

## Second IANA Naming Function Review (IFR2) Meeting 19

20 August 2024 | 18:00 UTC

Meeting Wiki:

<https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=350584934>

<b>Review Team Members and Liaisons:</b> Alan Barrett, Ashley Heineman, Brett Carr, Edowaye Makanjuola, Jonathan Robinson, Lars-John Liman, Marilia Hirano, Olga Cavalli, Peter Koch, Rick Wilhelm, Sami Ali, Steve Conte <b>Apologies:</b> Rafik Dammak, Lyman Chapin	<b>Observers:</b> N/A  <b>ICANN Org:</b> Brenda Brewer, Elizabeth Garber (technical writer), Jennifer Bryce, Reda Josifi
--	---

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.

### Action Items:

- ICANN support team to put together a task list of remaining items that need to be completed before the end of the project.
- ICANN support team to email homework assignment to the review team. The team should read the [Implementation report](#) of IFR1 recommendations.
- Co-Chairs to do a broader scan of CSC reports to see if there are any anomalies.
- Marilia to provide the IFR2 review team with reports from the last three months of the Customer Satisfaction Survey, the post ticket survey, with a brief description of what it measures, and the last three months of the response rate satisfaction. Marilia to also provide the review team with the links to the Annual Survey from previous years.

### 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](#))

Reference	Date	Action item	Status
07-01	4 March 2024	As follow up from the 6 March CSC briefing: Co-chairs to consider formally asking the CSC liaison if there is anything they would like to bring to the attention of the IFR2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ongoing - On hold for future consideration, once the IFR2 gets to a place in its work where it feels it can phrase the question most meaningfully.</li></ul>

**Agenda Item #3: Status Check: Review IFR2 scope per the Bylaws requirements and objectives in the Terms of Reference (see pages 3-6).**

- Determine group alignment on where the gaps are in work to date and agree at a high level any further data gathering /interviews the team should carry out.

Objective	Review Team Comments
<p><b>“(a) Review and evaluate the performance of PTI against the requirements set forth in the IANA Naming Function Contract in relation to the needs of its direct customers and the expectations of the broader ICANN community, and determine whether to make any recommendations with respect to PTI’s performance;”</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Consistent with ICANN’s mission and <u>Bylaws</u>, Section 18.3(a), the review team will assess the needs and expectations of IANA Naming function direct customers and the broader community, and then determine if there are any gaps in PTI’s performance. The IFRT will examine PTI’s performance against SLAs originally developed by the community; review PTI’s annual Customer Service Survey; discuss PTI’s performance with the Customer Standing Committee; solicit input through the first Public Comment of an Initial Draft; and other methods that the Review Team deems appropriate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AH: Is there any other way to better connect with customers?</li> <li>• PK: Positive feedback when we interpret performance as meeting SLAs. The other thing is things that don’t show up in reports. Not mentioned recently. Could reach out to TLDs.</li> <li>• AH: Report would go out for public comment.</li> <li>• LJL: Suggestion of making it a group exercise of going through all the reports and the surveys to make sure that we have not missed anything</li> <li>• <b>BC: If we are going report for public comment and expect to receive feedback from TLD operators, we should call this out explicitly in our public comment request</b></li> <li>• <b>AH: Add to task list: read surveys that are available to us and have a conversation at one of our next meetings</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>“(b) Review and evaluate the performance of PTI against the requirements set forth in the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW;”</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Consistent with ICANN’s mission and <u>Bylaws</u>, Section 18.3(b), the review team will assess all IANA Naming Function related requirements in the contract and SOW and determine if PTI has met these. The IFRT will do so through such means as interviews with PTI and ICANN staff and/or community subject matter experts, available monthly reporting and monitoring tools, as well as</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AH: This was covered in reading of contract and SOW and the questions that have been posed to ICANN as well as conversations with Brett as liaison to CSC.</li> <li>• LJL: Do not think it is worthwhile to go through all the IANA monthly reports since the CSC already reviews the reports and if there was a problem, the CSC would have caught it.</li> <li>• PK: Understanding that performance in this objective is measuring the fulfillment of the contract and not the evaluation of time limits, like the SLAs</li> </ul>

<p>IANA audit reports that apply to IANA Naming Functions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>AH: Add to task list: Look through items flagged in initial contract review.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>“(c) Review the IANA Naming Function SOW and determine whether to recommend any amendments to the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW to account for the needs of the direct customers of the naming services and/or the community at large;”</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Consistent with ICANN’s mission and <u>Bylaws</u>, Section 18.3(c), and based on the analysis conducted for 18.3.(a) and 18.3.(i) in particular, the Review Team will review the IANA Naming Function Contract and SOW to determine if the needs of IANA Naming customers are fully covered through a review team analysis.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AH: Same as the previous objective. We have reviewed the SoW and flagged issues that we need to go back and review.</li> <li>• SC: Agree that we have satisfied a different way. Previous input that was given was as if we were rewriting the contract. We did not take it in the perspective of the needs of the direct customer. It is going to be difficult having a conversation with direct customers</li> <li>• MH: Most recent <a href="#">IANA’s Annual Customer Survey Report</a>. Scope of this survey has changed over time. It now focuses on satisfaction with the engagement with IANA’s customers. The high-level results are posted on IANA’s website. IANA also has two different surveys with different scopes. One is focused on engagement, how customers interact with IANA and how they engage and how they can improve on the engagement. The second is the post ticket survey, which is sent to customers after a request is resolved.</li> <li>• <b>AH: Add to task list: Reading the annual survey would be complementary to our review and should be added as homework.</b></li> <li>• BC: Suggestion to start reading surveys from the last three months.</li> <li>• <b>AH: Add to task list: Peter and I could do a broader scan of reports going a bit further to see if there are any anomalies.</b></li> <li>• JR: Suggestion to randomize the reports and not look through three continuous months.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>AH: Add to task list: Each pick 3 random reports and team to see if they reach the same conclusion.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>“(d) Review and evaluate the openness and transparency procedures of PTI and any oversight structures for PTI's performance, including reporting requirements and budget transparency;”</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Consistent with ICANN’s mission and <u>Bylaws</u>, Section 18.3(c), the review team will assess PTI’s procedures while considering any customer feedback on the openness and transparency for such procedures as assessed in 18.3.(a) and (i). The review team considers PTI oversight structures to include, but not exclusive to: Board oversight, management, community committees and other accountability mechanisms.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AH: This was the theme of the team’s initial review of the contract and statement of work.</li> <li>• <b>LJL: Add to task list:</b> ‘Oversight structures’ includes board. Do we need to include the work of the PTI board here? And if so, how do we evaluate it?</li> <li>• <b>AH: We have not necessarily directly focused on transparency.</b> Will add this to ‘to do’ list.</li> <li>• PK: We do have all the raw data for this type of transparency. Hard to evaluate structures in place (i.e. for complaints). Apart from the structures being in place, we do not know how they work. Should only look for anomalies that would have surfaced by now.</li> <li>• AH: How would we review the PTI Board’s Transparency? What would be the benchmarks? Not sure about the expectations about PTI Board Transparency. Difficult to judge objectively. Do we consider the CSC as an oversight structure? Do we look at how transparent they are in terms of their reviews?</li> <li>• LJL: It may be helpful to briefly see that the types of reviews and transparency that the CSC has built into it corresponds to the expectations set forth in the contract and the statement of work. Regarding the Board, agree that we do not have a scale to measure it against—could do a brief check to see if there are minutes from the meetings and if they have content that would help our review. Does not have to be a formal review. <b>Potential homework</b></li> </ul>

	<p><b>to look and see what is missing. If we find that there is something missing, we can further investigate the connections between the contract and what is identified as missing.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• AB: Agree with Liman. The CSC is not part of the oversight of PTI. The CSC’s role is to view PTI from a customer standpoint and decide whether the customer wants to do something different or continue its contract with PTI. So, this would be out of scope for the IFR2 team.</li><li>• PK: Clause (d) states “oversight structures for PTI’s performance” — the CSC and the reports could be considered an oversight structure for the performance, not an oversight structure for PTI itself. I don’t think that makes much of a difference because we have made use of the CSC’s output and the CSC’s input to this committee so we should have the information that we need readily available.</li><li>• AH: Do we know what the reference “management community committees” is referring to? Is this the CSC and other accountability mechanisms? Should we be looking at how ICANN looks at its contractor in terms of fulfilling its requirements? I see “management community committees” to possibly be the CSC. <b>CSC at this point is something to review as is PTI Board.</b></li><li>• SC: Worthwhile to look at this because there is a unique relationship between PTI and ICANN.</li><li>• <b>AH: It will take more of a thought process with respect to how we would review ICANN’s transparency in the context of making sure that PTI is doing what it’s supposed to.</b></li></ul>
--	--

<p><b>“(e) Review and evaluate the performance and effectiveness of the EC with respect to actions taken by the EC, if any, pursuant to <a href="#">Section 16.2</a>, <a href="#">Section 18.6</a>, <a href="#">Section 18.12</a>, <a href="#">Section 19.1</a>, <a href="#">Section 19.4</a>, <a href="#">Section 22.4(b)</a> and <a href="#">Annex D</a>;</b>”</p> <p><b>OBJECTIVE:</b> To date, no Empowered Community (EC) actions have occurred in relation to Bylaws <a href="#">Section 16.2</a>, <a href="#">19.1</a>, <a href="#">19.4</a>, <a href="#">22.4(b)</a> and <a href="#">Annex D</a>.</p> <p>The review team will evaluate the performance and effectiveness of actions taken by the EC in relation to Sections <a href="#">18.6</a> and <a href="#">18.12</a>, as <a href="#">approved</a> by the Board in September 2023 and completed by the EC in November 2023.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JB: Actions taken by the Empowered Communities (EC) in relation to 18, 6 and 12 of the bylaws that was bylaws that took place as a result of recommendations from the first IFR. The steps that the EC took to complete the recommendations here are in the IFR1 implementation report, which the IFR2 team has yet to review. <b>This clause will be covered when the IFR2 team looks at the implementation of IFR1 recommendations.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>“(f) Review and evaluate the performance of the IANA naming function according to established service level expectations during the IFR period being reviewed and compared to the immediately preceding Periodic IFR period;”</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIVE:</b> The review team will review relevant monthly reporting and monitoring tools to evaluate the performance of the IANA naming function according to established service level expectations, and directly evaluate these against the findings from the first IFR.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AH: Summary of this section- <b>Review the monthly reporting and monitoring tools and then directly evaluate these against the findings from IFR1.</b> Have not done this explicitly. Do we need to read all the monthly reviews? We need to look at what IFR1 had to say about this. Then we could look at sample monthly reports and monitoring tools.</li> <li>• LIL: A good number of CSC reports state 100% compliance. We should look at the ones that do not meet the 100% compliance.</li> <li>• AH: <b>Add to task list: Propose that we go through and identify the reports that do not have 100% compliance.</b></li> <li>• AH: What are monitoring tools?</li> <li>• LIL: When we read the reports, we will see what they contain, and we can evaluate if it is a good tool. We can also look at the data for the ones that are below 100%.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>AH: Add to task list: Review reports in this period that are less than 100%, with an eye to comparing them with the results of the findings from the IFR1 review. Also looking at and considering the effectiveness of those reports.</b></li> <li>• <b>LJL: Add to task list: We could be looking at the measuring points and what values are being measured. We could look at the 64 SLAs and decide if there is anything missing and if the 64 SLAs are good things to measure.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>“(g) Review and evaluate whether there are any systemic issues that are impacting PTI’s performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW;”</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Consistent with ICANN’s mission and <u>Bylaws</u>, Section 18.3(g), the IFRT will review any complaints and escalations to IANA to evaluate if there are any systemic and/or recurring issues, while also considering input from the community.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AH: Suggest identifying complaint escalations. Are there many of these?</li> <li>• BC: There are no systemic complaints.</li> <li>• LJL: We should note that the CSC has the same remit here that the CSC is not tasked to look at individual complaints. It is tasked to look at whether there is a lot of complaints which lead to a suspicion that there’s a systemic problem. Agree that looking at complaints is a good way, and if there are not any complaints, they should be noted in our report.</li> <li>• <b>AH: Add to task list: We could do a quick review of CSC complaints and also note that Brett mentioned that there are no systemic complaints.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>“(h) Initiate public comment periods and other processes for community input on PTI’s performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW (such public comment periods shall comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN);”</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Consistent with ICANN’s mission and Bylaws, Section 18.3(h), the review team will solicit input from the community on PTI’s performance through such means as holding consultations with the community; a Public</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AH: This is something that has been planned but has not been done.</li> </ul>

<p>Comment period such as for an Initial Draft; and other methods that the Review Team deems appropriate.</p>	
<p><b>“(i) Consider input from the CSC and the community on PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW;”</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Consistent with ICANN’s mission and Bylaws, Section 18.3(i), the review team will discuss PTI’s performance with the Customer Standing Committee; and solicit input from the community through such means as holding consultations with the community; a Public Comment period such as for an Initial Draft; and other methods that the Review Team deems appropriate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AH-In progress or completed through the task that we have already identified.</li> </ul>
<p><b>“(j) Identify process or other areas for improvement in the performance of the IANA naming function under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW and the performance of the CSC and the EC as it relates to oversight of PTI; and”</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Consistent with ICANN’s mission and <u>Bylaws</u>, Section 18.3(j), based on the Review Team’s findings from 18.3.(a) to 18.3.(i), the Review Team will make recommendations for specific measurable steps that can be taken to improve any deficiencies or gaps.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AH: We have covered this in the context of our review and the contract and the SoW. Have not looked at this in the context of the CSC and EC but have somewhat Identified it as future work.</li> <li>• LIL: This is something that is ongoing but not finished yet.</li> </ul>
<p><b>“(k) Consider and assess any changes implemented since the immediately preceding IFR and their implications for the performance of PTI under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW.”</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JB: Review of the implementation of the four recommendations that came out of IFR1 and any impact that that implementation has had.</li> <li>• AH: Have there been any reports on its implementation or is this something that we can use ICANN</li> </ul>

<p><b>OBJECTIVE:</b> The review team will review the implementation of recommendations provided by the first IFR and the impact of implementation on performance of PTI under the IANA Naming Function Contract and the IANA Naming Function SOW.</p>	<p>staff as a resource for in terms of assessing?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JB: There is a report which outlines how the recommendations were implemented. ICANN staff can also be used as a resource</li> <li>• <b>AH: Add to task list: Review report which outlines how recommendations were implemented before the completion of this project. This needs to be covered in final report.</b></li> </ul>
---	--

**Agenda Item #4: Time permitting, begin working through topics beyond the ‘nice to have’ that were identified to revisit during initial contract review:**

- a. Article IV, Section 4.1: Designation (see row 11 in the [workbook \[docs.google.com\]](#))
  - b. Article VIII, Section 8.1: Complaint Resolution Process (see row 48 in the [workbook \[docs.google.com\]](#))
  - c. Article IX, Section 9.3: Transition (see row 54 in the workbook)
  - d. Annex A, 2(b): Service Levels (see row 103 in the [workbook \[docs.google.com\]](#))
  - e. Annex A, 4 (i) (1) (a): Interface Basic Functionality (see row 136 in the [workbook \[docs.google.com\]](#))
- The review team did not have enough time to discuss this action item. This will be covered in the next meeting.

**Agenda Item #5: Agree on next steps:**

- Next meeting 3 September @ 11:00 UTC.
- Homework assignment to be confirmed and distributed via email. Note: new available background reading: [Implementation report](#) of IFR1 recommendations.

**Agenda Item #6: AOB, close**

- No AOB was discussed.