

Fiona Alexander  
Associate Administrator, Office of International Affairs  
National Telecommunications and Information Administration  
U.S. Department of Commerce  
1401 Constitution Avenue, NW, Room 4701  
WASHINGTON DC 20230  
USA

The following is written from a foreign, but not necessarily hostile, perspective. While easy to dismiss, consider that in the long run it will not pay to ignore 96% of the world's population and, if not already then soon, co-operators on the internet.

Given the international nature of the internet it is simply not acceptable that any single government holds all the keys. ICANN, verisign, both in cahoots, or other large NGOs like the ITU are similarly not suitable. I'm not even referring to your own criteria. No single one can claim the necessary world wide trust, and each creates a single point of not merely failure, but contention and target for strife.

It is therefore imperative that the Government of the United States of America ceases demanding it or its controlled proxy be allowed full control over the root zone, and moves to a fully distributed ownership. Otherwise a rift is likely. Think about this for a moment.

Do you really want a byzantine situation where various entities maintain separate copies of root zones that each import possibly identical, partially different, completely different, or even conflicting root zones from various other parties, each party maintaining they have no problem because their version of the root zone works fine for them?

Due to the distributed nature of the DNS it is also unnecessary. In fact, without political unity no single large entity will accept any of the others retain more control; the EU already have a separate set of root zone servers ready, and China will likely have its own even if it hasn't published the fact. India is likely to follow suit, as are Russia and the league of Arabic nations. I'm sorry to have to break the news to you, but you aren't the only players in town any more, and when you've lost enough influence somebody else will become the de facto owner.

Unless, of course, you prepare. Make sure no single entity can have veto. The price is that you preemptively lose your inherited veto, but the gain is twofold: 1) nobody else can regain it again, and 2) you actually will gain some respect for doing the right thing in an increasingly american-hostile on-line world. How you capitalize on this is up to you, but the USoA truly has the initiative here. The downside is that you can either use it, and use it well, or lose it.

One approach is expounded in [nojur]. I can think of at least one more. Also consider moving .gov, .mil, and .edu under .us for strategic reasons.

Of course, now that a foreigner pointed out the bleeding obvious, gov.us will never agree there might possibly be a point in it on NIH grounds. Then we'll just have to wait for the Bastille to come down. I'd rather not, but we were given no vote.

[nojur] <http://www.templetons.com/brad/dns/nojur.html>

Disclosure: The author is in no way related to the author of the referred material, and furthermore has no relation whatsoever to any other internet related entity that might be an actor in this.