

This document

1. This document shares the findings of the IANA Public Records Study Group's discovery work to date, conducted under its [Charter](#). You can find background about the Study Group including its membership on the [ccNSO website](#).
2. The sections of this document record the Study Group's discovery of facts. The document avoids normative descriptions - it does not set out "what should be" - following ICANN 86 in June 2026, the Study Group will publish a document setting out its recommendations.
3. We intend this document to give readers insight into what the Study Group has discovered shaping the information base on which the Study Group will build its recommendations. We're seeking community feedback on this information to add further insights or/and to challenge our findings to date.
4. To help prompt feedback, we have included some "Community Prompts" in this document, but input is welcome on any aspect.

What are the IANA Public Records?

5. For the purposes of the Study Group's work, the "IANA public records" (hereafter referred to as "the records") are the data about country code top level domains shown on the [IANA](#) website. The "Root Zone Database" at <https://www.iana.org/domains/root/db> links to the records for each TLD. For example, the record for .uk (called a Delegation Record) is at <https://www.iana.org/domains/root/db/uk.html>
6. Each record includes the name and details for the ccTLD manager, and details and contact information for the administrative and technical contacts for that ccTLD. It also shows the authoritative name servers (host names and IPv4 & IPv6 addresses) for the ccTLD's name servers.
7. The Study Group has not considered other public information in the course of its work (e.g. delegation reports for a ccTLD, or letters exchanged between ccTLDs and ICANN).
8. The Study Group has not considered private records related to ccTLDs (e.g. the array of operational role contacts IANA maintains for ccTLDs), except insofar as these relate to or interact with the public records in a meaningful way. The Study Group was informed and is aware that over time contacts were added with operational roles, which are not made public (for example: specific named contacts having authority to make changes to the record).

Accuracy of the Public Records

9. Defining accuracy depends upon the purpose of the data. Purpose of the data appears to have changed over time and an operational change made a substantive positive change to utilising private contact data for the purposes of authorisation.
10. Working definition of the SG: "Accuracy" for the purposes of the Study Group's work means that the data is able to be used for its expected purpose.
11. For example, a telephone number is accurate if:
 - a. it has the appropriate numbers and symbols to allow it to be dialled, and
 - b. it connects to a service at the ccTLD manager for whose record it forms part.
12. The Study Group has become aware of various forms of inaccuracy, including:
 - a. A ccTLD updates its address details but makes an error;
 - b. A ccTLD mis-spells the email address of the technical contact;
 - c. There is a failure to reflect a change in technical operator in the public record.
 - d. A record's details are not up to date, but the relevant stakeholders are happy for it not to be up to date.
13. The Study Group will continue to explore various forms of inaccuracy in its work.
14. In terms of available information about the level of accuracy, IANA shared the following insights with the Study Group:
 - a. A recent email campaign to around 1000 ccTLD contacts by email resulted in approximately 150 bounces (implying a 15% inaccuracy rate).
 - b. Somewhere between 10 and 20 ccTLDs may have substantive inaccuracies in the data (10-20 out of 300+ ccTLDs (ASCII and IDNs), between 3 and 7 % of total pool).
15. There is no overarching process in place to assure the accuracy of the records.

Community Prompt 1:

Do you have any insights about the level of accuracy of the IANA public records?

Findings on the purpose of the Public Records

16. From an IANA perspective defining accuracy depends upon the purpose of the data. Purpose of the data appears to have changed over time and as noted above, an operational change made a substantive positive change to utilising private contact

data for the purposes of authorisation.

17. From IANA's perspective the **primary contemporary purpose** of the public records are to identify which ccTLDs are delegated, for what purpose, and to which legal entity responsibility has been delegated.
18. IANA's perspective is that the public records also serve additional purposes, such as providing public points of contact for management of the ccTLD, and technical information regarding how the domain is delegated in the domain name system.
19. The purposes of public points of contact seems to have changed over time.
 - a. For both the administrative and technical contacts that are published, they no longer necessarily encompass the role of authorizing change requests to the ccTLD with IANA. IANA has stated that ccTLD managers now privately administer who has such authorization in their systems and that information is not published.
 - b. Therefore, IANA has stated that both the administrative and technical contacts serve a public information purpose, set at the discretion of the ccTLD manager.
20. IANA noted the ongoing policy requirement from RFC 1591 that the administrative contact must be located within the country or territory, and that this contributes to demonstrating that a ccTLD is based in the relevant jurisdiction.
21. The administrative or technical contacts above are not required by IANA to be natural persons - they can be people or roles. It is noted that the Root Zone Management system (RZM) enforces them being people or roles. In RZM the "Person's full name and/or Title" is a mandated field. The entity is a second field "organization name" which seems to not be mandatory.
22. These purposes are achieved by the record including:
 - a. The name of the entity that manages the ccTLD and its physical contact details (allowing documents to be sent and contact to be made).
 - b. Nominated administrative and technical contacts, which are stated along with email and phone contact details, allowing the public to communicate with the ccTLD about technical or administrative matters.
23. The physical location shown of the ccTLD manager and the administrative contact helps validate the policy requirement that the ccTLD manager be present in the country or territory the ccTLD is associated with.
24. The publication of the name server information allows people to know with certainty what the IANA registry expects the nameservers to be as opposed to the current DNS. People can rely on those details to connect to the ccTLD's DNS.

25. The effect of this information is to give the public the opportunity to contact the ccTLD and to hold it to account in the case of any problems with its management of the domain.
26. In terms of policy requirements, there are no explicit policy statements regarding accuracy per se. However, in the the [Framework of Interpretation](#), the authoritative interpretation of RFC1591, it is noted:

From RFC 1591 as Interpreted by the Fol:

RFC1591 (section 3-1): The key requirement is that for each domain there be a designated manager for supervising that domain's name space. In the case of top-level domains that are country codes this means that there is a manager that supervises the domain names and operates the domain name system in that country.

Fol: Section 7 - The FOIWG interprets the requirement that there be an administrative and technical contact for each domain including, for ccTLDs, an administrative contact residing in the country (section 3.1 of RFC1591) to mean, as a general rule, that the manager must confirm, and the IANA Operator must be able to validate, that the administrative contact resides in the country or territory associated with the ccTLD.

27. A **past purpose** of the administrative and technical contacts was as known authorities for changes to the ccTLD's details. In recent times a change in IANA operational practices has allowed ccTLDs to define other authorised contacts in a non-published way, which is why we describe it as a past purpose.

Community Prompt 2:

What do you use the information in the IANA public records for? Are there any uses that imply a purpose the Study Group has not yet identified?

For your ccTLD's IANA public record, when you choose the details for a technical or administrative contact, what do you expect people to use those contacts for?

Enforcement or graduated compliance options

28. In a situation where data is identified as being inaccurate, there are currently no practical enforcement or graduated compliance options for resolving such a situation.
29. In practice, informal and private approaches to ask for updates and corrections are made by IANA, particularly at moments where parties request a change to the record.

30. As part of its work, the Study Group has begun to look at a range of possible approaches to these matters. It will in future consider whether suggesting some potential approaches (informal or formal) could help increase the overall accuracy of the information across the ccTLD community.

Community Prompt 3:

Are you aware of any methods used (by IANA or any other party) to respond to identified inaccuracies in the IANA Public Records?

Feedback welcome

31. Any community feedback is welcome - please contact the Study Group by emailing the ccNSO Secretariat on ccnsossecretariat@icann.org.
32. We would be grateful for your feedback by **Friday 17 July 2026**.