



SECRETARÍA DE COMUNICACIONES  
Y  
TRANSPORTES

"2011, Año del Turismo en México"

FORMA CG - 1A

**Dirección General de Política de  
Telecomunicaciones y de Radiodifusión  
Dirección General Adjunta**

2.1.- **6379**

México, D.F., a



**Sra. Fiona M. Alexander**

Administradora Asociada

Oficina de Asuntos Internacionales

Administración Nacional de Telecomunicaciones e Información

Departamento de Comercio de los Estados Unidos de América

Me refiero a la solicitud de comentarios *Docket No. 110207099-1319-02 RIN 0660-XA23* del Departamento de Comercio – Administración Nacional de Telecomunicaciones e Información relacionado con las funciones desempeñadas por la Autoridad para la Asignación de Números (IANA).

Sobre el particular, adjunto al presente los comentarios de esta Dirección General Adjunta, a efecto de que, de no existir inconveniente alguno, sea considerada en la consulta antes referida.

Sin más por el momento, le envío un cordial saludo.

Atentamente,  
El Director General Adjunto

**Omar Charén Tommasi**



DIRECCIÓN GENERAL DE POLÍTICA DE  
TELECOMUNICACIONES Y DE RADIODIFUSIÓN

Ccp.- Lic. Andrés de la Cruz Vielma.- Director General de Política de Telecomunicaciones y de Radiodifusión.- Conocimiento.

VMV

---

## ANNEX

---

Response to the Department of Commerce – National Telecommunications and Information Administration [Docket No. 110207099-1319-02] RIN 0660-XA23: The Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions

### **I. General View:**

We welcome the opportunity provided by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) to continue participating in the definition process of the Draft Statement of Work for the new IANA functions contract.

We express our commitment to participate in the activities for maintaining the security and stability of the Internet. For that reason we appreciate the key new elements provided by the NTIA to improve the transparency and accountability for the contractor, inclusion the requirement to elaborate a Contingency and Continuity of Operations Plan and the Customer Service Complaint Resolution Process.

We believe that is necessary to have a long-term contractual arrangement for IANA in order to avoid possible interpretation that in an simple manner the contractor could be changed, perhaps an a period of five years be appropriate.

### **II. Answers to Questions**

*Q1. 1. Does the language in “Provision C.1.3” capture views on how the relevant stakeholders as sources of the policies and procedures should be referenced in the next IANA functions contract. If not, please propose specific language to capture commenters’ views*

A1. The provision C.1.3 is clear, however considering that the provision C.1.4 is complementary to capture views on how the relevant stakeholders should be referenced in the next IANA Functions contract, we suggest a little addition as follow:

*C.1.4 The Contractor, in the performance of its duties, has a need to have close constructive working relationships with all interested and affected parties including to ensure quality performance of the IANA functions. The interested and affected parties include, but are not limited to, the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) and the Internet Architecture Board (IAB), regional registries, country code top-level domain (ccTLD) operators/managers, governments, international and regional organizations and the Internet user community.*

*Q2. 2. Does the new “Provision C.2.2.1.1” adequately address concerns that the IANA functions contractor should refrain from developing policies related to the IANA functions? If not, please provide detailed comments and specific suggestions for improving the language.*

A2. The provision C.2.2.1.1 addressed the concerns, nevertheless in some situations the participation of this staff could be necessary in order to provide more information or advise respect to the IANA functions, in this sense we suggest the follow wording:



C.2.2.1.1 *The Contractor shall ensure that any and all staff dedicated to executing the IANA functions remain separate and removed (not involved) from any policy development that occurs related to the performance of the IANA functions, however could provide advice in the policy development when the interested part it required.*

Q3. *Does the language in "Provisions C.2.2.1.2, C.2.2.1.3, C.2.2.1.4, and C.2.2.1.5" adequately address concerns that the IANA functions contractor should perform these services in a manner that best serves the relevant stakeholders? If not, please propose detailed alternative language.*

A3. Yes, the provisions expressed adequately our concerns.

Q4. *Does the language in "Provision C.2.2.1.3" adequately address concerns related to root zone management? If not, please suggest detailed alternative language. Are the timeframes for implementation reasonable?*

A4. Yes, the provisions expressed adequately our concerns and also we consider that the timeframes for implementation is reasonable.

Q5. *Does the new "Provision C.2.2.1.3.2 Responsibility and Respect for Stakeholders" adequately address concerns related to the root zone management process in particular how the IANA functions contractor should document its decision making with respect to relevant national laws of the jurisdiction which the TLD registry serves, how the TLD reflects community consensus among relevant stakeholders and/or is supported by the global public interest. If not, please provide detailed suggestions for capturing concerns. Are the timeframes for implementation reasonable?*

A5. The Provision C.2.2.1.3.2 attend the major concerns, however we believe necessary to clarify that not all delegation requests for new generic TLDS require consensus support or supported by the global public interest, also we consider important to refer the GAC participation in the public interest aspects. Then we suggest the follow wording:

C.2.2.1.3.2 *Responsibility and Respect for Stakeholders—The Contractor shall, in collaboration with all relevant stakeholders for this function, develop a process for documenting the source of the policies and procedures and how it has applied the relevant policies and procedures, such as RFC 1591, to process requests associated with TLDs. In addition, the Contractor shall act in accordance with the relevant national laws of the jurisdiction which the TLD registry serves. For delegation requests for new generic TLDS (gTLDS), when the relevant stakeholders considered that's convenient, the Contractor shall include documentation to demonstrate how the proposed string has received consensus support from relevant stakeholders. In cases where this requirement could affected the ~~and is supported by the global public interest, the process require the GAC advice.~~*

Q6. *Does the new "Section C.3 Security Requirements" adequately address concerns that the IANA functions contractor has a secure communications system for communicating with service recipients? If not, how can the language be improved? Is the timeframe for implementation reasonable?*

A6. Yes, the provisions expressed adequately our concerns and also we consider that the timeframes for implementation is reasonable.

*Q7. Does the new "Provision C.2.2.1.3.5 Customer Service Complaint Resolution Process" provide an adequate means of addressing customer complaints? Does the new language provide adequate guidance to the IANA functions contractor on how to develop a customer complaint resolution? If not, please provide detailed comments and suggestions for improving the language.*

A7. Yes, we believe the new language provide adequate guidance to the IANA functions contractor, nevertheless, we consider necessary to establish some timeframe for implementation.

*Q8. Does the new "Provision C.3.6 Contingency and Continuity of Operations Plan (CCOP)" adequately address concerns regarding contingency planning and emergency recovery? If not, please provide detailed comments and suggestions for improving the language. Are the timeframes for implementation reasonable?*

A8. Yes, the provisions expressed adequately our concerns and also we consider that the timeframes for implementation is reasonable.

*9. Does the new "Section C.4 Performance Standards Metric Requirements" adequately address concerns regarding transparency in root zone management process, and performance standards and metrics? Should the contractor be required to gather and report on statistics regarding global IPv6 and DNSSEC deployment? If so, how should this requirement be reflected in the SOW? What statistics should be gathered and made public?*

A9. Yes, "Section C.4 Performance Standards Metric Requirements" adequately addresses concerns regarding transparency in root zone management process, and performance standards and metrics.

*10. Does the new "Section C.5 Audit Requirements" adequately address concerns regarding audits? If not, please propose alternative language. Are the timeframes for implementation reasonable?*

A10. Yes, the provisions expressed adequately our concerns and also we consider that the timeframes for implementation is reasonable.