The IANA Functions Contract and NTIA's "Further Notice of Inquiry"

ccNSO Response

IANA Functions Contract

- Separate contract between DOC and ICANN to perform specific IANA functions
- First executed in 1999 to facilitate transfer of IANA data from USC/ISI to ICANN
- US procurement law requires periodic review of "sole source" designation, limits evergreen contracts

Notice of Inquiry

- Asked "big picture" questions -
 - Should functions be kept together?
 - What should be prioritized?
- ccNSO submitted comments (29 March)
 - Support for keeping functions bundled
 - Support for metrics
 - Support for increased automation
 - Support for considering change in nature of agreement between ICANN and IANA

Further Notice of Inquiry

- Synthesizes comments received and sets out USG response
- Requests comments on a draft statement of work (SOW)
- Comments due 29 July 2011
- www.ntia.doc.gov

ccNSO Response

- Recommend submission of ccNSO comments reflecting consensus of membership
- All members encouraged to submit individual comments
- Drafting team: Keith Davidson (.nz), Kathryn Reynolds (.ca), Paul Sczyndler (.au), Martin Boyle (.uk), Becky Burr
- Circulate draft to membership by 12 July, responses due 19 July

Key Themes - 1

- Highlight IANA-related work, including IDN Fast Track, Delegation/Redelegation WG, Framework of Interpretation WG, Country Names SG
- Support metrics, including metrics to ensure that new gTLD implementation does not affect service levels for existing TLDs
- Support further automation

Key Themes - 2

- Request modifications to ensure that specific tasks do not pre-empt current work (FOI)
- Request clarification regarding NTIA "approval"
- Significant concern regarding role of local law

Applicable Law

- "Act in accordance with the relevant national laws of the jurisdiction which the TLD registry serves."
- Resolve disputes between cc operator and government in country? Yes.
- Ask ICANN to interpret and apply local law? *Problematic*.