- ccNSO IFR Guideline
 - Wick-off IANA Function review
 - Board resolution
 - members selection

non-ccNSO members

What happens if none ccNSO steps forward? Is seat left vacant? Number is decreasing

Section 18.7 Requirement is: rep from ccTLD that is not member of ccNSO Appointed by the ccNSO Recommended that the ccNSO consult with regional Orgs in making its appointment

Use selection mechanisms CCWG Stewardship?

Invite non-meber, non-liaiosn participants ccNSO members

Procedure

Expression of interest

Section 18.8 (a)

Disclosure conflict of Interest after appointment

Section 18.8 (b)

Effort to achieve diversity balanced IFRT

Section 18.8 (c)

Assumes coordination

ccNSO not appoint members same Region

Section 18.8 (c)

Vacancy

appointing org

Vacancy

ccNSO appointed co-chair

Section 18.7 (a-b)

Particpant

Section 18.8 (g) Participants not appointed by ccNSO.

member removal

Section 18.8 (h) (i)

Notification to co-chairs and Secretary of ICANN

removal by appointing organisation

Mandate & requirements members

Section 18.5 (c) If recommendation IFRT focuses on a service specific to ccTLD registry operators, no recommendation if opposition from any ccNSO members appointed member (Includes non-ccNSO member, as this person is appointed by ccNSO)

Purpose & scope IFR

Reviews of PTI's performance of the IANA naming function against the contractual requirements set forth in the IANA Naming Function Contract and the IANA Naming Function SOW

Scope of review

Section 18.3

Performance PTI against requirements in INFC in relation expectations direct customers and broader community

Section 18.3 (a)

Review performance against requirements in INFC and INF SOW

Section 18.3 (b)

Review INF SOW and recommend changes to INFC and INF SOW to account for needs direct customers and/or community at large

Section 18.3 (c) what if conflciting views between direct cusotmers and broader community? Example: need for disclosure and transperancy see Section 18. 5 (c).

In any case where a recommendation of an IFRT focuses on a service specific to ccTLD registry operators, no such recommendation shall be made by the IFRT in any report to the community (including any report to the Board) if opposition to such recommendation is expressed by any IFRT member appointed by the ccNSO.

Openness and transparency procedures of PTI and any oversight structures for PTI's performance ?

Section 18.3 (d). Does this alos look into role of CSC

Review Performance and effectiveness of the EC with respect to actions taken by the EC

Review and evaluate performance of INF according to SLE during IFR period and compared to previous period

Section 18.3 (f) to what extend is this similar to role of the CSC: see Section 17.1: The mission of the CSC is to ensure continued satisfactory performance of the IANA naming function for the direct customers of the naming services. The direct customers of the naming services are toplevel domain registry operators as well as root server operators and other non-root zone functions.

The CSC will achieve this mission through regular monitoring of the performance of the IANA naming function against the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW and through mechanisms to engage with PTI to remedy identified areas of concern.

Review if systematic issues that ar impacting PTI's performance under INFC and INF SOW Section 18.3 (g)

Compre wiht Remedial Action Procedures and mission CSC as defined in its charter: See updated Charter CSC:

The CSC is authorized to undertake remedial action to address performance issues in accordance with the Remedial Action Procedures (RAP) as agreed between PTI and the CSC and published on the CSC website. The RAP may be updated from time to time in accordance with the change mechanism included in the RAP.

In the event performance issues are not remedied to the satisfaction of the CSC, despite goodfaith attempts to do so, and following the agreed escalation processes contained in the RAP, the CSC is authorized to escalate the performance issues to the ccNSO and GNSO Councils for consideration

Community input on issues considered relevant for IFR

Section 18.10 (a). REstricted to area scope as defined in section 18.3?

Scope of activities

Public comment periods

Section 18.3 (h)

Consider input from CSC and community on PTI's performance

Section 18.3 (i)

Scope of assessment

Identify process and other areas of improvement in performance of IANA Naming Function under INFC and SOW

Section 18.3 (j)

Identify process and other areas of improvement in performance of the CSC and the EC as it relates to oversight of PTI

Section 18.3 (j)

Note the potential overlap with effectiveness review of CSC

Consider and assets any changes implemented since the immediately preceding IFR and their implications for performance of PTI under the contract and SOW

Section 18.3 (k)

Required Inputs

Section 18.4

PTI reports

If need be redacted

Pursuant to Confidential Disclosure Framework set forth in Operating Standards Section 4.6 (a)(vi)

Realtion with Specific reviews

CSC Reports

Community input

Community consitlations , surveys, in person session at ICANN meetings, public meetings of IFRT.

Recommendations for improvement by CSC or community

Section 18.4 (d)

Results on site visit

🔻 output IFR

Recommendations to comply with section 18.5

Section 18.5 (a)

requirements recommendations

```
Section 18.5 (B)
```

identify Improvements

supported by data

associated analysis about existing definecies

how to adress issues

Include proposed remedial procedures

How does procedures address issue

Include proposed timelines for implementation of recommendations

Prioritise each recommendation and rational

If focus on specific service ccTLD, no recommendation if objection ccNSO appointed member

Section 18.5 (c): Porcedure needed to ensure this is captured properly

If recommendation change of Contract, SOW or CSC Charter

Section 18.6.

IFR may change CSC charter .

How does this relate to requirement of CSC charter approval (Section 17.3) related to section. Section 18.6 (g): Charter amendment needs to be approved by ccNSO an dGNSO Councils

Consult Board

Consult CSC

Public comeent

Input session ccTLD and gTLD registry operators

Recommendation to change INFC or SOW

Super majority vote ccNSO Council (2/3 thirds)

Public comment period

Board approved IFR Recommendation

▼ No EC rejection of the Board approval

Rejection Action process applies

Section 18.6 (d) applies: Reejction Action Porcess.

No Board approval after ccNSO Council and GNSO Council adoption rejection able action

IFR recommendation.

Community forum

General section Guideline

1 Miscellaneous

1.1 ccNSO Internal Guideline

This Guideline is an internal rule of the ccNSO in accordance with Article 10 section 3.(k) and Article 10 section 4. of the ICANN Bylaws. This Guideline should also be considered as the internal procedure of the ccNSO to elect ccNSO Council members.

1.2 Omission in or unreasonable impact of the Guideline

In the event the Guideline does not provide guidance and/or the impact is unreasonable to conduct the business of the ccNSO, the ccNSO Council, or the review team, the Chair of the ccNSO will decide.

1.3 Publication and Review of Guidelines

The Guideline will be published as part of the rules and guidelines of the ccNSO after adoption by the ccNSO Council.

The Guideline will be reviewed after any changes to the relevant sections in the ICANN bylaws or change of the Operating Standards, or otherwise adjusted when considered necessary. In order to become effective the updated Guideline must be adopted by the ccNSO Council and published on the ccNSO website.

Before publishing the updated Guideline, the Secretariat will update the version number and insert the date the Guideline was reviewed and adopted by the ccNSO.