

IANA Function Review and Separation Process

June 24, 2015

Goals

- Evaluate IANA performance against customer/ community needs and expectations and SOW requirements
- Evaluate performance of oversight structures (e.g. CSC)
- Assess changes implemented since last review
- Identify areas of potential performance improvements including suggestions by CSC and community
- **Periodic IANA Function Review may propose changes to the IANA SOW based on existing performance or evolving needs of customers and the community**

Periodic IANA Function Review (IFR)

- **Frequency:** 2 years from transition date, every 5 years thereafter
- **Trigger:** calendar-triggered by Fundamental Bylaw
- **Composition:** small, multi-stakeholder review team

IFR Composition Structure

- Makeup
 - **ccNSO** – 2 representatives
 - **ccTLD (non-ccNSO)** – 1 representative
 - **RySG** – 2 representatives
 - **RrSG** – 2 representatives
 - **NCSG** – 2 representatives
 - **GAC** – 1 representative
 - **SSAC** – 1 representative
 - **RSSAC** – 1 representative
 - **ALAC** – 1 representative
 - **CSC Liaison** – 1 representative
- Representatives are appointed by the group in accordance with internal procedures
- The review body is an **internal-to-ICANN** body defined in the ICANN bylaws.

Review Phases

- **Mandatory Phases for Review Team**
 - Consultation with the IANA Functions Operator
 - Consultation with the CSC
 - Public input session for ccTLD and gTLD operators
 - Public comment period
- **Steps for Amendment Approval**
 - Public comment period
 - Approval by the ccNSO **and** the GNSO Councils by a supermajority
 - Approval by the ICANN Board
 - *Rejection requires same threshold as supermajority PDP recommendation*
- **Inputs**
 - Statement of Work
 - Regular IANA Reporting
 - CSC inputs
 - Community Inputs

Special IANA Function Review

- Review may be triggered out-of-cycle by supermajority vote of ccNSO and GNSO
- Address performance deficiency not corrected by CSC remedial action procedures or IANA Problem Resolution Process
- Same composition structure and mandatory phases as IANA Function Review
- Outcomes not prescribed
- Scope narrowed to changes to address deficiency under coordination
 - Expectation that Special IFR would include implementation recommendations

Separation Community Working Group (SCWG)

- **If** IFR recommends a separation of naming functions from ICANN, the separation process will be carried out by SCWG
- Creation of SCWG approved by:
 - ccNSO **and** GNSO supermajority
 - ICANN Board
 - Community mechanism
- Selection of new operator approved by:
 - ICANN Board
 - Community Mechanism

SCWG Composition Structure

- **Makeup**

- ccNSO - 2
 - Non-ccNSO ccTLD - 1
 - RySG - 3
 - RrSG - 1
 - CSG - 1
 - NCSG – 1 GAC – 1
 - SSAC – 1
 - RSSAC – 1
 - ALAC - 1
 - CSC Liaison- 1
 - Special IFR Team Liaison - 1
 - Liaison from Protocol - 1 (TBD)
 - Liaison from Numbers - 1 (TBD)
 - Numbers - 1 (TBD)
- Representatives are appointed by the group in accordance with internal procedures
 - Group will follow principles for ICANN Community Working Groups

SCWG Responsibilities

- Determine how to resolve the issue(s) which triggered formation of the SCWG
- If the decision is to issue an RFP:
 - Developing RFP Guidelines and Requirements
 - Soliciting input on requirements to plan, and participation in, the RFP Process;
 - Reviewing responses to the RFP;
 - Selecting the entity that will perform the IANA Naming Functions; and
 - Managing any other Separation Process.
- If PTI divestiture or other reorganization is to be recommended, develop recommendations for that process.

Assessment of Public Comments

- Composition
- Geographic representation
- Outcomes
- Scope of IFRT
- Home of IFRT and SCWG
- Role of the ICANN Board
- Transparency

Key Changes from Comment Version

- Expanded details on separation process
- Revised composition of IFRT
 - *Previously 5 representatives per SO/AC*
- Requirements for geographic diversity
- Clarification of community consultation and transparency requirements
- Home of IFRT and SCWG defined
- Scope clearly limited to naming