ent text in the proposal

omer Standing Committee

WG is proposing that the CSC take on the NTIA's responsibilities with respect to managing the IANA Functions Operato
rts on performance. The CSC would take on certain duties currently performed by the Contracting Officer (CO) or Contr
er's Representative (COR) per the NTIA Contract with the IANA Functions Operator. The CSC would be primarily made u
er of representatives of registry operators; it is possible that liaisons or representatives from other SO/ACs, as well as
duals with relevant expertise, will also form part of the CSC (exact composition and manner of selection TBD). Input fro
vould feed into and inform the work of the MRT. The CSC would receive and review IANA Functions Operator reports a
ate any significant issues to the MRT. Specifically, the CSC would take on the duties currently performed by the CO or C
ollowing items currently required by the NTIA Contract and expected to be required by the post-transition IANA Functio
ract:

- C.2.9.2.c (receive and review) Delegation and Re-delegation of a Country Code Top Level-Domain (ccT
  reports
- C.2.9.2.d (receive and review) Delegation and Re-delegation of a Generic Top Level Domain (gTLD)) re
- C.4.2 (receive and review) Monthly Performance Progress Report
- C.4.3 (monitor and review performance of) Root Zone Management Dashboard
- C.5.1 Audit Data – (receive and review annual report)
- C.5.2 (receive and review) Root Zone Management Audit Data
- C.5.3 External Auditor (ensure performance of, receive and review results)

rts currently produced for the NTIA per the NTIA IANA Functions Contract (**unless otherwise specified, reports would**
produced post-transition and would require someone to receive them as well as to provide some type of validation
r the CSC or MRT):

Performance Reports

1.1.   C.4.2 Monthly Performance Progress Report

2.1.1.1.   Monthly from IANA, not public

1.2.   C.4.4 Performance Standards Reports.

2.1.2.1.   Monthly from IANA, Public (see Annex 1 for example)
2.1.2.2.   http://www.iana.org/performance/metrics

1.3.   C.5.2 Root Zone Management Audit Data.

2.1.3.1.   Monthly from IANA, Public (see Annex 2 for example)
2.1.3.2.   http://www.iana.org/performance/root-audit

Reports dealing with changes to the Root Zone or its Whois Database.

2.2.1.2.1.   If the CWG proceeds with this proposal it will also have to decide who receives the certification or completed. One will assume that this certification would become part of the IANA Reports (previous item

2.2.   Change requests to the Root Zone or its Whois Database which are not delegations or re-delegations. - The NTIA currently receives requests for all changes to the Root Zone and its Whois Database. Unlike the IANA Reports for delegations or re-delegations, these requests are never posted. The only public view of these requests is the month Zone audit report.

  2.2.2.1.   Section 3.5.3.1 of the public consultation (Public posting of all IANA change requests) is proposing that all requests for changes to the Root Zone or its Whois Database be publicly posted:

    2.2.2.1.1.   *Current proposal: IANA will be required to publicly post all requests for changes to the Root Zone F Root Zone WHOIS database as a notification that a change is being made. IANA will also continue to be re to produce and publish Delegation and Re-delegation Reports.*

  2.2.2.2.   Should the CSC or the MRT continue to receive these requests/reports post transition? - The NTIA current receives these requests for all such changes. This can essentially be broken down into two components: (1) confirmation that a change request has been made and (2) the authorization, or not, of this request.

    2.2.2.2.1.   Considering the proposal that all change requests be posted (previous section), we need to consid whether there is additional value in have IANA send individual requests that are not related to delegatio redelegations to the CSC or the MRT.

    2.2.2.2.2.   Authorization of requests – this is still under consideration.

2.3.   Reports which are not requests for changes to the Root Zone or its Whois Database. – The NTIA's IANA functions lists a number of these reports which are to be received by the NTIA. These break down into three major categorie

  2.2.3.1.   One time reports (start up and contract end).

    2.2.3.1.1.   C.2.11 The Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) will perform final inspection and acceptanc deliverables and reports articulated in Section C.2 Contractor Requirements (for deliverables and require of section C2).

    2.2.3.1.2.   C.4.6 Final Report – end of contract.

    2.2.3.1.3.   C.4.7 Inspection and Acceptance (for deliverables and requirements of section C4).

    2.2.3.1.4.   C.5.4 Inspection and Acceptance (for deliverables and requirements of section C5).

  2.2.3.2.   Annual Reports:

    2.2.3.2.1.   C.3.4 Security Plan

    2.2.3.2.2.   C.4.5 Customer Service Survey (CSS).

    2.2.3.2.3.   C.5.1 Audit Data

    2.2.3.2.4.   C.6.2.4 Conflict Of Interest Enforcement and Compliance Report.

    2.2.3.2.5.   C.7.2 Contingency and Continuity of Operations Plan (The CCOP)

    2.2.3.2.6.   C.7.3 Transition to Successor Contractor

  2.2.3.3.   Other reports

       3.1.1.1.   C.4.2 Monthly Performance Progress Report

       3.1.1.2.   C.4.4 Performance Standards Reports.

       3.1.1.3.   C.5.2 Root Zone Management Audit Data.

1.2.   Proposed Evaluation requirements

       3.1.2.1.   Verify reports have been delivered per schedule

       3.1.2.2.   Verify reports are in the correct format

       3.1.2.3.   Verify reports contain required information

       3.1.2.4.   Verify performance targets are being met.

       3.1.2.5.   Verify issues presented in the Monthly Performance Report were or are being handled satisfactorily.

1.3.   Scope of the CSC for performance reports

       3.1.3.1.   If there are no issues with the evaluation produce a public confirmation to this effect by the CSC.

       3.1.3.2.   If there are issues with the reports:

           3.1.3.2.1.   Try to resolve issues directly with the IANA Contractor.

           3.1.3.2.2.   If resolved produce a completed issue report.

           3.1.3.2.3.   If the issue cannot be resolved escalate to the MRT via an open issue report.

1.4.   Base requirements to accomplish this

       3.1.4.1.   At a bare minimum this would require three individuals (to insure no single point of failure and avoid dea
               with appropriate industry knowledge and experience to review two reports on a monthly basis (a few hours a
               there are no issues) and agree on the conclusion to be acted upon (usually posting notice that there are no iss
               the reports).

Should the CSC be tasked with additional functions?

2.1.   Although the CSC was originally conceived to only deal with performance related reports, this was very early on i
     process and did not necessarily consider all reports and functions. When considering the number of reports which
     produced as well as the volume associated with some of these (IANA Reports – delegations and re-delegations) it s
     doubtful that an MRT that does not meet often could deal with this appropriately. This does not imply that some o
     reports are not for MRT consideration and action but rather that the basic administrative mechanics of process (in
     schedules for delivery of reports) and initial validation are already part of the CSC and it would seem effective to ha
     CSC, which needs to meet regularly (most likely on a monthly schedule), receive all reports for both itself and the N
     following sections will propose some possible parameters to frame these functions in the CSC.

IANA Reports (delegations and redelegations of TLDs)

3.1.   Currently these reports are used by IANA as the request for obtaining authorization from the NTIA. These are pos
     the IANA web site following the completion of the requested action (http://www.iana.org/reports). This can essen
     broken down into two components: (1) confirmation that a change request has been made and (2) the authorizatic
     not, of this request. (**note this assumes that the current IANA practice of post-action posting of the IANA report c**

3.3.2.4.1.　　Note: Over the years IANA has had a number of cases of introducing what many ccTLDs consider le
stealth policy changes under the cover of changes to the IANA Reports. These are usually easy for someo
adequate experience to spot and would seem to be consistent with the type of work that is being reques
the CSC. However, this should probably be made explicit in the tasks of the CSC

3.3.　Scope of the CSC for performance reports

3.3.3.1.　　If there are no issues with the evaluation, produce a public confirmation to this effect by the CSC.
3.3.3.2.　　If there are issues with the reports:

3.3.3.2.1.　　Try to resolve issues directly with the IANA Contractor.
3.3.3.2.2.　　If resolved produce a completed issue report.
3.3.3.2.3.　　If the issue cannot be resolved escalate to the MRT via an open issue report.

3.4.　Base requirements to accomplish this

3.3.4.1.　　Given the volume of these and if it is a post action report these could be reviewed by a single individual w
would report to the full CSC prior to posting the results. However, if this is a pre-action report, more timely re
be critical, so at least two individuals should be tasked to this. If there are no issues the report could consist o
confirming that the CSC has reviewed the report. Time requirement = 200 hours per year (estimate)

Reports which are not requests for changes to the Root Zone or its Whois Database - One time reports (start up and co
end).

4.1.　These reports are neither regular nor scheduled and will be negotiated with IANA by the MRT and as such will be
directed towards those selected by the MRT to handle this.

Reports which are not requests for changes to the Root Zone or its Whois Database - Annual Reports.

5.1.　These include:

3.5.1.1.　　C.3.4 Security Plan
3.5.1.2.　　C.4.5 Customer Service Survey (CSS).
3.5.1.3.　　C.5.1 Audit Data
3.5.1.4.　　C.6.2.4 Conflict Of Interest Enforcement and Compliance Report.
3.5.1.5.　　C.7.2 Contingency and Continuity of Operations Plan (The CCOP)
3.5.1.6.　　C.7.3 Transition to Successor Contractor

5.2.　Evaluation requirements

3.5.2.1.　　Verify reports have been delivered in a timely fashion
3.5.2.2.　　Verify reports are in the correct format
3.5.2.3.　　Verify reports contain required information

5.3.　Scope of the CSC for performance reports

3.5.4.1.   Given the CSC will only carry out a summary evaluation of these reports prior to transmission to the MRT could be carried out by a single member of the CSC having his evaluation reviewed by the full CSC. Total time = a few days per year at most.

Reports which are not requests for changes to the Root Zone or its Whois Database - Other Reports

.6.1.   C.3.5 Director of Security - The Contractor shall notify and consult in advance the COR when there are personnel in this position

3.6.1.1.   This is not a report per se and this notice could be directed to the MRT directly.

 of questions and issues for the CWG to consider on this topic:

ection 2 - Reports currently produced for the NTIA per the NTIA IANA Functions Contract (**unless otherwise specified re ould continue to be produced post-transition and would require some to receive them as well as provide some type alidation from the CSC or MRT**):
ection 2.2.2.2 - Should the CSC or the MRT continue to receive these requests/reports (change requests to the Root Zo hois Database that are not delegation or re-delegation requests) post transition?
  o (Proposal) Considering the proposal that all change requests be posted (previous section) it would seem that the be little additional value in having IANA send individual requests which are not related to delegations or re-deleg the CSC or the MRT.
ection 3.1 Proposal for CSC handling Performance reports
ection 3.2 Recommendation and justification to have the CSC handle more than just performance reports.
ection 3.3 (if 3.2 accepted) Proposal for CSC handling delegation and redelegation reports. This proposal may need to b mended to take into account the decision on authorizing change requests.
ection 3.4 – proposal to not have the CSC handle one time reports
ection 3.5 (if 3.2 accepted) Proposal for CSC handling annual reports
ection 3.6 – proposal to not have the CSC handle reports on change of IANA Director of Security

Performance Standards Report

This report is produced in accordance with Section C.4.4 of Contract Number SA130112CN0035 for IC performance of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions. This report is for the reporting pe October 1, 2014 - October 31, 2014.

·ting Period

From: 1 October 2014
To:　31 October 2014

nary

C.2.9.1 — Assignment of Technical Protocol Parameters
C.2.9.2.a,b — Root Zone and WHOIS Change Requests
Timeliness . . . . Target met
Accuracy . . . . Target met
C.2.9.2.c — ccTLD Delegation and Redelegation
Timeliness . . . . Target not met
Accuracy . . . . Target met
C.2.9.2.d — gTLD Delegation and Redelegation
Timeliness (end-to-end) . . . . Target met
Timeliness (new gTLD processing) . . . . Target met
Accuracy . . . . Target met
C.2.9.3 — Allocation of Internet Numbering Resources
Accuracy (1) . . . . Target met
Accuracy (2) . . . . Target met
Timeliness and Process Quality (1) . . . . Target met
Timeliness and Process Quality (2) . . . . Target met
Transparency (1) . . . . Target met
Transparency (2) . . . . Target met

1 — Assignment of Technical Protocol Parameters

Performance reporting for the assignment of technical protocol parameters is provided in the monthl Performance Reports.

2 — Root Zone File Request Management

within 21 days.

Accuracy — The requests that have passed validation are implemented correctly at the conclusion of a change request.	100%	100%	✅

Requests Performed

The following requests were completed under Section C.2.9.2.a and C.2.9.2.b during the reporting period:

TLD	Dates				Targets met	
	Request received	Request validated	Request dispatched	Request completed	Timeliness	Acc
ly	2014-09-10	2014-10-03	2014-10-06	2014-10-07	✕	✓
museum	2014-09-17	2014-10-06	2014-10-07	2014-10-10	✕	✓
ng	2014-09-24	2014-10-10	2014-10-13	2014-10-14	✓	✓
coop	2014-09-24	2014-10-16	2014-10-17	2014-10-17	✕	✓
gq	2014-09-27	2014-09-29	2014-09-30	2014-10-01	✓	✓
мон	2014-09-30	2014-10-02	2014-10-03	2014-10-06	✓	✓
tirol	2014-10-01	2014-10-01	2014-10-02	2014-10-02	✓	✓
menu	2014-10-01	2014-10-02	2014-10-03	2014-10-03	✓	✓
gq	2014-10-02	2014-10-02	2014-10-03	2014-10-03	✓	✓
mz	2014-10-03	2014-10-03	2014-10-06	2014-10-07	✓	✓
tg	2014-10-05	2014-10-11	2014-10-14	2014-10-15	✓	✓
tz	2014-10-06	2014-10-07	2014-10-09	2014-10-11	✓	✓
fi	2014-10-07	2014-10-09	2014-10-10	2014-10-15	✓	✓
pl	2014-10-08	2014-10-09	2014-10-10	2014-10-15	✓	✓
tp	2014-10-08	2014-10-10	2014-10-13	2014-10-15	✓	✓
sj	2014-10-09	2014-10-09	2014-10-10	2014-10-15	✓	✓
bn	2014-10-10	2014-10-14	2014-10-15	2014-10-16	✓	✓
il	2014-10-12	2014-10-13	2014-10-14	2014-10-15	✓	✓
wed	2014-10-12	2014-10-29	2014-10-31	2014-10-31	✓	✓
ao	2014-10-14	2014-10-24	2014-10-27	2014-10-27	✓	✓
jp	2014-10-14	2014-10-15	2014-10-16	2014-10-20	✓	✓

C.2.9.2.c — Delegation and Re-delegations for Country-Code TLDs

Key Performance Indicators

Metric	Target	Actual	Target
Timeliness — End-to-end processing times for changes pertaining to delegation or re-delegation of country-code top-level domains are within 120 days.	50%	33.3%	✗
Accuracy — The requests that have been approved by the applicant are implemented correctly at the conclusion of a change request.	100%	100%	✓

Requests Performed

The following requests were completed under Section C.2.9.2.c during the reporting period:

	Dates				Targets met	
TLD	Request received	Request validated	Request dispatched	Request completed	Timeliness	Acc
mk	2014-04-10	2014-04-23	2014-10-22	2014-10-22	✗	✓
мкд	2014-04-10	2014-04-23	2014-10-22	2014-10-22	✗	✓
	2014-07-22	2014-08-05	2014-10-22	2014-10-24	✓	✓

C.2.9.2.d — Delegation and Re-delegations for Generic TLDs

Key Performance Indicators

Metric	Target	Actual	Target
Timeliness — End-to-end processing times for changes pertaining to delegation or re-delegation of generic top-level domains are within 30 days.	80%	100%	✓
Timeliness — Requests to delegate new gTLDs are dispatched to the Root Zone Administrator within 14 days of validation (passing technical checks and other confirmations).	100%	100%	✓
Accuracy — The requests that have been approved by the applicant are implemented correctly at the conclusion of a change request.	100%	100%	✓

	received	validated	dispatched	completed	end)	processing)	
crs	2014-09-17	2014-10-08	2014-10-14	2014-10-15	✅	✅	✅
alsace	2014-09-23	2014-10-01	2014-10-02	2014-10-06	✅	✅	✅
forsale	2014-09-25	2014-09-25	2014-09-30	2014-10-01	✅	✅	✅
ibm	2014-09-25	2014-09-26	2014-09-30	2014-10-01	✅	✅	✅
allfinanz	2014-09-26	2014-09-26	2014-09-30	2014-10-01	✅	✅	✅
flsmidth	2014-09-26	2014-10-06	2014-10-09	2014-10-15	✅	✅	✅
band	2014-10-02	2014-10-02	2014-10-14	2014-10-15	✅	✅	✅
poker	2014-10-03	2014-10-08	2014-10-10	2014-10-15	✅	✅	✅
abogado	2014-10-07	2014-10-08	2014-10-14	2014-10-15	✅	✅	✅
yoga	2014-10-08	2014-10-13	2014-10-14	2014-10-15	✅	✅	✅
wedding	2014-10-08	2014-10-08	2014-10-14	2014-10-15	✅	✅	✅
emerck	2014-10-08	2014-10-16	2014-10-20	2014-10-22	✅	✅	✅
rip	2014-10-09	2014-10-09	2014-10-14	2014-10-15	✅	✅	✅
taipei	2014-10-20	2014-10-20	2014-10-21	2014-10-23	✅	✅	✅

3 — Allocation of Internet Numbering Resources

Key Performance Indicators

Metric	Target	Actual	Targe
Accuracy (1) — Policy is correctly implemented.	100%	100%	✅
Accuracy (2) — Registry is updated before notifying requestor of allocation.	100%	100%	✅
Timeliness and Process Quality (1) — For a specific request, ICANN does not need to seek more than two iterations of clarification from the requesting Regional Internet Registry in order to correctly apply the registration policy.	100%	100%	✅
Timeliness and Process Quality (2) — Requests are to be completed within 7 days.	100%	100%	✅
			✅

same day as the allocation being recorded in the IANA registry.

No requests were completed during the reporting period.

Global Policy Implementation

No global policy changes were completed during the reporting period.

Annex 2 Monthly Root Operations Audit Report

C.5.2 Root Operations Audit Report

This report is produced in accordance with Section C.5.2 of Contract Number SA130112CN0035 for ICANN's performance of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions. This report is for the reporting period of September 1, 2013 through September 15, 2013.

Reporting Period

From:	1 September 2013
To:	15 September 2013

Root Zone Modification Requests and Related Transactions

The following requests were implemented during the audit period. All requests were processed according to RFC 1591, ISO 3166-1, and the GAC Principles.

1.1.1.1. Review of changes implemented for accuracy

TLD	Change Details	Final status (Reason for non-completion if applicable)	Date of Implementation or Closure
md	Updated Administrative Contact	Withdrawn (Withdrawn by applicant)	2013-09-02
укр	Multiple nameserver changes involving DNS1.U-REGISTRY.COM, DNS2.U-REGISTRY.NET, DNS3.DOTUKR.COM	Withdrawn (Withdrawn by applicant)	2013-09-02
by	Remove name server DNS6.TLD.TUTBY.COM	Completed	2013-09-03
sz	Add name server NS1.SISPA.ORG.SZ	Completed	2013-09-03
nu	Updated Nameserver Records	Completed	2013-09-05
bw	Multiple nameserver changes involving DNS1.NIC.NET.BW, PCH.NIC.NET.BW,	Completed	2013-09-06

	NS4.BTC.BW, RAIN.PSG.COM, NS-BW.AFRINIC.NET, HIPPO.RU.AC.ZA, DNS2.NIC.NET.BW, DAISY.EE.UND.AC.ZA, VPSM.BTC.BW, NS.UU.NET		
ve	Add name server SNS-PB.ISC.ORG	Completed	2013-09-06
укр	Multiple nameserver changes involving DNS1.U-REGISTRY.COM, DNS2.U-REGISTRY.NET, DNS3.DOTUKR.COM	Completed	2013-09-06
ee	Remove name server NS.UU.NET	Withdrawn (Withdrawn by applicant)	2013-09-06
md	Updated Administrative Contact	Completed	2013-09-10
nu	Updated Domain Metadata	Completed	2013-09-10
gov	Added 2 and removed 2 DS records	Completed	2013-09-11
ee	Multiple nameserver changes involving E.TLD.EE, NS.UU.NET	Completed	2013-09-11
af	Multiple nameserver changes involving ADRAS.NIC.AF, NS-AF.RIPE.NET, AF4.DYNTLD.NET, AF2.DYNTLD.NET	Completed	2013-09-12

Annex 3 – Example of Board Minutes prepared by IANA regarding the re-delegation of a ccTLD

a. *Re-delegation of the .VG domain representing the British Virgin Islands*

Resolved (2014.03.27.02), as part of the exercise of its responsibilities under the IANAFunctions contract, ICANN has reviewed and evaluated the request to redelegate the .VG country-code top-level domain to the Telecommunications Regulatory Commission of the British Virgin Islands. The documentation demonstrates that the proper procedures were followed in evaluating the request.

Resolved (2014.03.27.03), the Board directs that pursuant to Article III, Section 5.2 of theICANN Bylaws, that certain portions of the rationale not appropriate for public distribution within the resolutions, preliminary report or minutes at this time due to contractual obligations, shall be withheld until public release is allowed according to those contractual obligations.

Rationale for Resolutions 2014.03.27.02 – 2014.03.27.03

Why is the Board addressing the issue now?

In accordance with the IANA Functions contract, the ICANN staff has evaluated a request forccTLD re-delegation and is presenting its report to the Board for review. This review by the Board is intended to ensure that ICANN staff has followed the proper procedures.

What is the proposal being considered?

The proposal is to approve a request to change the sponsoring organization (also known as the manager or trustee) of the .VG country-code top-level domain to the Telecommunications Regulatory Commission of the British Virgin Islands.

Which stakeholders or others were consulted?

In the course of evaluating a delegation application, ICANN staff consults with the applicant and other interested parties. As part of the application process, the applicant needs to describe consultations that were performed within the

country concerning the ccTLD, and their applicability to the local Internet community.

What concerns or issues were raised by the community?

Staff received multiple inquiries from the Internet community regarding the dispute within AdamsNames Ltd., the listed technical contact for .VG which is currently responsible for operating the name servers for the registry. The dispute raised concerns over the stability of the domain as well as over the pricing for registration of second-level domains under .VG.

[Portions of Rationale Redacted]

What factors did the Board find to be significant?

The Board notes that the current technical contact for the domain does not agree to this change request. However, because the formally appointed manager of the domain is dissolved, and there is consensus within the local Internet community — including the government — that the domain should be redelegated, ICANN concludes that the interests of the local Internet community are best served by implementing this request.

Are there positive or negative community impacts?

The timely approval of country-code domain name managers that meet the various public interest criteria contributes positively to ICANN's overall mission, the local communities to which country- code top-level domains are designated to serve, and responsive to ICANN's obligations under the IANA Functions contract.

Are there financial impacts or ramifications on ICANN (strategic plan, operating plan, budget); the community; and/or the public?

The administration of country-code delegations in the DNS root zone is part of the IANAfunctions, and the delegation action should not cause any significant variance on previously planned expenditure. It is not ICANN's role to assess the financial impact of the internal operations of country-code top-level domains within a country.

Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS?

ICANN does not believe this request poses any notable risks to security, stability or resiliency.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function that does not require public comment.

Annex 4 – Example of an IANA report on re-delegation of a ccTLD

http://www.iana.org/reports/2014/gw-report-20140603.html

Report on the Re-delegation of the .GW domain representing Guinea-Bissau to the Autoridade Reguladora Nacional das Tecnologias de Informação e Comunicação da Guiné Bissau

3 June 2014

This report is being provided under the contract for performance of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) function between the United States Government and the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). Under that contract, ICANN performs the "IANA functions", which include receiving delegation and re-delegation requests concerning TLDs, investigating the circumstances pertinent to those requests, making its recommendations, and reporting actions undertaken in connection with processing such requests.

Factual Information

1.1.1.2. Country

The "GW" ISO 3166-1 code is designated for use to represent Guinea-Bissau.

1.1.1.3. Chronology of events

The currently designated manager for the .GW top-level domain is Fundação IT & MEDIA Universidade de Bissao, as described in the IANA Root Zone Database. Over the past two years, ICANN's IANA department has received several reports from the community that the administrative contact and sponsoring organization for .GW are unreachable.

On 24 May 2010 the Supreme Court of Justice of Guinea-Bissau declared the nonexistence of Fundação IT & MEDIA Universidade de Bissao. Since that time, a variety of applicants have submitted unsuccessful re-delegation requests.

In October 2012, the Ministry Council of Guinea-Bissau approved the Decree No. 7/2012 that empowered the Autoridade Reguladora Nacional das Tecnologias de Informação e Comunicação da Guiné Bissau (ARN) to lead and manage the .GW top-level domain. One month later, an agreement was signed between Fundacao para a Computacao Cientifica Nacional (FCCN), the private nonprofit organisation responsible for managing the .PT (Portugal) top-level domain, and ARN. The agreement governs the terms of the cooperation between the parties and the support that will be provided by FCCN to ARN. FCCN has agreed to use its experience managing the country-code top-level domain for Portugal to provide technical support for ARN in managing the .GW domain. ARN's goal is to eventually become fully autonomous.

On 3 January 2013, ARN commenced a request to ICANN for re-delegation of the .GW top-level domain. The .GW registry data has been communicated to DNS.PT by the domain's current technical contact, DENIC.

In August 2013, the .PT top-level domain was redelegated from FCCN to Associação DNS.PT. Associação DNS.PT inherited all the responsibilities that were already previously assumed as part of FCCN, including the collaboration with ARN.

1.1.1.4. Proposed Sponsoring Organisation and Contacts

The proposed sponsoring organisation is Autoridade Reguladora Nacional das Tecnologias de Informação e Comunicação da Guiné Bissau, a national regulatory authority in Guinea-Bissau.

The proposed administrative contact is Frank Barbosa de Oliveira, Member of the Board of Autoridade Reguladora Nacional das Tecnologias de Informação e Comunicação da Guiné Bissau. The administrative contact is understood to be based in Guinea-Bissau.

The proposed technical contact is Assis Neves Guerreiro, Manager of Technical Infrastructure Service, Associação DNS.PT.

Evaluation of the Request

1.1.1.5. String Eligibility

The top-level domain is eligible for continued delegation under ICANN policy, as it is the assigned ISO 3166-1 two-letter code representing Guinea-Bissau.

1.1.1.6. Public Interest

Support for the application to redelegate the domain was provided by Rui Duarte Barros, the Prime Minister of Guinea-Bissau. Additional statements in support of this re-delegation were provided by two local telecommunications companies, Spacetel Guinea-Bissau and Orange Bissau.

The application is consistent with known applicable local laws in Guinea-Bissau.

The proposed sponsoring organisation undertakes responsibility to operate the domain in a fair and equitable manner.

1.1.1.7. Based in country

The proposed sponsoring organisation is constituted in Guinea-Bissau. The proposed administrative contact is understood to be resident in Guinea-Bissau.

1.1.1.8. Stability

The existing sponsoring organisation has been dissolved, and as such ICANN is unable to obtain formal explicit consent for the transfer.

The current administrative contact for the domain does not consent to the change request. He proposed an alternative re-delegation request that was deemed insufficient. The application was not revised after an extended opportunity to remedy its deficiencies, and was therefore administratively closed. A transfer plan was provided by ARN for the re-delegation of .GW to mitigate any risks relating to Internet stability.

1.1.1.9. Competency

The application has provided satisfactory details on the technical and operational infrastructure and expertise that will be used to operate the .GW domain. Proposed policies for management of the domain have also been tendered.

Evaluation Procedure

ICANN is tasked with coordinating the Domain Name System root zone as part of a set of functions governed by a contract with the U.S. Government. This includes accepting and evaluating requests for delegation and re-delegation of top-level domains.

A subset of top-level domains are designated for the local Internet communities in countries to operate in a way that best suits their local needs. These are known as country-code top-level domains (ccTLDs), and are assigned by ICANN to responsible trustees (known as "Sponsoring Organisations") that meet a number of public-interest criteria for eligibility. These criteria largely relate to the level of support the trustee has from its local Internet community, its capacity to ensure stable operation of the domain, and its applicability under any relevant local laws.

Through ICANN's IANA department, requests are received for delegating new ccTLDs, and redelegating or revoking existing ccTLDs. An investigation is performed on the circumstances pertinent to those requests, and, when appropriate, the requests are implemented and a recommendation for delegation or re-delegation is made to the U.S. National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA).

1.1.1.10.　　　Purpose of evaluations

The evaluation of eligibility for ccTLDs, and of evaluating responsible trustees charged with operating them, is guided by a number of principles. The objective of the assessment is that the action enhances the secure and stable operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems.

In considering requests to delegate or redelegate ccTLDs, input is sought regarding the proposed new Sponsoring Organisation, as well as from persons and organisations that may be significantly affected by the change, particularly those within the nation or territory to which the ccTLD is designated.

The assessment is focussed on the capacity for the proposed sponsoring organisation to meet the following criteria:

- The domain should be operated within the country, including having its sponsoring organisation and administrative contact based in the country.
- The domain should be operated in a way that is fair and equitable to all groups in the local Internet community.
- Significantly interested parties in the domain should agree that the prospective trustee is the appropriate party to be responsible for the domain, with the desires of the national government taken very seriously.
- The domain must be operated competently, both technically and operationally. Management of the domain should adhere to relevant technical standards and community best practices.
- Risks to the stability of the Internet addressing system must be adequately considered and addressed, particularly with regard to how existing identifiers will continue to function.

1.1.1.11.　　　Method of evaluation

To assess these criteria, information is requested from the applicant regarding the proposed sponsoring organisation and method of operation. In summary, a request template is sought specifying the exact

details of the delegation being sought in the root zone. In addition, various documentation is sought describing: the views of the local internet community on the application; the competencies and skills of the trustee to operate the domain; the legal authenticity, status and character of the proposed trustee; and the nature of government support fort he proposal. The view of any current trustee is obtained, and in the event of a re-delegation, the transfer plan from the previous sponsoring organisation to the new sponsoring organisation is also assessed with a view to ensuring ongoing stable operation of the domain.

After receiving this documentation and input, it is analysed in relation to existing root zone management procedures, seeking input from parties both related to as well as independent of the proposed sponsoring organisation should the information provided in the original application be deficient. The applicant is given the opportunity to cure any deficiencies before a final assessment is made.

Once all the documentation has been received, various technical checks are performed on the proposed sponsoring organisation's DNS infrastructure to ensure name servers are properly configured and are able to respond to queries correctly. Should any anomalies be detected, ICANN staff will work with the applicant to address the issues.

Assuming all issues are resolved, an assessment is compiled providing all relevant details regarding the proposed sponsoring organisation and its suitability to operate the relevant top-level domain.

Annex 5 – Example of an IANA Delegation report for a gTLD (.party)

Note – this copy presents formatting issues vs the original at
http://www.iana.org/reports/c.2.9.2.d/20141117-party

Delegation Report for .party

2014-11-17

This report is produced in accordance with Section C.2.9.2.d of Contract Number SA130112CN0035 for the performance of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions. Under the contract, ICANN verifies that all requests relating to the delegation and re-delegation of gTLDs are consistent with the procedures developed by ICANN. Documentation is provided verifying that ICANN followed its own policy framework including specific documentation demonstrating how the process provided the opportunity for input from relevant stakeholders and was supportive of the global public interest.

Summary

- gTLD delegation eligibilityDeemed Eligible
- Applicant matches approved partyYes
- Contact ConfirmationsCompleted
- Technical ConformanceCompleted
- Other processingCompleted

Domain information

U-label	party	The U-label is the presentation form of the domain. It is the version that is expected to be used by end-users in applications.
A-label	party	The A-label is the encoded form of the domain. It is the version that may be seen as part of technical configuration management. For non-ASCII domains, this version may also be needed in applications that do not have full IDN support.

Applicant information

The proposed sponsoring organisation for this domain is:

Blue Sky Registry Limited
2nd Floor, Leisure Island Business Centre
Ocean Village, Gibraltar, GX11 1AA
Gibraltar

IANA change request eligibility

New gTLD Application Process Completed — ICANN produces a "New gTLD Program String Delegation Readiness Report" that serves as a confirmation that the application submitted for the delegation of a new generic top-level domain name has completed all applicable phases of the New gTLD Program which included opportunities for input from relevant stakeholders as outlined in the Applicant

Report 1-1214-59403

Guidebook and the ICANN New gTLD Program website.

Applicant matches the contracted party — The entity listed as the "sponsoring organisation" in the Root Zone Database has overall responsibility for managing the delegation details with the IANA functions. The entity proposed as sponsoring organisation must match the contracted party that has been approved as part of the New gTLD Program.	Matches
Contact confirmations — The proposed points-of-contact for the domain must confirm their details are correct and agree to responsibility for management of the domain.	Completed
Technical conformance — The proposed technical configuration of the domain must pass a number of minimum technical requirements in order to be listed in the DNS Root Zone.	Completed
Other requirements — The request must pass a number of procedural checks conducted for all root zone changes in order to be transmitted for authorisation and implementation.	Completed