

Second IANA Naming Function Review (IFR2) Meeting 6

21 February 2024 | 01:00 UTC – 02:00 UTC

Meeting wiki:

<https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=286818568>

Review Team Members and Liaisons: Alan Barrett, Ashley Heineman, Carlton Samuels, Lars-Johan Liman, Rafik Dammak, Rick Wilhelm, Apologies: Brett Carr, Peter Koch	Observers: N/A ICANN Org: Brenda Brewer, Elizabeth Garber (Technical Writer), Jennifer Bryce, Marilia Hirano, Reda Josifi, Sam Eisner, Steve Conte
--	--

These high-level notes are designed to help people to navigate through the content of the call. They are not meant to be a substitute for the meeting recording, which can be accessed directly via this [link](#), or on the wiki page linked above.

Agenda Item #1: Welcome, Roll Call, SOI Updates

- This meeting did not have a large turnout from the review team.
- No SOI updates were offered.

Agenda Item #2: Action Items (all action items tracked in the Google sheet linked [here](#) [docs.google.com])

Reference	Date	Action item	Status
02-05	5 Dec 2023	ICANN team to start working with Co-Chairs on getting the briefings lined up. They will start with a briefing at the next meeting.	Contract walkthrough from ICANN Legal – 20 February @ 01:00 UTC CSC - ICANN79 (Wednesday 6 March @ 13:15 AST (UTC – 4)
02-08	5 Dec 2023	For the ICANN team to go back and see if there was a blog published to announce the first IFR and if so, republish a similar blog for IFR2.	IFR2 blog will be published in advance of ICANN 79. Draft will be shared with the review team ahead of publication.

Agenda Item#3: IFR2 Contract Walkthrough– Sam Eisner, ICANN Legal

- Sam used the below documents for her presentation.
 - [Naming Function Contract](#)
 - [CWG Stewardship Carry Over Clauses](#)
 - [CWG Stewardship-Contract Term Proposals](#)

- The review team’s questions are summarized below.

Question:	Summary of Answer:
<p>Lars-Johan Liman asked about the relationship between ICANN and PTI.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PTI is an affiliate of ICANN, with ICANN being the parent company of PTI. It is legally considered a supporting organization to ICANN. • PTI’s purpose is to support ICANN in delivering its mission. PTI was formed for the purpose of fulfilling a portion of ICANN’s mission. • ICANN has the obligation to maintain PTI in certain ways (i.e. funding, resources to do its work). • They are closely related but separate entities. • They have separate signatories, corporate forms if the community decided that ICANN was no longer an appropriate place to serve as the operator of the IANA functions.
<p>Lars-Johan Liman asked about the organization’s escalation process.</p>	<p>Marilia Hirano: If a request comes in, there are several checks that the team performs before a transfer is completed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IANA has authorizers (technical and administrative) in place that may/may not be authorized to approve the requested transfer. • Due diligence in place that undergoes whole process before decisions is made, which is based on policy. <p>Sam Eisner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any customer can have a customer service complaint to trigger the

	<p>process. If PTI not performing well, it could serve as the basis for an escalation of the problem separate from the individual issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process: After IANA team goes through the work of analyzing the ccTLD transfer request, they go to the ICANN board to see if PTI has followed its process. After ICANN board confirms, then transfer can get carried out. • gtLDs have different processes as they are handled by PTI, not the ICANN board.
<p>Ashley Heineman asked about the mechanism by which PTI staff can propose amendments to the contract if they see areas that need improvement.</p>	<p>Sam Eisner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depends on the item needs to be changed. • Service-related issue (i.e. SLA that can't be achieved, required to go through the CSC). • If issue is around relationship between ICANN and PTI, the contract can get amended by mutual agreement of both parties. ICANN would have to initiate a public comment over the proposed amendment.

Agenda Item #4: Next Meeting

- Meeting 7 – ICANN79 (Wednesday 6 March @ 13:15 – 14:30 AST (UTC-4)) – in advance of this briefing, team should think about questions to ask the CSC.

Agenda Items #5: AOB, close

- No AOB was discussed.