

GNSO gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group Comments

Issue: Further Notice of Inquiry (FNOI) - The Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions

Date: July 28, 2011

Request for public comments URL:

http://www.ntia.doc.gov/frnotices/2011/FR_IANA_FurtherNOI_06142011.pdf

From: National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA)

[Docket No. 110207099-1319-02] [RIN 0660-XA23]

The Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions

AGENCY: NTIA, U.S. Department of Commerce

This statement on the issue noted above is submitted on behalf of the ICANN GNSO gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG). The statement that follows represents a consensus position of the RySG as further detailed at the end of the document. The RySG statement was arrived at through a combination of RySG email list discussion and RySG meetings (including teleconference meetings).

As a user of the IANA functions, the RySG appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions. We benefit every day from the stable and secure operation of the IANA functions and thank you for your leadership in that regard.

Comments about the Draft Statement of Work (Draft SOW)

C.1.4

The second sentence of this section says “The interested and affected parties include, but are not limited to, the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) and the Internet Architecture Board (IAB), regional registries, country code top-level domain (ccTLD) operators/managers, governments, and the Internet user community.” We recognize that the ‘interested and affected parties’ are not limited to this list but we are curious as to why generic top-level domain operators/managers are not included and note the majority of the domain names in the world are associated with gTLDs.

Comments in Response to a Five of the FNOI Questions

Note that FNOI questions are printed in *italic font* with RySG responses indented and in normal font.

1. *Does the language in “Provision C.1.3” capture views on how the relevant stakeholders as sources of the policies and procedures should be referenced in the next IANA functions contract. If not, please propose specific language to capture commenters’ views.*

We support the requirement that the “the Contractor shall advise the Government of that (confidentiality) obligation” but believe it would be helpful if the language was stronger. We suggest that the Contractor should not just advise the Government of that obligation but commit to fulfilling that obligation.

5. *Does the new “Provision C.2.2.1.3.2 Responsibility and Respect for Stakeholders” adequately address concerns related to the root zone management process in particular how the IANA functions contractor should document its decision making with respect to relevant national laws of the jurisdiction which the TLD registry serves, how the TLD reflects community consensus among relevant stakeholders and/or is supported by the global public interest. If not, please provide detailed suggestions for capturing concerns. Are the timeframes for implementation reasonable?*

The last sentence of provision C.2.2.1.3.2 says the following: “For delegation requests for new generic TLDs (gTLDs), the Contractor shall include documentation to demonstrate how the proposed string has received consensus support from relevant stakeholders and is supported by the global public interest.” We note that IANA has historically and fundamentally implemented highly objective methods and steps in relation to its duties, tasks and responsibilities. The incorporation of this provision seems to break from this rule by going down the path of subjectivity for delegation requests for new gTLDs. NTIA introduces the likelihood for the need for new checks and balances that do not today exist within the ICANN framework. We definitely believe that delegating gTLDs into the root is a necessary and critical IANA function [i.e., function (2) in the Summary of the In our understanding of the Further Notice of Inquiry], but we have always understood that to be a technical function that is performed in accordance with policy developed outside of the IANA operation. We also note that provision C.2.2.1.1 of the Draft SOW directs that “. . . all staff dedicated to executing the IANA functions remain separate and removed (not involved) from any policy development that occurs related to the performance of the IANA functions.” In our assessment, requiring the IANA Contractor to “include documentation to demonstrate how the proposed string has received consensus support from relevant stakeholders” and “is supported by the global public interest” would violate provision C.2.2.1.1. But it is possible that we are misinterpreting what was intended. Regardless, we think that clarification of this issue would be very helpful.

7. *Does the new “Provision C.2.2.1.3.5 Customer Service Complaint Resolution Process” provide an adequate means of addressing customer complaints? Does the new language provide adequate guidance to the IANA functions contractor on how to develop a customer complaint resolution? If not, please provide detailed comments and suggestions for improving the language.*

We recommend that language be added to require that:

- 24 hour customer service be offered every day of the year.
 - Service level requirements be established for both initial response times and closure of customer service requests.
 - Monthly customer service reports be publicly posted within 15 days of the previous month.
8. *Does the new “Provision C.3.6 Contingency and Continuity of Operations Plan (CCOP)” adequately address concerns regarding contingency planning and emergency recovery? If not, please provide detailed comments and suggestions for improving the language. Are the timeframes for implementation reasonable?*

We support the requirement that the “Contractor shall, in collaboration with relevant stakeholders, develop and implement a CCOP for the IANA functions within nine (9) months after date of contract

award.” But we question whether nine (9) months will be sufficient time to do that, especially considering the need for community collaboration.

9. *Does the new “Section C.4 Performance Standards Metric Requirements” adequately address concerns regarding transparency in root zone management process, and performance standards and metrics? Should the contractor be required to gather and report on statistics regarding global IPv6 and DNSSEC deployment? If so, how should this requirement be reflected in the SOW? What statistics should be gathered and made public?*

We commend the focus on metrics and suggest that the metrics be developed “in collaboration with relevant stakeholders” as required in provision C.3.6.

We suggest a minor edit in provision C.4.1: Change the reporting period to “previous calendar month” instead of “previous 30-day period”.

Summary of RySG Member Support

The above comments represent the views of the RySG as indicated below. The RySG comments were arrived at through a combination of RySG email list discussion and RySG meetings (including teleconference meetings).

- 1.1. Level of Support of Active Members: Supermajority
 - 1.2. # of Members in Favor: 12
 - 1.3. # of Members Opposed: 0
 - 1.4. # of Members that Abstained: 0
 - 1.5. # of Members that did not vote: 2
2. Minority Position(s): N/A

General RySG Information

- Total # of eligible RySG Members¹: 15
- Total # of RySG Members: 14
- Total # of Active RySG Members²: 14

¹ All top-level domain sponsors or registry operators that have agreements with ICANN to provide Registry Services in support of one or more gTLDs are eligible for membership upon the “effective date” set forth in the operator’s or sponsor’s agreement (RySG Charter, Article II, RySG Membership, Sec. A). The RySG Charter can be found at http://www.gtldregistries.org/sites/gtldregistries.org/files/Charter_for_RySG_6_July_2011_FINAL.pdf .

² Per the RySG Charter, Article II, RySG Membership, Sec. D: Members shall be classified as “Active” or “Inactive”. An active member must meet eligibility requirements, must be current on dues, and must be a regular participant in RySG activities. A member shall be classified as Active unless it is classified as Inactive pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph. Members become Inactive by failing to participate in three consecutively scheduled RySG meetings or voting processes or both. An Inactive member shall continue to have membership rights and

- Minimum requirement for supermajority of Active Members: 10
- Minimum requirement for majority of Active Members: 8
- # of Members that participated in this process: 14
- Names of Members that participated in this process:
 1. Afilias (.info & .mobi)
 2. DotAsia Organisation (.asia)
 3. DotCooperation (.coop)
 4. Employ Media (.jobs)
 5. Fundació puntCAT (.cat)
 6. ICM, Inc. (.xxx)
 7. Museum Domain Management Association – MuseDoma (.museum)
 8. NeuStar (.biz)
 9. Public Interest Registry - PIR (.org)
 10. RegistryPro (.pro)
 11. Societe Internationale de Telecommunication Aeronautiques – SITA (.aero)
 12. Telnic (.tel)
 13. Tralliance Registry Management Company (TRMC) (.travel)
 14. VeriSign (.com, .name, & .net)
 - Names & email addresses for points of contact
 - Chair: David Maher, dmaher@pir.org
 - Alternate Chair: Keith Drazek, kdrazek@verisign.com
 - Secretariat: Cherie Stubbs, Cherstubbs@aol.com
 - RySG representative for this statement: Chuck Gomes, cgomes@verisign.com

duties except being counted as present or absent in the determination of a quorum. An Inactive member immediately resumes Active status at any time by participating in a RySG meeting or by voting..