

8 February 2021

RE: IFRT's Recommendation Requiring an IANA Naming Functions Contract Amendment

Katrina Sasaki, Chair, Country-Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) Council

Philippe Fouquart, Chair, Generic Name Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council

Dear Chairs,

We write in our roles as the Co-Chairs of the IANA Naming Function Review Team (IFRT). The IFRT has approved their [Final Report](#) containing four (4) Recommendations. The fourth Recommendation would require an amendment to the IANA Naming Function Contract. We are coming to the GNSO Council and the ccNSO Council to seek approval on this recommendation, per the ICANN [Bylaws](#) Section 18.6 (b)(i):

*“(b) A recommendation of an IFRT for a Periodic IFR that would amend the IANA Naming Function Contract or IANA Naming Function SOW shall only become effective if, with respect to each such recommendation (each, an “**IFR Recommendation**”), each of the following occurs:*

- (i) The IFR Recommendation has been approved by the vote of (A) a supermajority of the ccNSO Council (pursuant to the ccNSO's procedures or, if such procedures do not define a supermajority, two-thirds (2/3) of the ccNSO Council's members) and (B) a GNSO Supermajority*

The IFRT has already completed a series of consultations on this amendment, as required by ICANN [Bylaws](#), Article 18, Section 18.5.d.(a):

“The IFRT may recommend, among other things to the extent reasonably related to the IFR responsibilities set forth in [Section 18.3](#), amendments to the IANA Naming Function Contract, IANA Naming Function SOW and/or the CSC Charter. The IFRT shall, at a minimum, take the following steps before an amendment to either the IANA Naming Function Contract, IANA Naming Function SOW or CSC Charter is proposed:

- (i) Consult with the Board (such consultation to be conducted in parallel with other processes set forth in this Section 18.6(a)) and PTI;*
- (ii) Consult with the CSC;*
- (iii) Conduct a public input session for ccTLD and gTLD registry operators; and*

(iv) Seek public comment on the amendments that are under consideration by the IFRT through a public comment period that complies with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN.”

The IFRT consulted with the CSC, the [ICANN Board](#) and performed a [community webinar](#) prior to the [Initial Draft's Public Comment](#). [The CSC](#) and [the Board](#) responded that there were no concerns, while no issues were brought up during the community webinar or the Public Comment. Comments received can be reviewed in the [Staff Comment Report](#) as well as Appendix D in the [Final Report](#). A public comment forum has also been opened on Recommendation 4, closing on XX March. [add Public Comment URLs]

The IFRT requests the GNSO Council and ccNSO Council to each initiate a vote for approval of Recommendation 4:

Recommendation 4:

The [IANA Naming Function Contract](#) *currently states at Article VII, Section 7.1 (a): Audits:*

“Contractor shall generate and publish via the IANA Website a [monthly audit report](#) identifying each root zone file and root zone “WHOIS” database change request and its status. The relevant policies under which the changes are made shall be noted within each monthly report. Such audit report shall be due to ICANN no later than 15 calendar days following the end of each month.”

The IFRT recommends that this statement, "The relevant policies under which the changes are made shall be noted within each monthly report" be removed from the contract.

This section refers to the [Root Operations Audit Reports](#) (<https://www.iana.org/performance/root-audit>) which is published monthly by PTI. This statement, carried over from the contract between ICANN and NTIA, is no longer required; further, implementation of this requirement has long been recognised as being operationally impracticable, as a single change request cannot be traced back to a single relevant policy. The IFRT is satisfied that there is no value to this statement remaining in the IANA Naming Function Contract, as the referenced line adds no value to the reports.

If either Council has any items related to this proposed change that it would like to discuss with the IFRT, we would welcome consultation in writing or through a call. In addition, if any members are interested in reviewing the recording of our community webinar on this subject, the link can be found on the homepage of the IFRT's wiki at: <https://community.icann.org/display/ifr> or the IFRT can prepare a live presentation for your meeting.

Sincerely,

Fred Neves and Tomslin Samme-Nlar
IANA Naming Function Review, Co-Chair