments (mostly outside Europe)
- Conversely, some governments feel that the ccTLD manager does not act in the interest of the country (particularly when the ccTLD appears to have been “high-jacked” by a foreign company)

The above is not intended to be a criticism of ICANN, but merely a reflection of the current situation.



What ccTLDs have said (1/6)

- Committed to continuing dialog within ICANN
- Policies affecting ccTLDs should be made by the ccTLDs
- Willing to fund ICANN activities which directly support ccTLD operations
- Committed to working with governments

<http://forum.icann.org/reform-comments/general/msg00135.html>



What ccTLDs have said (2/6)

- ccTLD policies are national matters
- IANA function must be carried out by a trusted international body
- No cross-subsidization
- Committed to industry self-regulation
- ccTLD issues should be solved locally

<http://www.centri.org/docs/presentations/ICANN-reform.pdf>



What ccTLDs have said (3/6)

- ICANN, in its current form, cannot fulfill its goals
- With respect to ccTLDs, ICANN's role should be pure technical coordination
- ICANN sees its role as a global policy provider
- ccTLDs policies should be developed locally
- Re-delegations should be handled locally
- ccTLDs require:
 - Stable and secure root server operations
 - Stable, secure, and reliable IANA function, to be carried out by a trusted international body

<http://www.centri.org/meetings/ga-14/ICANN-response.html>



What ccTLDs have said (4/6)

- No cross-subsidies
- Support industry self-regulation
- Current IANA does not guarantee stability and security [mixes administrative and policy functions]
- Refusal to perform IANA function without contract is not acceptable
- Decisions should be based on consensus

<http://www.centri.org/meetings/ga-14/ICANN-response.html>



What ccTLDs have said (5/6)

- Regulation should be done by governments
- ICANN's decisions should not be binding on ccTLDs
- Re-delegation should generally be handled within a country, in accordance with national laws and regulations
- For certain cases where this cannot be done, there should be procedures mutually agreed by governments and ccTLDs
- There should be a way to authenticate legitimate re-delegation requests, which ICANN would merely implement
- Cannot endorse ICANN's Blueprint for Reform

<http://www.centri.org/news/CENTR-ICANN-statement.html>



What ccTLDs have said (6/6)

- Dissatisfied with performance of IANA function, set up a Working Group to explore plan to set up system of independent management
- This work to take place in parallel with ongoing discussions with ICANN in the context of ICANN reform

<http://www.dnsso.org/clubpublic/council/Arc11/msg00155.html>



ICANN statement

- ... there is no obvious motivation for ccTLDs to enter into any such agreements [contracts with ICANN], absent compulsion from their local governments.
- We are hopeful the reform efforts, especially the greater coordination with and integration of the Governmental Advisory Committee, will help this process move forward more quickly.

<http://www.icann.org/general/status-report-15aug02.htm>



What is ITU's Situation (1/5)

- ITU already cooperates with ICANN, at the Board of Directors and through PSO and GAC
- ITU-T working methods are fast and efficient: for example, 190 Recommendations have been approved under Alternative Approval Process in 2001, more than 60% in less than 2 months (ex. E.129, Representation of national numbering plans)
- ITU membership has increased in the private sector
- Non-government (non-profit) organizations can apply for ITU membership



What is ITU's Situation (2/5)

ITU-T Approval and publication times

	before 1988	1989-1993	1993-1996	1997-2000	2001-2004
Approval time	4 years	2 years	18 months	9 months (exceptional case: 5 months)	2-9 months
Publication time	2-4 years	2 years	1-1.5 year	6-12 months	3-9 months

- Notes:**
1. Pre-published Recommendations, available on ITU-T Website, from a few days to four weeks after approval of the text.
 2. Recs in force, pre-published, superseded/obsolete: available on ITU-T Website.
 3. Forms of publication: paper, CD-ROM, electronic bookshop, online, etc.
 4. **FREE ONLINE ACCESS SINCE JANUARY 2001** (one free access per member, 3 free downloads for public)
 5. "Approval time" counted between "determination/consent" and final approval



What is ITU's Situation (3/5)

TSB

- ITU-T is a dynamic, well-respected industry-government partnership (650 Sector Members)
- Examples of ITU-T Recommendations:
 - G.723.1 & G.729 - Speech coding for Voice over IP and other applications
 - H.323 - Packet based multimedia communication systems - the protocols behind Voice over IP, along with:
 - H.245 - Control protocol for multimedia communications
 - H.248 - Gateway control protocol (developed jointly with IETF)
 - X.509 - Public-key encryption
 - V.90 - 56kbit/s PSTN modems - providing ubiquitous worldwide internet access
 - G.99x series - xDSL Recommendations for broadband access



What is ITU's Situation (4/5)

ITU-T–Electronic Publishing

- All Recommendations available online
- Key databases (for example, telephone country codes) available online
- Working documents available online

See <http://www.itu.int/ITU-T/>



What is ITU's Situation (5/5)

- ITU participation and coordination do not imply ITU control or government control.
- A good example is the international telephone numbering scheme, which is coordinated by ITU-T and is universally considered to work to the satisfaction of the general public; however, telephone services are not controlled by ITU-T and are provided by private companies
- Issue (to be resolved in open discussion): mapping ITU-T Members to ISO 3166 codes



How does ITU-T Develop Recommendations?

- Consensus of Sector Members and Member States
- Work typically driven by Sector Members
- Open (for members), transparent, bottoms-up process
- Sensitive to national sovereignty: will only cover matters not considered to be national
- Will not impose contractual terms or operating rules on private companies

Recommendations are not binding, but tend to be followed because they represent a true consensus.



CENTR's Questions and Answers (1/10)

- In what way exactly proposes the ITU to participate and coordinate in the ccTLD field?
 - We will do whatever is requested. An option would be to develop jointly a recommendation.
- In what committee exactly within ITU would ccTLD issues be dealt with? What would the structure of the committee be?
 - This requires further discussion, but initial thinking is to start with an open forum, then evaluate whether it would be best to create a special focus group within SG 2 or even a new SG. In any case, all work would be done jointly by ccTLDs, governments, and other concerned parties.



CENTR's Questions and Answers (2/10)

- In what way is the input from private member organizations implemented?
 - Inputs (called “contributions”) from Sector Members are discussed along with those from Member States.
- Would the top level ITU Council (essentially governments) have the final say on anything?
 - No. Recommendations are approved at the SG level.



CENTR's Questions and Answers (3/10)

- Who is to pay for what service?
 - That would be defined in the output recommendation.
Traditionally, TSB provides services at no marginal cost, since costs are already covered by the contributions from Member States.
- Who would do the operational bits [maintaining the IANA database]?
 - To be defined, presumably IANA.
- Who would define the policies which apply to the IANA?
 - To be defined, presumably the joint ccTLD/government group.



CENTR's Questions and Answers (4/10)

- What SLA do they have in mind for these services?
 - Depends on the service. TSB has no operational roles. SLA for administrative work is considered satisfactory by current users.
- Would there be a contract [most major ccTLDs are private companies]?
 - Most major data network and telecommunication operators are private companies. No contracts are needed, TSB provides services in accordance with agreed Recommendations (e.g. E.164). If desired, an MoU with TSB could be established.



CENTR's Questions and Answers (5/10)

- If not, how would the ITU have any authority over the ccTLDs?
 - ITU Recommendations have no binding force. They are followed because they represent a genuine consensus. For example, E.164.
- How is or will the ITU (be) linked to other organizations such as the EC, ICANN, IANA or the root server operators?
 - The EC is a Sector Member. Other organizations can become members or we could establish a liaison (as is the case for IETF, ETSI, etc.)



CENTR's Questions and Answers (6/10)

- How is the ITU organized to react fast and effective to input from the local and global Internet communities?
 - Covered by previous slides, if not, I can take specific questions.
- What outcome does the ITU Secretariat seek in both the short and longer term from the discussion by ITU members of resolution 101 and 102 at the Plenipotentiary?
 - The Secretariat will be happy to offer its services to the members and the public to meet their expectations.



CENTR's Questions and Answers (7/10)

- How will the ITU avoid a conflict of interest concluding a member of the ITU should “win” in preference to a non-member, or a junior (ccTLD) member – if ccTLD become members?
 - I’m not sure I understand the question. Membership is not exclusive, so anybody can become a member. There is no concept of “senior” or “junior” members. ITU does not make decisions regarding who can or cannot provide certain types of services. Countries may or may not have national rules on that. Any “conflicts” regarding who should operate a given ccTLD would, I presume, be resolved at the national level.



CENTR's Questions and Answers (8/10)

- What is/was the mandate of ITU vis a vis the Authority of the States that participate in the ITU with regard to ENUM? Has this changed over time?
 - There has never been any doubt that the ITU's role in ENUM was based on Recommendation E.164. There has not been any change in principle, but the extent of TSB's role has been clarified as a result of discussions.
- Is this mandate derived from the authority from national governments over telephone number space? Other?
 - It is derived from E.164. The extent to which national governments exert authority over telephone numbers varies by country.



CENTR's Questions and Answers (9/10)

- What's the ITU view on the line of authority between governments and the ccTLD manager if this line of authority is not formal (not derived from national legislation)?
 - ccTLDs would be ITU Sector Members. Within ITU-T, there is no arrangement for governments to give instructions to Sector Members. Member States and Sector Members work together to develop recommendations.



CENTR's Questions and Answers (10/10)

- What is the mandate of the ITU if there is no formal line of authority between the national government and the ccTLD manager? Does the ITU need to be formally mandated by a national government to be involved in the ccTLD matters? And if not the case, what is the basis for the mandate of the ITU?
 - The mandate of the TSB would be derived from an agreed recommendation. The usual source of ITU's authority is consensus. For example, there is no formal line of authority between ITU (or most national governments) and modem manufacturers. But modem (or FAX, or whatever) manufacturers voluntarily follow ITU-T recommendations, because they were developed by consensus. The same for telephone companies with respect to international codes (E.164).



Proposals

- ccTLDs and governments could work together to agree ITU-T Recommendations related to ccTLD issues, in particular re-delegation issues
 - Issue for open discussion: local vs. global boundaries
- The management teams of CENTR and other ccTLD forums could engage in dialog with ITU-T to explore this and other areas for cooperation



Conclusions

- ITU-T could help ICANN to achieve the ccTLD-government consensus that appears to be missing today, by using ITU-T's well-proven processes and procedures.