

# IFR Scope of Work

## Table of Contents

	<b>1</b>
<b><i>Section I: Review Identification</i></b>	<b>2</b>
<b><i>Section II: Mission, Purpose, and Deliverables</i></b>	<b>3</b>
Scope:	3
Required Inputs:	5
Dependencies on Other Organizations:	6
Deliverables:	6
Requirements for Recommendation Drafting:	7
Timeframes:	8
<b><i>Section III: Formation and Dissolution</i></b>	<b>10</b>
Membership:	10
Changes to Review Team Membership, Dissolution of Review Team:	10
<b><i>Section IV: Decision-Making and Methodologies</i></b>	<b>12</b>
Decision-Making Methodologies:	12
Accountability and Transparency:	14
Reporting:	15
Subgroups:	15
Outreach:	16
Observers:	16
Closure & Review Team Self-Assessment:	16
<b><i>Definitions:</i></b>	<b>17</b>

<b>Review Name:</b>	<b>IANA Naming Functions Review</b>
<b>Section I: Review Identification</b>	
<b>Board Initiation</b>	<a href="#">Resolution</a>
<b>Announcement of Review Team:</b>	<a href="#">25 September 2019</a>
<b>Name(s) of RT Leadership:</b>	Frederico Neves, Co-Chair Tomslin Samme-Nlar, Co-Chair
<b>Review Workspace URL:</b>	<a href="https://community.icann.org/display/ifr">https://community.icann.org/display/ifr</a>
<b>Review Mailing List:</b>	<a href="https://mm.icann.org/mailman/admindb/ifrt">https://mm.icann.org/mailman/admindb/ifrt</a>
<b>Background</b>	<p>On 16 September 2018, the first IFR was <u>convened by the ICANN Board</u>, in compliance with <u>Article 18</u> of the ICANN Bylaws. The IFR is one of the new accountability mechanisms created as part of the IANA stewardship transition to ensure that Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) meets the needs and expectations of its naming customers.</p> <p>Consistent with ICANN’s mission and <u>Bylaws</u>, Section 18.3.b, the review team will evaluate the performance of PTI against the requirements set forth in the <a href="#">IANA Naming Function Contract</a> and the <a href="#">IANA Naming Function SOW</a>.</p> <p>The <a href="#">review team was assembled in September 2019</a> and began <a href="#">it’s work</a>.</p>

## Section II: Mission, Purpose, and Deliverables

### Scope:

This review team is tasked, as per the Bylaws, Section 18.3:

#### **18.3.(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”*

**OBJECTIVE:** Consistent with ICANN's mission and Bylaws, 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.

#### **18.3.(b)**

*“Review and evaluate the performance of PTI against the requirements set forth in the [IANA Naming Function Contract](#) and [IANA Naming Function SOW](#)”*

**OBJECTIVE:** Consistent with ICANN's mission and Bylaws, 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 IANA audit reports that apply to IANA Naming Functions.

#### **18.3.(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”*

**OBJECTIVE:** Consistent with ICANN’s mission and Bylaws, 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.

**18.3.(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”*

**OBJECTIVE:** Consistent with ICANN’s mission and Bylaws, 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.

**18.3.(e)**

*“Review and evaluate the performance and effectiveness of the Empowered Community (EC) with respect to actions taken by the EC, if any, pursuant to Section 16.2, Section 18.6, Section 18.12, Section 19.1, Section 19.4, Section 22.4(b) and Annex D”*

**OBJECTIVE:** to date, no Empowered Community (EC) actions have occurred in relation to Bylaws Section 16.2, 18.6, 18.12, 19.1, 19.4, 22.4(b) and Annex D.

**18.3.(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”*

**OBJECTIVE:** As this is the first IANA Naming Function Review, Bylaws 18.3 (f) does not apply.

**18.3.(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”*

**OBJECTIVE:** Consistent with ICANN’s mission and Bylaws, 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.

**18.3.(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)”*

**OBJECTIVE:** 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 Comment period such as for an Initial Draft; and other methods that the Review Team deems appropriate.

**18.3.(i)**

*“Consider input from the CSC and the community on PTI’s performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW”*

**OBJECTIVE:** 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.

**18.3.(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”*

**OBJECTIVE:** Consistent with ICANN’s mission and Bylaws, 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.

**18.3.(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.”*

**OBJECTIVE:** As this is the first IANA Naming Function Review, Bylaws 18.3 (k) does not apply.

**Required Inputs:****“Section 18.4. IFR REQUIRED INPUTS**

*In conducting an IFR, the IFRT shall review and analyze the following information:*

- (a) Reports provided by PTI pursuant to the IANA Naming Function Contract and/or IANA Naming Function SOW during the IFR period being reviewed, any portion of which may be redacted pursuant to the Confidential Disclosure Framework set forth in the Operating Standards in accordance with Section 4.6(a)(vi);*
- (b) Reports provided by the CSC in accordance with the CSC Charter during the IFR period being reviewed;*
- (c) Community inputs through public consultation procedures as reasonably determined by the IFRT, including, among other things, public comment periods, input provided at in-person sessions during ICANN meetings, responses to public surveys related to PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW, and public inputs during meetings of the IFRT;*
- (d) Recommendations for technical, process and/or other improvements relating to the mandate of the IFR provided by the CSC or the community; and*
- (e) Results of any site visit conducted by the IFRT, which shall be conducted in consultation with ICANN (i) upon reasonable notice, (ii) in a manner so as to not affect PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract or the IANA Naming Function SOW and (iii) pursuant to procedures and requirements reasonably developed by ICANN and reasonably acceptable to the IFRT. Any such site visit shall be limited to matters reasonably related to the IFRT's responsibilities pursuant to Section 18.3.”*

**Dependencies on Other Organizations:**

The review team will ensure the work it undertakes does not duplicate or conflict with purview the following efforts:

- [CSC Charter Review](#)

[CSC Effectiveness Review](#)

**Deliverables:**

***“Section 18.10. COMMUNITY REVIEWS AND REPORTS***

*(a) The IFRT shall seek community input as to the issues relevant to the IFR through one or more public comment periods that shall comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN and through discussions during ICANN's public meetings in developing and finalizing its recommendations and any report.*

*(b) The IFRT shall provide a draft report of its findings and recommendations to the community for public comment. The public comment period is required to comply with the designated practice for public comment periods within ICANN.*

*(c) After completion of the IFR, the IFRT shall submit its final report containing its findings and recommendations to the Board. ICANN shall thereafter promptly post the IFRT's final report on the Website.”*

The draft report should include the following:

- Overview of the review team’s working methods, tools used and analysis conducted
- Facts and findings related to the investigation of the objectives identified in the scope
- Resolution to all questions raised in the scope or those that arose subsequently during the course of the review (as appropriate)
- Summary of public consultations and engagement conducted
- Self-assessment of what processes (pertinent to the scope) work well and where improvements can be made; the self-assessment ought to be based on and refer to facts, findings, and data provision wherever possible.
- Preliminary recommendations that address significant and relevant issues detected
- Preliminary feasibility assessment
- A preliminary impact analysis to measure the effectiveness of the recommendations proposed by the current review team, including source(s) of baseline data for that purpose:
  - Identification of issue
  - Definition of desired outcome, including identification of metrics used to measure whether recommendation goals are achieved, where possible
  - Identification of potential problems in attaining the data or developing the metrics
  - A suggested timeframe in which the measures should be performed
  - Define current baselines of the issue and define initial benchmarks that define success or failure
  - Surveys or studies
- All recommendations should indicate a preliminary, non-binding level of consensus they have received, as defined in this document. This is to inform the community during the public

comment period to indicate the level of review team support for each recommendation, without binding the review team on their support level in the final report.

At least one draft report will be submitted for public comment, following standard ICANN procedures. The review team may update the draft Report based on the comments and/or other relevant information received, and submit its final report to the ICANN Board. The final report shall contain the same sections as the draft Report and, in addition, a section detailing the public comments received on the draft Report and an explanation of why and how they were incorporated into the final report or why and how they were rejected by the review team. Each recommendation shall include the level of consensus received from the review team members, as defined in this document. The final report of the review team shall be published for public comment in advance of the Board's consideration.

### Requirements for Recommendation Drafting:

The Review Team shall:

1. Perform Review according to Review Scope
2. Make recommendations according to Review Scope
3. Initiate a Public Comment period and any other processes for obtaining community input (such as, but not limited to, in-person sessions during ICANN meetings, responses to public surveys and public inputs during meetings 18.4.c\*) on PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract & SOW (18.3.h\*) as well as improvement recommendations (technical, process or other) (18.4.d\*)
4. Request input from the CSC (18.3.j\*)
5. Review PTI Reports created to meet IANA Naming Function Contract & SOW requirements and that were created during the IFR period being reviewed (18.4.a\*)
6. Review CSC Reports created to meet the CSC Charter requirements and that were created during IFR period being reviewed (18.4.b\*)
7. Review results of any site visits by the IFRT (18.4.e\*) (IV.7.3.b & Annex A: 3.a.ii\*\*)

The Review Team should ensure any recommendation:

1. is supported by data and analysis of the existing deficiency and a proposal to address (18.5.b\*)
2. provides a proposed remedial procedure with an explanation of how this will correct the issue (18.5.b\*)
3. provides a timeline for implementing (18.5.b\*)
4. provides prioritization if there is more than 1 recommendation (18.5.b\*)
5. 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\*)
6. 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 (18.5.c\*)
7. that would amend the IANA Naming Contract or SOW or the CSC charter require (18.6.a\*):
  - a) consultation with the Board and the CSC (18.6.a.i and ii\*)
  - b) a public input session for ccTLD and gTLD registry operators (18.6.a.iii\*)



c) a Public Comment period (18.6.a.iv\*)

In regards to Review Team actions:

1. IFRT actions require a consensus agreement, though consensus does not have a numerical definition
2. Members who disagree with an action may file a minority dissent to be included in meeting minutes/or reports
3. IFRT meetings and work shall be open to the public and follow transparency procedures

The Secretary acting for the IFRT will transmit meeting minutes, recordings, transcripts, etc. to mailing lists and icann.org

**See Bylaws Section 18.5**

**Timeframes:**

The review team shall to the best of its abilities respect the timelines and deliverables as outlined in this document. The review team shall develop a work plan that outlines the necessary steps and expected timing in order to achieve the milestones of this review, as agreed on below. The review team shall follow its published work plan to address review objectives within the available time and specified resources. The work plan is a roadmap towards reaching milestones and is subject to adjustments as the review team progresses through work.

Progress towards time-bound milestones defined in the work plan shall be tracked and published on a Fact Sheet.

**(subject to change):**

- December 2019 – January 2020: Define and approve rules of engagement, scope of work and work plan
- January 2020 – April 2020: Data analysis
- March 2020 – May 2020: Assemble draft findings
- May 2020 – June 2020: Approve draft findings
- July 2020 – August 2020: draft report up for public comment
- September 2020 – October 2020: Assemble final recommendations and update draft report based on public comments received; engagement at ICANN63
- November 2020: Seek GNSO & ccNSO Council approval (unique to this review) and adopt final report for ICANN Board consideration

## Section III: Formation and Dissolution

### Membership:

As per the ICANN Bylaws, the review team has been selected by ICANN's Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees (SO/ACs).

	Name	Region	SO/AC Nomination
1	Frederico Neves	LAC	ccNSO
2	Peter Koch	EUR	ccNSO
3	Unguec Stephen Kang	AF	ccNSO nomination of non-ccNSO ccTLD manager
4	Rick Wilhelm	NA	RySG
5	Jean-Christophe Vignes	EUR	RySG
6	Kristian Ørmen	EUR	RrSG
7	Christian Dawson	NA	Commercial Stakeholder Group
8	Tomslin Samme-Nlar	AF	Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group
9	Mr. Andreas Dlamini	AF	GAC
10	Patrik Fältström	NA	SSAC
11	Suzanne Woolf	NA	RSSAC
12	Kaili Kan	AP	ALAC
13	James Gannon	EUR	CSC liaison
14	Kim Davies, PTI		PTI liaison
15	Steve Conte, ICANN		ICANN liaison
16	Danko Jevtovic		Board liaison

### Notes:

- The ASO and IAB declined their right to appoint a liaison to the team.
- Per the Bylaws, Section 18.8:  
(d) The IFRT shall be led by two co-chairs: one appointed by the GNSO from one of the members appointed pursuant to clauses (c)-(f) of [Section 18.7](#) and one appointed by the ccNSO from one of the members appointed pursuant to clauses (a)-(b) of [Section 18.7](#).

The ccNSO appointed co-Chair is Frederico Neves.

The GNSO appointed co-Chair is Tomslin Samme-Nlar

### Changes to Review Team Membership, Dissolution of Review Team:

#### Dissolution of review team:

This review team shall be disbanded once it has submitted its final report to the ICANN Board.

#### Implementation Phase:

The review team shall identify one or two review team members to remain available for clarification as

may be needed during the planning phase of implementation of review team recommendations.

**Replacement and Removal of Members:**

The review team will follow the replacement and removal of members stipulations from Bylaws 18.8.(h).

## Section IV: Decision-Making and Methodologies

### Decision-Making Methodologies:

#### *“Section 18.9. MEETINGS*

*(a) All actions of the IFRT shall be taken by consensus of the IFRT, which is where a small minority may disagree, but most agree. If consensus cannot be reached with respect to a particular issue, actions by the majority of all of the members of the IFRT shall be the action of the IFRT.*

*(b) Any members of the IFRT not in favor of an action (whether as a result of voting against a matter or objecting to the consensus position) may record a minority dissent to such action, which shall be included in the IFRT minutes and/or report, as applicable.”*

*[For discussion by IFRT]*

All minority dissents must detail the analysis or recommendations in the final report with which its author(s) disagree(s), including a rationale for that disagreement.

The authors of minority dissents are encouraged to provide alternative recommendations that include the same details and context as is required from the recommendations in this document.

The review team leadership will be responsible for designating each decision as having one of the following designations:

- **Full consensus** - no review team members speak against the recommendation in its last readings.
- **Consensus** - a small minority disagrees, but most agree. A rule-of-thumb for judging consensus is that the decision is supported by 80% of the review team.
- **Strong support but significant opposition** - most of the group supports a recommendation but a significant number of members do not.
- **Divergence** - no strong support for any particular position, rather many different points of view. Sometimes this is due to irreconcilable differences of opinion and sometimes it is due to the fact that no one has a particularly strong or convincing viewpoint, but the members of the group agree that it is worth listing the issue in the report, nonetheless.
- **Minority view** - a proposal where a small number of people support the recommendation. This can happen in response to a **consensus**, **strong support but significant opposition**, and **no consensus**; or, it can happen in cases where there is neither support nor opposition to a suggestion made by a small number of individuals.

In judging the extent to which consensus has been reached, it may be useful for each team member to

consider which of the following categories they apply to them.

**Disagree:** I have a fundamental disagreement with the core of the proposal that has not been resolved. We need to look for a new proposal.

**Stand aside:** I can't support this proposal because ... But I don't want to stop the group, so I'll let the decision happen without me.

**Reservations:** I have some reservations but am willing to let the proposal pass.

**Agreement:** I support the proposal.

In cases of **consensus**, **strong support but significant opposition**, and **no consensus**, an effort should be made to document that variance in viewpoint and to present adequately any **minority views** that may have been made. Documentation of **minority view** recommendations normally depends on text offered by the proponent(s). In all cases of **divergence**, the review team leadership should encourage the submission of minority viewpoint(s).

The recommended method for discovering the consensus level designation on recommendations should work as follows:

- i. After the review team has discussed an issue long enough for all issues to have been raised, understood and discussed, the review team leadership makes an evaluation of the designation and publish it for the group to review.
- ii. After the review team has discussed the review team leadership's estimation of designation, the leadership should reevaluate and publish an updated evaluation.
- iii. Steps (i) and (ii) should continue until the leadership makes an evaluation that is accepted by the review team.
- iv. In rare cases, leadership may decide that the use of a poll is reasonable. Some of the reasons for this might be:
  - o A decision needs to be made within a time frame that does not allow for the natural process of iteration and settling on a designation to occur.
  - o It becomes obvious after several iterations that it is impossible to arrive at a designation. This will happen most often when trying to discriminate between **consensus** and **strong support but significant opposition** or between **strong support but significant opposition** and **divergence**.

Care should be taken in using polls that opinions cast do not become votes. A liability with the use of polls is that, in situations where there is **divergence** or **strong opposition**, there are often disagreements about the meanings of the poll questions or of the poll results.

Based upon the review team's needs, the leadership may direct that review team participants do not

have to have their name explicitly associated with any full consensus or consensus view/position. However, in all other cases and in those cases where a group member represents the minority viewpoint, their name must be explicitly linked, especially in those cases where polls were taken.

Consensus calls should always involve the entire review team and, for this reason, should take place on the designated mailing list to ensure that all review team members have the opportunity to fully participate in the consensus process. It is the role of the leadership to designate which level of consensus is reached and announce this designation to the review team. Member(s) of the review team should be able to challenge the designation of the leadership as part of the review team's discussion. However, if disagreement persists, review team members may use the process set forth below to challenge the designation.

If several participants in a review team disagree with the designation given to a position by the leadership or any other consensus call, they may follow these steps sequentially:

1. Send email to the leadership, copying the review team explaining why the decision is believed to be in error.
2. If the leadership still disagrees with the opposing member, a straw poll shall be conducted to determine the result.

### Accountability and Transparency:

#### ***"Section 18.9. MEETINGS***

*(c) IFRT meetings, deliberations and other working procedures shall be open to the public and conducted in a transparent manner to the fullest extent possible.*

*(d) The IFRT shall transmit minutes of its meetings to the Secretary, who shall cause those minutes to be posted to the Website as soon as practicable following each IFRT meeting. Recordings and transcripts of meetings, as well as mailing lists, shall also be posted to the Website."*

Teleconferences and face-to-face meetings will be recorded and streamed, to the extent practicable, and subject to Confidential Framework provisions. However, the record shall reflect this decision, as well as the underlying considerations that motivated such action.

The review team and supporting members of ICANN organization will endeavor to post (a) action items within 48 hours of any telephonic or face-to-face meeting; and (b) streaming video and/or audio recordings as promptly as possible after any such meeting, subject to the limitations and requirements described above.

The review team will maintain a wiki, <https://community.icann.org/display/ifr>, on which it will post: (a) action items, decisions reached, correspondence, meeting agendas, background materials provided by ICANN, members of the review team, or any third party; (ii) audio recordings and/or streaming video; (b) the affirmations and/or disclosures of review team members under the review team's conflict of

interest policy; (c) input, whether from the general public, from ICANN stakeholders, from ICANN organization, the ICANN Board, Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, etc. Absent overriding privacy or confidentiality concerns, all such materials should be made publicly available on the review team website within 48 business hours of receipt.

Email communications among members of the review team shall be [publicly archived](#) automatically via the review email list, [IFRT@icann.org](mailto:IFRT@icann.org). Email communication between team members regarding review teamwork should be exchanged on this list. In exceptional circumstances, such as when required due to Non-Disclosure Agreement or Confidential Disclosure Agreement provisions, non-public email exchanges may take place between review team members and ICANN organization. When possible, a non-confidential summary of such discussions will be posted to the public review email list.

### Reporting:

Review team members are expected to perform their reporting obligations and provide details in terms of content and timelines. Reporting should start when a review team is launched and should continue until its conclusion. The review team should include in this section (a) the information to be reported, (b) the report format to be used, and (c) report intervals, to assure accountability and transparency of the RT vis-a-vis the community. In addition, reference to the quarterly Fact Sheets, assembled by ICANN organization, should be made.

Review team members are, as a general matter, encouraged to report back to their constituencies and others with respect to the work of the review team, unless the information involves confidential information.

While the review team will strive to conduct its business on the record to the maximum extent possible, members must be able to have frank and honest exchanges among themselves, and the review team must be able to have frank and honest exchanges with stakeholders and stakeholder groups. Moreover, individual members and the review team as a whole must operate in an environment that supports open and candid exchanges, and that welcomes re-evaluation and repositioning in the face of arguments made by others.

Members of the review team are volunteers, and each will assume a fair share of the work of the team.

Members of the review team shall execute the investigation according to the scope and work plan, based on best practices for fact-based research, analysis and drawing conclusions.

The review team will engage in dialog with the dedicated ICANN Board Caucus Group, if and when a caucus group is assembled; for example, when the review team reaches a milestone and could benefit from feedback on agreed scope or any recommendations under development to address that scope.

### Subgroups:

The review team can create as many subgroups as it deems necessary to complete its tasks through its standard decision process, as follows:

- Subgroups will be composed of review team members and will have a clear scope, timeline, deliverables and leadership.

- Subgroups when formed will appoint a rapporteur who will report the progress of the subgroup back to the plenary on a defined timeline.
- Subgroups will operate per review team rules and all subgroup requests will require review team approval.
- Subgroups can arrange face-to-face meetings in conjunction with review team face-to-face meetings.
- All documents, reports and recommendations prepared by a subgroup will require review team approval before being considered a product of the review team.
- The review team may terminate any subgroup at any time.

### Outreach:

The review team will conduct outreach to the ICANN community and beyond to support its mandate and in keeping with the global reach of ICANN's mission. As such the review team will ensure the public has access to, and can provide input on, the team's work. Interested community members will have an opportunity to interact with the review team. The review team will present its work and hear input from communities (subject to budget requirements).

### Observers:

Observers may stay updated on the review team's work in several ways:

#### **Mailing-Lists**

Observers may subscribe to the observers mailing-list: [ifrt-observers@icann.org](mailto:ifrt-observers@icann.org). Calendar invites to meetings as well as agendas are forwarded to this mailing-list.

In addition, observers can follow the review team exchanges by subscribing to the RDS-WHOIS2 review team mailing-list with read-only rights only.

#### **Attend a meeting virtually**

All meetings, whether in person or online, will have a dedicated Zoom room for observers.

#### **Attend a meeting in person**

When review team members gather for public face-to-face meetings, Observers may attend to share their input and questions with the review team, as appropriate. The calendar of scheduled calls and meetings is published on the wiki.

#### **Email input to the review team**

Observers may send an email to the review team to share input on their work. Remarks and/or questions can be sent to the following address: [input-to-IFRT@icann.org](mailto:input-to-IFRT@icann.org).

### Closure & Review Team Self-Assessment:

The review team will be dissolved upon the delivery of its final report to the Board, unless assigned additional tasks or follow-up by the ICANN Board are being requested.

Following its dissolution, review team members shall participate in a self-assessment, facilitated by supporting members of ICANN organization, to provide input, best practices, and suggestions for



improvements for future review teams.

## Definitions:

An assessment of this type requires a common understanding of the key terms associated with the review. Initially, the IFR Review Team is operating under the following definitions:

From [Glossary of IANA Terms](#):

- **Country-code top-level domain (ccTLD):** A class of top-level domains only assignable to represent countries listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard. At present these are two-letter codes like “.UK”, “.DE” etc., however in the future it is expected there will be non-Latin equivalents also available. Much of the policy-making for individual country-code top-level domains is vested with a local sponsoring organisation, as opposed to other top-level domains where ICANN sets the policy. It is a requirement that ccTLDs are operated within the country they are designated so appropriate local laws, governments etc. have a say in how the domain is run.
- **DNS – Domain Name System:** The Domain Name System (DNS) helps users to find their way around the Internet. Every computer on the Internet has a unique address - just like a telephone number - which is a rather complicated string of numbers. It is called its "IP address" (IP stands for "Internet Protocol"). IP Addresses are hard to remember. The DNS makes using the Internet easier by allowing a familiar string of letters (the "domain name") to be used instead of the arcane IP address. So instead of typing 207.151.159.3, you can type www.internic.net. It is a "mnemonic" device that makes addresses easier to remember.
- **DNSSEC:** A technology that can be added to the Domain Name System to verify the authenticity of its data. The works by adding verifiable chains of trust that can be validated to the domain name system.
- **DNS zone:** a section of the Domain Name System name space. By default, the Root Zone contains all domain names, however in practice sections of this are delegated into smaller zones in a hierarchical fashion. For example, the “.COM” zone would refer to the portion of the DNS delegated that ends in “.COM”.
- **domain name:** A unique identifier with a set of properties attached to it so that computers can perform conversions. A typical domain name is “icann.org”. Most commonly the property attached is an IP address, like “208.77.188.103”, so that computers can convert the domain name into an IP address. However the DNS is used for many other purposes. The domain name may also be a delegation, which transfers responsibility of all sub-domains within that domain to another entity.
- **domain name label:** a constituent part of a domain name. The labels of domain names are connected by dots. For example, “www.iana.org” contains three labels — “www”, “iana” and “org”. For internationalised domain names, the labels may be referred to as A-labels and U-labels.
- **domain name registrar:** An entity offering domain name registration services, as an agent between registrants and registries. Usually multiple registrars exist who compete with each other, and are accredited. For most generic top-level domains, domain name registrars are accredited by ICANN.
- **domain name registry:** A registry tasked with managing the contents of a DNS zone, by giving registrations of sub-domains to registrants.
- **domain name server:** A general term for a system on the Internet that answers requests to convert domain names into something else. These can be subdivided into authoritative name servers, which store the database for a particular DNS zone; as well as recursive name servers and caching name servers.

- **Domain Name System (DNS):** The global hierarchical system of domain names. A global distributed database contains the information to perform the domain name conversations, and the most central part of that database, known as the root zone is coordinated by us.
- **Domain Name System Root:** see Root Zone.
- **Domain:** A set of host names consisting of a single domain name and all the domain names below it.
- **Domain Name:** As part of the Domain Name System, domain names identify IP resources, such as an Internet website.
- **GNSO - Generic Names Supporting Organization:** The supporting organization responsible for developing and recommending to the ICANN Board substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains. Its members include representatives from gTLD registries, gTLD registrars, intellectual property interests, Internet service providers, businesses and non-commercial interests.
- **gTLD - Generic Top Level Domain:** Most TLDs with three or more characters are referred to as "generic" TLDs, or "gTLDs", such as .COM, .NET, and .ORG. In addition, many new gTLDs such as .HOTELS and .DOCTOR are now being delegated.
- **IDNs — Internationalized Domain Names:** IDNs are domain names that include characters used in the local representation of languages that are not written with the twenty-six letters of the basic Latin alphabet "a-z". An IDN can contain Latin letters with diacritical marks, as required by many European languages, or may consist of characters from non-Latin scripts such as Arabic or Chinese. Many languages also use other types of digits than the European "0-9". The basic Latin alphabet together with the European-Arabic digits are, for the purpose of domain names, termed "ASCII characters" (ASCII = American Standard Code for Information Interchange). These are also included in the broader range of "Unicode characters" that provides the basis for IDNs.
- **Internet Architecture Board (IAB):** The oversight body of the IETF, responsible for overall strategic direction of Internet standardisation efforts. The IAB works with us on how the protocol parameter registries should be managed. The IAB is an activity of the Internet Society, a non-profit organisation.
- **Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA):** A suite of various Internet coordination functions, relating to ensuring globally-unique protocol parameter assignment, including management of the root of the Domain Name System and IP Address Space.
- **Internet Coordination Policy (ICP):** A series of documents created by ICANN between 1999 and 2000 describing management procedures. Three such documents were published before the numbering system stopped being used. Subsequent ICANN publications have not been given ICP numbers.
- **Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG):** The committee of area experts of the IETF's areas of work, that acts as its board of management.
- **Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF):** The key Internet standardisation forum. The standards developed within the IETF are published as RFCs. Our protocol parameter registries are closely aligned with the work of the IETF.
- **Internet Protocol (IP):** The fundamental protocol that is used to transmit information over the Internet. Data transmitted over the Internet is transmitted using the Internet Protocol, usually in conjunction with a more specialised protocol. Computers are uniquely identified on the Internet using an IP Address.
- **IP address:** A unique identifier for a device on the Internet. The identifier is used to accurately route Internet traffic to that device. IP addresses must be unique on the global Internet, although some are

re-used within private networks using a system of private IP addresses and network address translation.

- **ISO:** International Organisation for Standardisation. An international organisation comprised mostly of national standardisation agencies.
- **ISO 3166:** A suite of international standards for labelling countries, territories, sub-national entities and former countries. Most notable, Part 1 of ISO 3166 (aka ISO 3166-1) is used to determine country-codes for top-level domains.
- **recursive name server:** A domain name server configured to perform DNS lookups on behalf of other computers. This is often configured at corporate network boundaries and ISPs for their network customers to use. As an individual domain name lookup can often involve multiple queries to different servers, these name servers do these iterative lookups and only provide back to the computer the final answer. They are often combined with the functions of a caching name server to improve network performance, and therefore are also known as caching resolvers.
- **Redelegation:** The transfer of a delegation from one entity to another. Most commonly used to refer to the redelegation process used for top-level domains.
- **Redelegation process:** A special type of root zone change where there is a significant change involving the transfer of operations of a top-level domain to a new entity. Such a change must be evaluated by ICANN staff to ensure that the new entity meets a number of criteria, and must be voted on and agreed by the ICANN Board of Directors.
- **Registrant:** The entity that has acquired the right to use an Internet resource. Usually this is via some form of revocable grant given by a registrar to list their registration in a registry.

- **Registrar:** Domain names can be registered through many different companies (known as "registrars") that compete with one another. The registrar you choose will ask you to provide various contact and technical information that makes up the registration. The registrar will then keep records of the contact information and submit the technical information to a central directory known as the "registry." This registry provides other computers on the Internet the information necessary to send you e-mail or to find your web site. You will also be required to enter a registration contract with the registrar, which sets forth the terms under which your registration is accepted and will be maintained.
- **Registry:** The "Registry" is the authoritative, master database of all domain names registered in each Top Level Domain. The registry operator keeps the master database and also generates the "zone file" which allows computers to route Internet traffic to and from top-level domains anywhere in the world. Internet users don't interact directly with the registry operator; users can register names in TLDs including .biz, .com, .info, .net, .name, .org by using an ICANN-Accredited Registrar.
- **registry operator:** The entity that runs a registry.
- **reverse IP:** A method of translating an IP address into a domain name, so-called as it is the opposite of a typical lookup that converts a domain name to an IP address. Utilises PTR records in the IN-ADDR.ARPA zone for IPv4, and IP6.ARPA for IPv6.
- **RFCs:** A series of Internet engineering documents describing Internet standards, as well as discussion papers, informational memorandums and best practices. Internet standards that are published in an RFC originate from the IETF. The RFC series is published by the RFC Editor.
- **Root:** the most central (or all-encompassing) authority of any naming or numbering system. Usually used to refer to the domain name system root (see Root Zone). However, we are also the root for IP addresses, and other systems.
- **Root Servers:** the authoritative name servers for the Root Zone. These are considered unlike regular name servers in part because they are generally the most critical and heavily-used name servers. They are also special as they are not easily replaced, as changes to them needs to be stored in every name server worldwide in a hints file.
- **Root Zone:** The top of the domain name system hierarchy. The root zone contains all of the delegations for top-level domains, as well as the list of root servers, and is managed by us.
- **Root Zone Management:** The management of the DNS Root Zone by us.
- **RZM:** see Root Zone Management.

- **sponsoring organization:** The entity acting as the trustee of a top-level domain on behalf of its designated community. Sponsoring organisations are not assigned ownership of a domain, rather, are custodians appointed by their local Internet community to act as proper stewards in that community's best interests. The Sponsoring Organisation can generally be re-assigned if the local Internet community wishes using the redelegation process.
- **sub-domain:** A domain that resides within another domain. For example, "www.icann.org" is a sub-domain of "icann.org", and "icann.org" is a sub-domain of "org". Sub-domains are entrusted to other entities through a process of delegation.
- **TLD:** see top-level domain.
- **top-level domain (TLD):** The highest level of subdivisions with the domain name system. These domains, such as ".COM" and ".UK" are delegated from the DNS Root zone. They are generally divided into two distinct categories, generic top-level domains and country-code top-level domains.
- **Trustee:** An entity entrusted with the operations of an Internet resource for the benefit of the wider community. In root zone management, usually in reference to the sponsoring organisation of a top-level domain.
- **U-label:** The Unicode representation of an internationalised domain name, i.e. how it is shown to the end-user. Contrast with A-label.
- **Unicode:** A standard describing a repertoire of characters used to represent most of the worlds languages in written form. The collection of scripts used to do this is maintained by the Unicode Consortium and is constantly growing. Unicode is the basis for internationalised domain names.
- **unsponsored top-level domain:** a sub-classification of generic top-level domain, where there is no formal community of interest.
- **Variant:** In the context of internationalised domain names, an alternative domain name that can be registered, or mean the same thing, because some of its characters can be registered in multiple different ways due to the way the language works. Depending on registry policy, variants may be registered together in one block called a variant bundle. For example, "internationalise" and "internationalize" may be considered variants in English.
- **variant bundle:** A collection of multiple domain names that are grouped together because some of the characters are considered variants of the others.
- **variant table:** A type of IDN table that describes the variants for a particular language or script. For example, a variant table may map Simplified Chinese characters to Traditional Chinese characters for the purpose of constructing a variant bundle.
- **WHOIS:** WHOIS protocol (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym) An Internet protocol that is used to query databases to obtain information about the registration of a domain name (or IP address). The WHOIS protocol was originally specified in RFC 954, published in 1985. The current specification is documented in RFC 3912. ICANN's gTLD agreements require registries and registrars to offer an interactive web page and a port 43 WHOIS service providing free public access to data on registered names. Such data is commonly referred to as "WHOIS data," and includes elements such as the domain registration creation and expiration dates, nameservers, and contact information for the registrant and designated administrative and technical contacts. WHOIS services are typically used to identify domain holders for business purposes and to identify parties who are able to correct technical problems associated with the registered domain.
-

