Design Team N.	Periodic Review of IANA Functions
Draft Transition Proposal Reference	III.A.1.4
Summary Description	Regardless of the model selected to implement the transition the SOW will have to be reviewed on a regular basis. This requirement brings on several additional requirements: • What period (duration) should be covered by the first SOW post transition? • What should be the standard period for reviewing SOWs post transition? • What should be the process for reviewing or amending SOWS (including approval by the community and acceptance by ICANN)?
	The current definition and operational parameters (including the format of request and reporting requirements) for these functions in the IANA Functions contract and IANA Response have to be reviewed to ensure they meet all the post transition requirements.
Detailed description	Considerations that need to be included in the considerations of the SOW length include: • what is a sufficient length to avoid the thrash of constant SOW review? • what would be so long as to create too much of a status quo assumption? Considerations on the standard period for a SOW review include: • Is the SOW reviewed at intermediate stages or just on reconsideration of the SOW • Is a regular period, like yearly, necessary? If so, what is the periodicity? Consideration on process for review and renewal include: • who are the relevant stakeholders? • what sort of process structure is warranted? • do periodic reviews have a different structure than
	 review for renewal? what are the objective issues any such review should take up? How is the wider community involved in such a review?

	 Is it done by a standing committee of some sort (for example the MRT or any of its model based analogues) or a team built for purpose like an ICG or CWG.
Proposed Membership	
Proposed by / Lead	provisional volunteer - Avri Doria
Status	Step 0
Determination by CWG Chairs	Priority 1 (Provisional)