

Second IANA Naming Function Review Team (IFR2) Initial Report

ccNSO Council Comment

Introduction

The ccNSO Council welcomes this opportunity to provide input on your Initial Report. To avoid any misunderstandings, this comment is a ccNSO Council comment, and the views expressed in this comment should not be interpreted as views from the ccNSO members, nor from individual ccTLD managers.

The ccNSO Council also welcomes the structure of the recommendations, specifically inclusion of the expected due date and priority per recommendation.

General Comments

The ccNSO Council is very pleased to note that the IFR2 team has found that PTI operates in a reliable and efficient manner, serves the needs of the IANA Naming Function customers - which includes the ccTLDs - and has found no performance deficiencies nor major opportunities for operational improvements.

The ccNSO Council appreciates all the findings in the report and fully supports all recommendations as included in the Report. However, with respect to recommendation 2.3 and the findings in 2.4.4, the ccNSO Council requests the IFRT to take the ccNSO's specific observation into consideration, in preparing the Final Report.

Specific Observations

- **Specific Observation 1 regarding IFRT2 Finding 3 Frequency of Reviews**

The ccNSO Council fully supports the IFRT recommendation to amend the frequency of reviews as proposed. The Council also notes that, together with the GNSO Council, it endorsed a similar recommendation made by the second CSC Review Team—which, notably, is still pending implementation. To prevent overlapping reviews, the ccNSO Council suggests that in implementing both the IFRT and CSC RT recommendation, it is ensured that the starting dates of the 3rd IFR and CSC are 2.5 years apart. In the view of the ccNSO Council, the IFR and CSC review are partly overlapping in content (for example with respect to SLAs and SLA reporting), and also, likely, with respect to membership of the teams.

- **Specific Observation 2 regarding Incidental Finding 4: Ombuds**

The ccNSO Council appreciates the findings with respect to Article 8 of the IANA Naming Function Contract. Accordingly, and as part of the section 8.1 complaint process, a complainant may escalate a complaint to the ICANN's Ombudsman. This

becomes a requirement if a complainant seeks the mediation as provided under the contract.

The ccNSO Council notes that the Ombuds is always available to resolve problems (see for example the IANA Complaint Resolution Process <https://www.iana.org/help/complaint-procedure>), independent and not linked to the complaint process as provided under section 8.1 of the Contract.

Assuming the ccNSO proposed Review Mechanism for specific decisions will be adopted and implemented, the already complicated pathways to resolve complaints for direct customers of the IANA Naming Function, which includes all ccTLDs, will become even more entangled and less obvious.

Although the ccNSO Council appreciates that the IFRT is in no position to resolve these issues, the Council suggests that the IFRT change its recommendation to include a call for ICANN org, direct customers, and other stakeholders to review the full range of complaint procedures, to streamline them and reduce the complexity. The ccNSO Council notes that the more recent discussions about scheduling reviews (and ATRT4 in particular) would suggest a special approach to this particular issue

The ccNSO Council is of the view that, with the introduction of the Review Mechanism adequate checks and balances to protect against capture are introduced, mitigating the need to make the Ombuds part of the Article 8 complaint procedure.

On behalf of the ccNSO Council

Alejandra Reynoso,
Chair