

Draft for Design Team consideration

Chronology of CWG-Stewardship work on IANA IPR since submission to ICG:

Call Date	Summary of CWG discussion	Questions for Design Team
Statement of 2 July	In Buenos Aires, there was some concern over the draft text in the CWG proposal -- the text appeared to be in conflict with the other communities. CWG issued a statement to clarify that the text was draft only. CWG intended to deal with IPR further in implementation.	N/A
6 August call	<p>CWG tasked Sidley with producing a memo on this issue. Sidley examined three structures and presented them on the 6 August call:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICANN maintains ownership of rights • PTI becomes owner of rights • a Trust (could be IETF Trust) becomes owner of rights 	<p><i>Note: Based on later statements (see 1 September statement), the CWG decided to proceed with the trust option.</i></p> <p>1. What should be the requirements if the Trust to ensure continued operations, stability and security of the IANA functions in the event of separation?</p>
6 August call	The main takeaway from Sidley was that the owner of the mark needs to exercise some control/oversight of the mark(s).	<p>2. Does the Design Team consider this one of the principles or requirements for the names community?</p> <p>3. Does the Design Team think that the needs of all three operational communities should be taken into consideration in exercising control/oversight of the IPR?</p>
6 August call	The CWG agreed that it would be useful to understand how the IETF trust manages existing trademarks.	4. What information remains to be provided to the Design Team?
20 August call	The CWG agreed on: a neutral/independent trust and the communities can focus on requirements for this trust during implementation.	5. What does the Design Team propose to be the defining qualities of a neutral/independent trust that will serve in this role?
Statement of 1 September	“Accordingly, the CWG hereby formally confirms that its position is consistent with that of the other two respondents to the ICG RFP in that it has no objection to the IANA trademarks and the IANA domain names (iana.org , .com and .net) being transferred to an entity independent of the IANA Functions Operator. For the avoidance of doubt, we view the CWG position as also consistent with the ICANN Board statement of 15 August 2015 on the same subject.”	<p>6. Does the Design Team confirm that IFO operational control (and transfer) of domain names is one of the principles/requirements for the names community?</p> <p>7. Can the Design Team specify the elements that would define a neutral/independent trust?</p>