Staff Report of Public Comment Proceeding

IANA Naming Function Review (IFR) Initial Report

Publication Date:	21 December 2020
Prepared By:	Amy Creamer

Public Comment Proceeding	
Open Date:	08 October 2020
Close Date:	02 December 2020
Staff Report Due Date:	22 December 2020

Important Information Links

Announcement
Public Comment Proceeding
View Comments Submitted

Staff Contact:	Amy Creamer	**Email**	Amy.creamer@icann.org

Section I: General Overview and Next Steps

This Public Comment proceeding is on behalf of the IANA Naming Function Review Team (IFRT). The team conducted the review in accordance with the scope specified in Article 18 of the ICANN Bylaws, which centers around a review and evaluation of Public Technical Identifiers (PTI)'s performance of the IANA naming function against the contractual requirements in the IANA Naming Function Contract and the IANA Naming Function Statement of Work (SOW).

The Initial Report outlines key findings and draft Recommendations. The IFRT is seeking community input.

The IFRT will carefully consider comments received and amend the report as it deems appropriate and in the public interest before submitting its final report to the ICANN Board of Directors. The IFRT expects to submit its final report to the Board by or before January 2021. The final report will be published for Public Comments in advance of the Board's consideration.

Section II: Contributors

At the time this report was prepared, a total of six (6) community submissions had been posted to the forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.

Organizations and Groups:

Name	Submitted by	Initials
At-Large Advisory Committee	ICANN Policy Staff on Behalf of ALAC	ALAC
Internet Infrastructure Coalition	Christian Dawson, i2Coalition	i2Coalition
Business Constituency	Steve DelBianco, Vice Chair for Policy Coordination, ICANN Business Constituency (BC)	BC

Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group	Tomslin Samme-Nlar, NCSG Policy Chair	NCSG
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group	Elizabeth Bacon, RySG Vice Chair, Policy	RySG
Root Server System Advisory Committee	Andrew McConachie, ICANN Policy Support for the RSSAC	RSSAC

Individuals: N/A

Section III: Summary of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section intends to summarize broadly and comprehensively the comments submitted to this public comment proceeding but does not address every specific position stated by each contributor. The preparer recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).

There were six comments submitted, all of which unanimously supported the four (4) recommendations made within the IFRT's Initial Report. Many of the comments acknowledged the review revealed PTI's operating efficiency as well as the general importance of the first IANA Naming Function Review (IFR).

Section IV: Analysis of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section intends to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments submitted along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.

All of the submitted comments recommended that the Board approve the four recommendations made by the IFRT.

Several complimented the Review Team's work: "*The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) congratulates the IANA Naming Function Review Team for the methodology used in the elaboration of the review.*" And the majority expressed satisfaction that the review ran as expected and fulfilled its intent from the IANA Stewardship Transition: "*We note that the review progressed according to its schedule after the Review Team was established and we are encouraged to see the ICANN community fulfilling the commitments made during the IANA transition.*" (from the gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group [RySG]).

The Business Constituency (BC) showed some concern that Recommendations 1 and 2 were necessary. These Recommendations found gaps where the IANA Services provider had failed to publish materials on-line. The BC questioned if this gap was due to an "*oversight from scheduled staff activity list?*" as otherwise "*evaluation of the PTI's performance found that PTI is operating with a great deal of operational efficiency and is serving the needs of IANA customers.*"

The Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group (NCSG) commented on PTI's management of .int:

"The NCSG highlights, when the moment comes, the need of establishing spaces for policy discussion related to the .INT TLD (p. 15)." The IFRT held substantive discussions regarding .int's needs, and came to the same conclusion that is noted in the Initial Report, Section 5.3: " *The IFRT notes that if in the future changes are needed to evolve the policy management process for .INT, the IANA Function Contract may need to be updated; but no action is required at this point."*