IANA Stewardship Transition Cross Community Working Group (CWG) on Naming Related Functions

CWG RFP 4

Transition Implications

December 29, 2014 @ 2100 UTC

Agenda
Dec 29, 2014

* 1. Review of previous call

* 2. Updates:
    * 2.1 Other communities (IETF, RIR's..)
    * 2.2 Work stream #1 – Current Situation
    * 2.3 Work stream #2 – Describing the transition path
    * 2.4 Work stream #3 – Testing the proposal

* 3. Review & next steps

1. Review of previous call

* Olivier Crepin Leblond to discuss timeline with his colleagues and send result to the mailing list

* Staff to circulate call for volunteers to further elaborate tasks list

* All to elaborate tasks list in preparation of next call

* IN PROGRESS: Staff to aggregate the threats / risk list (thank you Siva for creating Google Doc)

* IN PROGRESS: All to categorize elements on that list in two categories: Out of scope of this group , Should be included as risk/stress test item

2. Updates

2.1 Updates
IETF

IETF
Transition implications

- **No structural changes are required for the handling of protocol parameters**

- **As no services are expected to change, no continuity issues are anticipated, and there are no new technical or operational methods proposed by the IETF to test.**

- **The IETF leadership, ICANN, and the RIRs maintain an ongoing informal dialog to spot any unforeseen issues that might arise as a result of other changes**

2.2 Updates

Consolidated RIR IANA Stewardship Proposal (CRISP)

CRISP
Transition implications (1)

1. Description of the intent

1. *Minimize risks to operational continuity of the management of the Internet number related IANA functions, and;*

2. *Retain the existing framework for making those policies that describe the management of the global Internet number resource pools, as this framework is already structured to ensure open, bottom-up development of such policies.*

CRISP
Transition implications (2)

- The shift from existing arrangements to new ones should result in no operational change. This will help minimize any operational or continuity risks associated with stewardship transition.

- Shift from NTIA being responsible to contract with 5 RIR's, who would coordinate decisions via NRO Executive Council.

- By building on the existing Internet registry system and its structures, the proposal reduces the risk associated with creating new organizations whose accountability is unproven

- The agreement can be established well before the NTIA target date for transition (September 2015) as no changes to service levels or reporting being proposed.

2.3 Updates
Work streams

2.3.3 Work stream #3

- **Testing the new proposal**
  - **Some scenarios as visualized by the Business Constituency, SSAC and Mathieu Weill are captioned and listed in the table (Siva)**
  - **https://docs.google.com/document/d/1QVC12Q-NuB35pyaBirUDF85DBR_oFHkEYC5vbWu04go/edit?usp=sharing**
  - **Review stress-tests table (excel) : walk though and comment on if/not relevant to our RFP 4 discussions**

- **Critical Periods**
  - **Develop a list of key periods where proposal should be tested (& how)**

2.3.2 Work stream #2

- **<u>Transition path</u>**
  - **Draft text was circulated on how to describe changes (review)**
  - **Transition path for alternate proposals (ie. ALAC)**

2.3.1 Work stream #1

- **Current situation**
  - **Review of existing ICANN/IANA Technical proposal**
  - **Discussion of using table of contents from ICANN/IANA Technical proposal as a template to develop text on how this will change depending on RFP 3 (Contract Co. <-> all internal, inclusion of IAP etc.).**
  - **Identify relevant terms in the ICANN proposal as well**

3. Review & next steps

- **4. Review & next steps**
  - **Next call**
    - **6 January 2015 (14:00 – 16:00 UTC)**

THANK YOU