Registries Stakeholder Group Statement

**Issue:** Fundamental Bylaws Amendment Proposal – IANA Naming Function Review

Date statement submitted: **26 July 2019**

**Background**

The proposed change to Bylaws Section 18.7(b), regarding the IANA Naming Function Review Team’s Composition, would remove the requirement for the ccNSO to identify a non-ccNSO member ccTLD representative and instead allow the ccNSO to appoint three representatives to the team, regardless of ccNSO member status.

---

**Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) comment:**

The Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the proposed Fundamental Bylaws Amendment Proposal – IANA Naming Function Review.

The RySG supports the amendment as proposed.

We would like to take the opportunity during this comment period to reflect on other challenges encountered in establishing the IANA Naming Function Review Team as a result of the requirements identified in the bylaws, specifically as they relate to geographic diversity:

**Section 18.8. MEMBERSHIP; ELECTION OF CO-CHAIRS, AND LIAISONS**

(c) To the extent reasonably possible, the appointing organizations for the IFRT members and liaisons shall work together to achieve an IFRT that is balanced for diversity (including functional, geographic and cultural) and skill, and should seek to broaden the number of individuals participating across the various reviews; provided, that the IFRT should include members from each ICANN Geographic

---

1 Background: intended to give a brief context for the comment and to highlight what is most relevant for RO’s in the subject document – it is not a summary of the subject document.
Region, and the ccNSO and *Registries Stakeholder Group shall not appoint multiple members who are citizens of countries from the same ICANN Geographic Region.*

The membership of the RySG is currently 84 members: 36 from Europe; 32 from North America; 12 from Asia Pacific; 2 from Latin America and 1 from Africa. Our original call for volunteers, which was over 12 months ago, identified two well-qualified volunteers from North America; however, because of the geographic requirement highlighted above we had to conduct a second call in order to satisfy the requirement. While we were able to address the problem on this occasion, it is foreseeable that this may not always be the case and as such consideration should be given to building some flexibility into the bylaws to overcome this situation. Otherwise, we run the risk that a future process may also be subject to significant delays while attempts are made by the RySG to satisfy the geographic requirement.

The RySG understands and acknowledges the importance of geographic diversity; however, we believe it is important for others to recognise the limitations we sometimes face in meeting prescribed ICANN Bylaw requirements because of the composition of our membership.