

Assessment of gaps continued

Meeting 22 October 2024



Instructions



Revisit assessment on whether there is an issue from the ccNSO perspective

- Local presence
- Minimum level of involvement
- Active compliance monitoring

Theme - Local Presence



RFC 1591 stipulates that *"... at least the administrative contact must reside in the country involved."*

IANA interpretation: where is the ccTLD manager (as a legal entity) is domiciled, and where is primary operations are conducted

- 1. What is the purpose of the local presence requirement? Does the purpose of jurisdictional nexus need to be more clearly articulated?**
- 2. Is the local presence requirement sufficiently ensured by the policy language and IANA's operational implementation of it?**

In the case of dependent territories, IANA has a flexible requirement for local jurisdiction, in that it can be either territorial, or that of the parent country.

- 3. Is this a satisfactory definition of jurisdiction scope?**
- 4. If there is a conflict between law and/or significantly interested parties between the country and territory level jurisdiction, what should happen?**

To satisfy the requirement of local admin contact, cases where nominal points of contact listed in the IANA database are: persons who have little to no involvement in operations, or proxy local addresses where the contact is primarily resident out of the country.

- 5. For contact requirements, what is the minimum level of acceptable local presence and how should that be assessed?**

Does the lack of definition of required level of local presence illustrate an issue that the ccNSO needs to deal with at some stage?

0

Strongly agree

0

Agree

0

Neutral

0

Disagree

0

Strongly disagree



Minimum level of involvement



There is a wide variety of operational situations for ccTLD managers. Some ccTLD managers are responsible for every aspect of the ccTLD.

However, in many cases, there are a complex set of interrelated parties with different responsibilities.

IANA often has difficulties in reaching decision makers or identifying the true parties that are managing the domain



Lack of definition of what is the minimum level of expected involvement of a ccTLD manager (and for that matter, the administrative contact as a vehicle for local accountability). Without such a definition and associated enforcement, it is not possible to assess whether a ccTLD manager materially manages the domain themselves or not.

- 1. Does there need to be definitions for what the minimum obligations of a ccTLD manager to do directly?**

Consider nominal points of contact listed in the IANA database

- 2. What requirements should be assessed for points of contact?**

Is the lack of definition of minimum level of expected involvement in the operation of a ccTLD an issue that the ccNSO needs to address at some stage?



Active compliance monitoring



IANA does not have a program of ongoing monitoring that its records are up-to-date, or that ccTLD managers are otherwise continuing to meet the global policy requirements.

Only some less formal initiatives, such as periodical testing of email addresses and postal addresses



When IANA becomes aware of an issue through a third party report, it will seek to notify the ccTLD manager and ask them to cure the problem. It is however fundamentally only when a change request is received that a comprehensive assessment is made relating to meeting policy requirements.

- 1. Should IANA have a program of actively measuring compliance of the various requirements for ccTLDs?**

Does the lack of a program of actively measuring compliance of requirements for ccTLDs illustrate an issue that the ccNSO needs to deal with?

0%

Strongly agree

0%

Agree

0%

Neutral

0%

Disagree

0%

Strongly disagree



The final two themes

- Disaster Recovery
- Request Confidentiality

Format of assessment

- Introduction of topic
- Q&A on topic
- Assess importance of topic
- Why considered important
- Assess whether a GAP

Theme - Disaster Recovery



Generally, disaster recovery for a ccTLD is considered wholly the responsibility for the ccTLD manager and its local community to address.

If it is not addressed, the parties often look to IANA for mechanisms to address it, and IANA is expected to do what it reasonably can to address threats to the operation of a ccTLD.

What, if any, requirements should be established around disaster recovery and/or the ability to sustain ongoing operations of the domain in the case of disaster or non-compliance with global policies?

Another area of disaster recovery is where ccTLD managers have sought to make private arrangements with IANA on special procedures to perform in emergencies. Pre-define a set of conditions under which IANA would seek to recognize another party to manage the domain, through mutual agreement.

This is (partly) driven by the recognition that a formal transfer of a ccTLD may take months to perform, but a fast response would be expected to immediately restore ccTLD operations in an emergency where the ccTLD manager has failed.

Should there be any policies regarding how such arrangements are made?

Is IANA empowered to establish such arrangements?

Do you have any questions?



Do you believe it is important that IANA is empowered to get generally involved in disaster recovery?



Why did you rate the importance the way you did?



Does the lack of general empowerment of IANA to get involved in disaster recovery present an issue that the ccNSO needs to deal with at some stage?



Theme - Request Confidentiality



Requests to perform fundamental actions on a ccTLD (delegate, transfer, revoke) are generally processed confidentially by IANA

At the conclusion of a successful request of this nature, a report is published that distills key factors in the evaluation.

This is a practice, stipulated by contract, but is not policy.

Some have requested greater transparency into individual cases or the ability in the process to contribute their position into the assessment.

The current practice does not provide an explicit pathway for such input.

Do you have any questions?



Do you believe it is important to that IANA treats requests confidentially?

0%
Very Important

0%
Important

0%
Neutral

0%
Not Important

0%
Not Important at all

Why did you rate the importance the way you did?



Does IANA's treatment of requests as confidential illustrate an issue that the ccNSO needs to deal with at some stage?

0%

Strongly agree

0%

agree

0%

neutral

0%

Disagree

0%

Strongly Disagree

