

## Second IANA Naming Function Review (IFR2) Meeting 25

13 November 2024 | 10:15 UTC

Meeting Wiki:

<https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=387154042>

<b>Review Team Members and Liaisons:</b> Alan Barrett, Ashley Heineman, Brett Carr, Ching Chiao, Edowaye Makanjoula, Jonathan Robinson, Kim Davies, Lars-Johan Liman, Marilia Hirano, Olga Cavalli, Peter Koch, Raffik Dammak, Rick Wilhelm, Sami Ali, Steve Conte	<b>Observers:</b>
<b>Apologies:</b> N/A	<b>ICANN Org:</b> Brenda Brewer, Elizabeth Garber (technical writer), 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 conduct a poll on the list regarding future IFR2 meeting times.
- ICANN support team to invite ICANN Legal to next meeting to clarify their stance on Article 8.
- IFR1 recommendation follow up: IFR2 review team to discuss the reporting obligations and review frequency.
- Review team to triage findings and suggestions from the compiled 'nice to have' list.

### 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
24-01	29 October 2024	ICANN support team to look into the formal relationship between the ICANN and PTI Boards (particularly as it pertains to the Domain Name function and report back to the review team. Review team to decide on whether more transparency and openness needed.	Discussion to take place at the 13 November meeting. Email response shared with the IFR2 Team on 8 November.
24-02	29 October 2024	Elizabeth to summarize contract review's 'nice to have' marked items in a table to share with the IFR2 Team.	Summary will be shared at the 13 November meeting.

Reference	Date	Action item	Status
24-01	29 October 2024	ICANN support team to look into the formal relationship between the ICANN and PTI Boards (particularly as it pertains to the Domain Name function and report back to the review team. Review team to decide on whether more transparency and openness needed.	Discussion to take place at the 13 November meeting. Email response shared with the IFR2 Team on 8 November.
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.	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.

- Rick, as CSC liaison, provided update on Action Item 07-01 (CSC liaison flagging item for discussion with IFR2 team).
- The CSC reviewed Article 8 (Sections 8.1 and 8.2) in the IFR contract remedial action procedure. The CSC found that the remedial action procedure in Article 8 (Sections 8.1 and 8.2) is complicated and merits a closer review. For example, the role of the ombuds should be reviewed and possibly changed because the section specifically calls out when the ombuds can be invoked since the ombuds can be invoked at any time.
- The complexity of this procedure has not been exercised in the past and the CSC would like to have this reviewed so that it is clarified prior to it being needed to be used in ‘real life.’
- **Clarification:** this is not about changing the remedial action procedure itself. This is about how the remedial action procedures are triggered. The language is part of the complaint process- most notably in Article 8 in IANA Function Contract. CSC noted that the decision path in the contract is not a clean read and would like to hear from ICANN Legal’s explanation about this point. This is about the contract and not the remedial action procedure.

**Agenda Item #3: [Presentation to the RySG](#)**

- Rick and Jonathan to provide any immediate reactions/comments from their presentation to the RySG on Tuesday, 12 November.
- Questions posed to the RySG group after the presentation:
  - i) Do members of the RySG:
    - Find that PTI’s performance is meeting their needs?
    - Experience any systemic issues?
    - Find that the IANA Naming function contract and statement of work meet their needs?
- Jonathan and Rick received a few basic questions from the gTLD community after the presentation. The questions were answered at the meeting.
- The gTLD community was encouraged to fill out survey.
- The ccTLD side will schedule a webinar to fulfill the community outreach requirement.

**Agenda Item #4: Revisiting discussion on the formal relationship between the ICANN and PTI Boards (particularly as it pertains to the domain name function).**

- [Email response](#) shared with IFR2 team on 8 November.
- **Summary:** ICANN and PTI Boards do not have a regular, direct relationship. It is through delegation that the day-to-day oversight and performance of the PTI functions is conducted.
- No formal relationship and no meetings conducted.
- The review team agreed that there is no reason to doubt the openness and transparency of the two Boards.

**Agenda Item #5: Summary of 'nice to have' contract review items**

- Table summarizing contract items marked as 'nice to have' during contract review will be discussed at the next meeting on 26 November.
- The review team to triage findings and suggestions on the list.

**Agenda Item #6: Review and discuss the [IFR1 Recommendations report](#).**

- Review team to take up for discussion, with potential elevation to recommendation, the reporting obligations and review frequency.

**Agenda Item #7: Next meeting:**

- Tuesday, 26 November at 11:00 UTC.
- ICANN support team to conduct a poll on the list regarding future IFR2 meeting times.

**Agenda Item #8: AOB, close**

- No AOB was discussed.