

Second IANA Naming Function Review (IFR2) Meeting 4
23 January 2024 | 11:00 UTC – 12:00 UTC

Meeting wiki:

<https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=286818564>

<p>Review Team Members and Liaisons:</p> <p>Ashley Heineman, Brett Carr, Carlton Samuels, Edowaye Makanjuola, Jonathan Robinson, Lars-Johan Liman, Peter Koch, Rafik Dammak, Rick Wilhelm, Sami Ali</p> <p>Apologies: Alan Barrett, Marilia Hirano</p>	<p>Observers: N/A</p> <p>ICANN Org: Brenda Brewer, Jennifer Bryce, Reda Josifi, Steve Conte</p>
--	---

These high-level notes are designed to help people to navigate through the content of the call. They are not meant to be a substitute for the meeting recording, which can be accessed directly via this [link](#), or on the wiki page linked above.

Agenda Item #1: Welcome, Roll Call, SOI Updates

- No SOI updates were offered.

Agenda Item #2: Action Items (all action items tracked in the Google sheet linked [here](#) [docs.google.com])

Reference	Date	Action item	Status
02-02	5 Dec 2023	ICANN team to share the Terms of Reference from the first IFR. For the review team to call out the specific areas and questions for discussion so that an agreement can be reached on the next call.	Redline Terms of Reference shared via email 4 Jan – to be approved on an upcoming call or on list.
02-05	5 Dec 2023	ICANN team to start working with Co-Chairs on getting the briefings lined up. They will start with a briefing at the next meeting.	In progress – Briefing from the CSC (Brett) planned for ICANN79; pending briefings from Legal (contract walkthrough) and follow-up briefings from IANA (more details on the naming function).
02-08	5 Dec 2023	For the ICANN team to go back and see if there was a blog published to announce the first IFR and if so, republish a similar blog for IFR2.	IFR1 blog published at team approval of Terms of Reference document – IFR2 to consider publishing a blog at the same time.

Agenda Item #3: Terms of Reference and Work Plan

- a. Final review of comments in the [Terms of Reference \[docs.google.com\]](https://docs.google.com) and team approval.
 - o As summarized in the table below, a few more edits will need to be made before a final Terms of Reference document will be distributed to the list for approval.

Discussion Topic:	Summary of key discussion points/comments:
<p>“IFR2 meetings and working procedures will be open to the public and conducted in a transparent manner to the fullest extent possible. More information can be found on the IFR2 wiki space.”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jennifer Bryce recommended that this sentence remains in the Terms of Reference document because it is derived from the bylaws.
<p>Requirements for Recommendation Drafting Section (Clauses 5 and 6) “The Review Team should ensure any recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is not made public to the community or Board if it impacts gTLD registry operator services and received opposition from the Registry Stakeholder Group’s appointed IFRT member (18.5 c) • is not made public to the community or Board if it impacts ccTLD registry operator services and received opposition from the ccNSO’s appointed IFRT member” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lars-Johan Liman retracted his comment on this section because he recognizes that there are certain situations where sensitive information can be part of the review and there should be a limitation on what is published due to sensitivities. • Carlton Samuels asked if the entire report or specific sections will be made public and the response from Peter Koch was that Clauses 5 and 6 apply to the recommendations section and the report will be made public. • Rick Wilhelm suggested moving Clauses 5 and 6 from the ‘should’ section to the ‘shall’ section as the language pertains to making recommendations public. • The leadership team will review this suggestion against the bylaws and will come back with a decision. • Liman suggested that the team should also review if the bylaws have changed since the first review and make any changes to align the documents before an approval is reached.
Timeline Section	Section is mirrored from the first IFR but is subject to change
Formulation and Dissolution Section	Replacement of names
Decision Making Section	Section remains the same

Mailing Lists Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slightly simplified from IFR1 where there was a separate mailing list for observers. • All meetings will be open to observers and the schedule of calls will be published on wiki. • Peter mentioned that the veto voices section is written in plural in the bylaws but is not covered in this document. This document will need to be updated to match the bylaws document before it is approved.
Definition Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team came to a consensus to remove the entire section but will include a link to the icann.org page which includes acronyms and terms.

b. Walk through the [Work Plan \[docs.google.com\]](#), which will be updated as the team determines how it will break out division of work.

- High level, living document that will be updated by the Project Manager and the co-chairs.
- Template is broken down into a sample review team (100% complete), research, conduct review, produce the draft and final report.
- The start and end dates align with the Terms of Reference document.
- Tasks are broken down into percentages complete (100% if task is complete, 80% if task is towards the end of completion, 20% if task has started a bit, 0% if task has not started) .

Agenda Item #4: IANA Naming Function Contract – start with section 4. Exercise to start identifying specific areas of the IANA Naming Function Contract that require clarification to ensure the team is working from the same baseline.

- This was an opportunity to flag items that the review team would like covered in a briefing moving forward.
- Jonathan Robinson suggested that the requirement for a US presence should be addressed and explained.
- Liman would like to further examine whether the requirement for US jurisdiction is listed out of convenience or an actual requirement from the US government.
- Look through contract to spot sections that the review team would like to know more about or could be of particular interest for the review (i.e. more information for the review team to do their work).
- Liman asked about the level of micro-oversight as part of the team’s role.
 - Peter answered that micro-oversight is not so much the role of the review team as there are already review mechanisms within the IANA function, the CSC, and bigger picture oversight by the IFR.
 - Ashley stated that it is important to keep in mind that the reports are there if needed. The team will rely on the CSC point of contact for any questions on the reports.
- Ashley Heineman encouraged the team to reread the briefing and contract and prepare questions for PTI and the CSC briefing.

Agenda Item #5: ICANN79 – Intention is to have a working session with a briefing from the CSC.

- Session is planned for 6 March at 13:15 local time with a duration of 75 minutes.
- Team should think about preparing questions that could be shared in advance with the CSC.
- Team will discuss if current meeting rotating schedule is suitable for future meetings.

Agenda Item #6: Next Meetings

- Meeting 5 - Tuesday 6 February @ 18:00 - 19:00 UTC
- Meeting 6 - Wednesday 21 February @ 01:00 - 02:00 UTC
- Meeting 7 – ICANN79 (Wednesday 6 March @ 13:15 local time)

Agenda Item #7: AOB, close

- No AOB was discussed.