ICANN69 | Virtual Annual General – IANA Function Review Team (IFRT) Public Meeting
Thursday, October 22, 2020 – 09:00 to 10:00 CEST

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Thank you and welcome to the ICANN 69 engagement session with the IANA naming function review team. My name is Kim Carlson. I will be your remote participation manager for this session.

As a reminder to all, this call is being recorded and recordings will be posted on the ICANN 69 website shortly after the call. If at any point you have a question or comment, please use the Q&A pod found at the bottom of the Zoom window. We will not be monitoring the chat for questions. Additionally, you can verbally ask a question using the raised hand icon found at the bottom of the screen. You will then be automatically put into the speaker queue. Once called on, our techs will engage your microphone at which time you will be able to unmute your line.

When using the chat, please use the dropdown menu in the chat pod and select "respond to all panelists and attendees." This will allow everyone to view your comment. Please note that private chats are only possible among panelists in the Zoom webinar format. Any messages sent by a panelist or a standard attendee to another standard attendee will be seen by the session host, cohost and other panelists.

Finally, this session, like all other ICANN activities, is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. And with that, I would like to hand the floor over to Tomslin Samme-Nlar, co-chair of the IFRT.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:	Thank you, Kim. Welcome, everyone, to our engagement session at ICANN 69. We have just published our initial report and we thought it would be good to engage the community about this and explain a little bit how we did this work and what we did there. Next slide, please.

So for today, the agenda will be we'll look at the background of the IFRT and we'll look at how the team executed its work, then we'll go through the recommendations that the team has put forward. We'll look at the next steps for the team, and then if necessary, look at the appendix. But before that, I think we'll have some time for questions. Next slide, please.

Like I mentioned, we have published the initial report. The links are on the slides that you see right now. The comment period opened on the 8th of October 2020, and will close on the 2nd of December. Next slide, please.

Let's look at the first agenda item, which will be the background of the IFR. This happens to be the first IANA naming function review as well. Next slide, please. This slide just shows the team members that made up the IFRT, and the liaisons from the CSC, PTI, ICANN Org and ICANN board, and these were very important for our work, actually, because it wouldn't have been smooth without the liaisons being present with us doing the work.

So we had two co-chairs. I cochaired this team with Frederico Neves who is the ccNSO appointed co-chair, and I am the GNSO appointed co-chair. Next slide, please.

So still on the background, the IFR, as some will know, is one of the new accountability mechanisms created as part of the IANA stewardship transition to ensure that ICANN, via its affiliate, the public technical identifiers—PTI—meets the needs and expectations of its naming customers.

The ICANN board convened this IFRT on the 16th of September 2018. And we had a slow start. It took a while to get all the members as required by the bylaw together, so the completion of the team was only announced a year later, 16th of September 2018. We started our work December the same year. Next slide, please.

This slide just gives an overview of the process of the IFR. We're currently at the conduct review stage where we've done the actual research and submitted our recommendations after initial public comment. And we are now seeking input from the community on this report. Next slide, please.

I think this slide looks at the review background itself rather than the IFR. So the review was to be conducted—and we did conduct it—in accordance with the scope specified in Article 18 of the ICANN bylaws. and this centers around a review and evaluation of PTI's performance of the IANA naming function against the contractual requirements in the IANA naming function contract and statement of work. Next slide, please.

So we'll now look at how the team executed this work. Next slide, please. To do its work, the review team came up with a methodology, and in this methodology, it developed three documents. The first was the rules of engagement which provided the team with operating rules to set expectations on how to proceed with the work, and as well, it defined the rules and responsibilities of ICANN Org, the review team members, and the review team leadership. Next slide, please.

The second document was the scope of work and this was really a key one. It followed the ICANN bylaws, defining points such as the objective behind each scope requirement and how the team would execute it, what input should be sought and considered by the team, where the review had dependencies and where the review should ensure there was no overlap with the work the team was doing. It also had the expected deliverables and the methodology for drafting recommendations. Next slide, please.

The final document that the team developed was the workplan as part of the methodology, and this created a practical and actionable path for the team. We used this to guide us in terms of the work we're doing and to ensure we weren't falling too far back. It's good to announce today that we are in fact going to deliver the work as we had documented in the work plan. Next slide, please.

Like I said, the team is on target to complete the work by the original due date that we set, and that's something we're very happy about. Understandably, we had challenges with COVID and stuff, but we did

put in the effort to get to the end like we had promised ourselves. Next slide, please.

In terms of methodology for the actual execution, the team took a two-pronged approach to ensure that every aspect of the IANA naming services performance was reviewed. We followed the requirements as set out in the ICANN bylaw which cover the scope, the inputs to be reviewed, the requirement for determining recommendations, and the second approach was to examine in detail every section of the IANA naming function contract and statement of work. That provided expectations for IANA naming function services and the requirement for oversight of said services. Next slide, please.

The first approach that we ensure all research resources were utilized according to each bylaw requirement. So we listed the bylaws and looked at all the possible resources. This included documents, interviews and meetings with the relevant organizations or groups. Next slide, please.

With regards to the second approach in the methodology, we performed a thorough contract review of the IANA naming function contract and statement of work. Next slide, please. This shows a bit what we did when we broke down the contract into sections and reviewed them in detail, and we listed our findings. Next slide, please.

And this is how the two-pronged approach came together. Like you'll see in the slide, the contract sections that were listed, the reference materials that were used for research and studying and to analyze those reference materials with reference to the section there, our

findings and how this relates to the bylaws scope of the ICANN bylaw sections. This ensured that we use the bylaw requirements to ensure the full scope of the IFR was met and all inputs were examined. Next slide, please.

So I'll walk through the recommendations that came out of this now. Next slide, please. We have four recommendations. Some of the recommendations are already being looked at by PTI and ICANN. I think it was helpful that we had liaisons present and representatives from these organizations.

The first recommendation, the IFRT recommends that PTI publishes the IANA naming function transition plan required by the IANA naming function contract in Article IX Section 9.3(a), (b) and (c). While we were doing this work, ICANN began responding to this recommendation as well, and that's why you see a status for this recommendation. So ICANN is in the process already of working with PTI to publish the IANA services transition plan to be in compliance with that section of the IANA naming function contract. Next slide, please.

Recommendation 2 recommends that the annual attestation of the PTI president, which has been complied with according to the requirements of Section 6.1 of the IANA naming function be posted on IANA.org annually. We're happy to see that ICANN has already published this attestation of compliance and transparency now on the link that you see on the slide. Next slide, please.

Recommendation 3, the IFRT in conjunction with the CSC has identified a duplication in the ICANN bylaws. The remedial action

procedures—also called RAP—as generated by the CSC and PTI are referred to as components in the initiation of the special IFR as outlined in Section 18.12 of the ICANN bylaws. However, the CSC and IFRT have identified that Section 18.12 (ii) is redundant as the RAP and the IANA problem resolution process were combined into a single set of procedures already. Next slide, please.

This is the section that recommendation refers to. So Section 18.12 (i) and (ii) were combined by the CSC, and right now that meant that those were redundant procedures. Next slide, please.

Recommendation 4, this relates to Article 7 Section 7.1 on the IANA naming function contract. The IFRT recommends that the statement, "The relevant policies under which the changes are made shall be noted within each monthly report" be removed from the contract as it is a legacy statement from the NTIA contract that is no longer required. And in our research and discussions with and interviews with PTI, we found that this requirement has long been recognized that implementation is impractical, and this is because there are really only high-level documents like the RFC 1591 and the GAC principles that govern PTI's work. And therefore, there is no specific policy that changing something like the telephone number of a technical contact in the zone file can be pointed to a specific policy. Next slide, please.

These are the reports that this refers to. I think the next slide has a more detailed view of the report. Next slide, please. That's exactly how the reports look like today. So like I mentioned earlier, it's a carryover

from the NTIA contract and it's currently impractical to implement. Next slide, please.

That's it about the four recommendations. We have the report out now and we will definitely be glad for you to share your input with the team so that we can consider them through the public comment period. And the links on the slide also have the link to our Wiki where we have all the meeting records and all the documents and decisions that were made during our work. Next slide, please.

Next steps for the team. Next slide, please. Like you can see, we published the initial report in October and the public comment period is open now until the 2nd of December, so we will be reviewing these comments and analyzing them. We hope to publish our final report sometime in February, but before that, we also hope to submit our final report after reviewing and analyzing the comments to the board in January. Next slide, please.

These are some facts about the team's work. The section on the top right shows our participation rate from the team members, and that currently sits at 77%. Up to this point, we had 39 meetings. We have them fortnightly. The volunteers have put in a total of 391 hours, and staff, whom we couldn't do this without and we really appreciate the effort, especially Amy and Kim, they've put 192 hours into this work.

In terms of the status of the review, we're sitting at 64% completion as of today. The budget that was assigned for this team, we haven't used any because as part of its work, the team had to decide whether a [site visit] will be necessary, and the team looked at this and didn't think

there was any substantial information that will be added to the team's review, and so we didn't make that visit to the site. So you see the budget there still sitting at 0%. Next slide, please.

In terms of milestones, I think as you can see, the planning, the research and studies and draft report are 100% completed. We're now sitting at—we have a time between the draft report and the final report, which is where we are at now and having engagement session and taking public comments for this. So the final report milestone is sitting at 0%. That's what we're hoping to start working on in December once we get your comments in. And this fact sheet is also on our Wiki if you'd like to take a look. Next slide, please.

And I think that covers the background and the work that I intended to cover today. I think we open it now to take questions.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Tomslin, we have one hand raised from Harel Efraim. I'll go ahead and engage his microphone so he can ask it verbally.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Kim.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: You may unmute your microphone now. Harel, did you want to ask your question? You have your hand raised. Tomslin, I see no other questions in the Q&A pod or any other hands raised.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right. Well—

JAMES GANNON: I think Danko is putting his hand up.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Sorry to interrupt. Yes, I did. Actually, it's not a question. Well, as the board liaison to the team, I just wanted to comment on this important milestone because I'm so grateful that we came to this point. Initial delays for the work of the IANA naming function review team was due to a bit of bylaws complications for the composition of the team. Once we overcame that, the team was very efficient.

And of course, IANA is the keystone for the whole Internet and everything we are doing, and this is the first review. It is very well and precisely defined by the bylaws, but I believe that work of this team creates a very good baseline also for the future reviews, and very importantly, shows the good work of IANA. Recommendations are based on issues identified, but I don't see anything critical that shows that we have a problem.

So I just wanted to thank the team, thank Kim and IANA team and also the support staff. Now, community has 40 days to comment on this report, and I believe this is very important because in that way, it verifies the work and the IANA services that we provide. So just, once again, thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Danko, and thank you, especially, for all your input to the team and the collaboration that we had with you. Thank you.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: We have one other question from Lise. I'll go ahead and allow her mic. You can speak now, Lise.

LISE FUHR: Hi. Thank you. Thank you for a very comprehensive and nice walkthrough of the review and how you did it. I'm the chair of PTI, and of course, we're very interested in the outcome of this review and also how it was conducted.

However, I was a bit surprised that there was no outreach done to the PTI board as such. So I'm just a little curious on what were your thoughts about who you needed to do outreach and include in the review as such during the process.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Lise. I will answer this, I'll give it a go, then if I think there's any other member of the team that would like to add to this. But many times during the review, we had questions for PTI and because Kim Davies was on the review and also a member of the board, we thought he did answer all the questions we had and thought we wanted to know at the time. So we didn't get any specific question that we

wanted to ask the board as a whole. But I will let other members chime in as well, if anyone wants to add something.

Doesn't look like anyone wants to add anything. But that was our thinking, Lise. We didn't come up with any specific questions for the board, so we didn't request for a meeting for the board. But we do understand that the board has requested for a meeting with us to understand how we did this work, and we hope that when we meet the PTI board, we'll be able to explain in detail how we went about executing this work and any other questions that the board will have or has.

LISE FUHR: Thank you very much. And thank you for also doing the outreach and taking the meeting without … For me as the PTI board, it's just important that we are included in all of this because it's our responsibility that we comply with the agreement. So that was the only reason. But it's a very nice piece of work, and congratulations on meeting the deadline and timeline. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Lise. Is there any other question, Kim?

KIMBERLY CARLSON: I see no questions in chat, the Q&A pod, or any hands raised.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right then, if there are no other questions or hands, then I thank everyone for coming, and I do hope you respond or send any comments to us in relation to the initial report. We look forward to your comments. Thank you.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Thank you all. Please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]