IFRT Plenary Meeting #16

IFRT PLENARY MEETING, 18 AUGUST 2020 ***RT Members: If you have corrections, please email Amy at amy.creamer@icann.org***

# INITIAL REPORT DISCUSSION POINTS

The below discussion points are for the team to consider as they review the draft report. These comments have also been inserted where appropriate in the draft report itself.

## #1 DISCUSSION POINT

Regarding Recommendation .int, this text on page 3

Contractual Reference: IANA Naming Functions Contract, Article IV, Section 4.3 (b)

Recommendation Summary: The IFRT suggests that some clarity should be made in the contract to clarify the policy functions related to the .INT zone. Specifically the IFRT found that there is a challenge in validation of the registrants data due to the manner in which the .int zone is managed. Additionally the IFRT feels that an evaluation on the introduction of a structured renewal process for .int domains should be considered.

Expected Due Date: ICANN Board Recommendation Approval + 365 Days

Evaluation Criteria

1. IANA Functions Contract updated with new language regarding the policy development and management of the .int registry
2. PTI undertakes an internal evaluation on the domain renewal process for .int domains for evaluation by the ICANN Board.
3. Comment by Kim Davies: for Evaluation Criteria #2 – what kind of evaluation is expected?
4. Comment by Peter Koch: believes this should not be the first Recommendation in the report. Peter will also suggest some new or extra text.

## #2 DISCUSSION POINT

Regarding Recommendation 2 on PTI user manuals, this text on page 3

Contractual Reference: IANA Naming Functions Contract, Article IV, Section 4.6

Recommendation Summary: The IFRT finds that PTI has published user instructions for IANA services and systems on icann.org. However the IFRT recommends that the depth and nature of the user training and documentation be improved for end users of the IANA services.

Expected Due Date: ICANN Board Recommendation Approval + 180 Days

Evaluation Criteria

1. PTI works in conjunction with a designated set of IFRT members to review and update the training documents. The IFRT member reports that the updates are suitable and meets the requirements of this recommendation.
2. Kim: PTI needs specificity on what should be improved.
3. Fred: will review and respond with more details

#3 DISCUSSION POINT

Regarding Rec 3 on publishing all CCOP results, page 4

Recommendation Summary:The IFRT recommends that PTI publishes all previous CCOP test reports since 2016 and should continue to publish future reports within 90 calendar days of the annual test, as required by the contract.

1. Kim: the CCOP was not done in 2016 & 2017 for justified reasons and OKed by ICANN. IFRT suggested removing "reports since 2016" and just stating that "all CCOP test reports need to be published in 90 days"

# ACTION ITEMS

1. Peter Koch:. will also suggest some new or extra text for Recommendation on .int. (may get re-ordered) on .int
2. Fred: will give more details on what needs to be improved in user guides from Rec 2