

a) **Role and responsibilities of the CSC in relation to the administration and oversight of the statement of work;**

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

- C.2.9.2.c (receive and review) Delegation and Re-delegation of a Country Code Top Level-Domain (ccTLD) reports
- C.2.9.2.d (receive and review) Delegation and Re-delegation of a Generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) ) reports
- 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)

b) **Identify and list IANA reports that are currently provided to the NTIA or provided as a result of the IANA Contract and specify and list those that are expected to be provided by the IANA Functions Operator post-transition;**

**Unless otherwise specified, reports would continue to be produced post-transition and would require someone to receive them as well as to provide some type of validation from either the CSC or MRT):**

1. Performance Reports:

- C.4.2 Monthly Performance Progress Report
  - Monthly from IANA, not public
- C.4.4 Performance Standards Reports.
  - Monthly from IANA, Public (see Annex 1 for example)
  - <http://www.iana.org/performance/metrics>
- C.5.2 Root Zone Management Audit Data.
  - Monthly from IANA, Public (see Annex 2 for example)
  - <http://www.iana.org/performance/root-audit>

2. Reports dealing with changes to the Root Zone or its Whois Database.
  - Delegation and re-delegation Reports (these are used by IANA as the request for authorization to the NTIA).
    - IANA Reports (delegations and re-delegations of TLDs)
      - As required from IANA, public (See Annex 4 and 5 for examples)
      - <http://www.iana.org/reports>
    - Independent certification for delegation and re-delegation requests (section 3.5.3.2 of public consultation) – Proposed.  
If the CWG proceeds with this proposal it will also have to decide who receives the certification once completed. One will assume that this certification would become part of the IANA Reports (previous item).
  - 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 monthly Root Zone audit report.
    - 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:
    - Current proposal: IANA will be required to publicly post all requests for changes to the Root Zone File or the Root Zone WHOIS database as a notification that a change is being made. IANA will also continue to be required to produce and publish Delegation and Re-delegation Reports.
    - Should the CSC or the MRT continue to receive these requests/reports post transition? - The NTIA currently 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.
    - Considering the proposal that all change requests be posted (previous section), we need to consider whether there is additional value in have IANA send individual requests that are not related to delegations or redelegations to the CSC or the MRT.
    - Authorization of requests – this is still under consideration.
  - Reports which are not requests for changes to the Root Zone or its Whois Database. – The NTIA’s IANA functions contract lists a number of these reports which are to be received by the NTIA. These break down into three major categories:
    - One time reports (start up and contract end).
      - C.2.11 The Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR) will perform final inspection and acceptance of all deliverables and reports articulated in Section C.2 Contractor Requirements (for deliverables and requirements of section C2).
      - C.4.6 Final Report – end of contract.
      - C.4.7 Inspection and Acceptance (for deliverables and requirements of section C4).
      - C.5.4 Inspection and Acceptance (for deliverables and requirements of section C5).

- Annual Reports:
  - C.3.4 Security Plan
  - C.4.5 Customer Service Survey (CSS).
  - C.5.1 Audit Data
  - C.6.2.4 Conflict Of Interest Enforcement and Compliance Report.
  - C.7.2 Contingency and Continuity of Operations Plan (The CCOP)
  - C.7.3 Transition to Successor Contractor
- Other reports
  - C.3.5 Director of Security - The Contractor shall notify and consult in advance the COR when there are personnel changes in this position

**c) Specify an instruction for CSC, describing a process how, post transition, the CSC will review these reports, and**

1. **Performance Reports** – It is generally agreed in the CWG that the CSC receive and evaluate monthly performance reports from IANA to quickly identify any performance issues. This implies:

List of performance reports currently produced:

- C.4.2 Monthly Performance Progress Report
- C.4.4 Performance Standards Reports.
- C.5.2 Root Zone Management Audit Data.

Proposed Evaluation requirements

- Verify reports have been delivered per schedule
- Verify reports are in the correct format
- Verify reports contain required information
- Verify performance targets are being met.
- Verify issues presented in the Monthly Performance Report were or are being handled satisfactorily.

Scope of the CSC for performance reports

- If there are no issues with the evaluation produce a public confirmation to this effect by the CSC.
- If there are issues with the reports:
  - Try to resolve issues directly with the IANA Contractor.
  - If resolved produce a completed issue report.
  - If the issue cannot be resolved escalate to the MRT via an open issue report.

Base requirements to accomplish this

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

- 2. IANA Reports (delegations and redelegations of TLDs)** Currently these reports are used by IANA as the request for obtaining authorization from the NTIA. These are posted on the IANA web site following the completion of the requested action (<http://www.iana.org/reports>). 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. (note this assumes that the current IANA practice of post-action posting of the IANA report on its website would continue as is). Given the authorization function is still an open question we will proceed with the assumption that the CSC is receiving IANA Reports on delegations and re-delegations but not for the purpose of authorization (this can be reviewed accordingly once the authorization question is resolved).

#### Evaluation requirements

- Verify reports have been delivered in a timely fashion
- Verify reports are in the correct format
- Verify reports contain required information
- Identify any significant variations in reporting.

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

#### Scope of the CSC for performance reports

- If there are no issues with the evaluation, produce a public confirmation to this effect by the CSC.
- If there are issues with the reports:
  - Try to resolve issues directly with the IANA Contractor.
  - If resolved produce a completed issue report.
  - If the issue cannot be resolved escalate to the MRT via an open issue report.

#### Base requirements to accomplish this

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

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

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

These include:

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

Evaluation requirements

- Verify reports have been delivered in a timely fashion
- Verify reports are in the correct format
- Verify reports contain required information

Scope of the CSC for performance reports

- Confirm that the CSC and not the MRT will conduct initial review of Annual Reports.
- If there are no issues with the evaluation produce a public confirmation to this effect by the CSC.
- If there are issues with the reports:
  - Try to resolve issues directly with the IANA Contractor.
  - If resolved produce a completed issue report.
  - If the issue cannot be resolved escalate to the MRT via an open issue report.

Base requirements to accomplish this

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

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

- C.3.5 Director of Security - The Contractor shall notify and consult in advance the COR when there are personnel changes in this position
  - This is not a report per se and this notice could be directed to the MRT directly.
- d) Specify an instruction for CSC, describing a process how, post transition, the reporting requirements will be reviewed.**
- e) Specify an instruction for CSC, describing remedial action in the event of poor performance of IANA against specified SLAs.**
- f) Specify an instruction for CSC, of what is not mandated or out of scope.**
- g) Consider whether it would be appropriate for the CSC to be an initial point of escalation for TLD operators who are experiencing IANA performance issues.**
- h) Consider the extent to which the CSC could engage with IANA on emerging issues, that is those issues that are currently unforeseen, that impact registry operators and IANA services.**

**i) Composition of the CSC taking into account the agreed role and responsibilities of the CSC by the Design Team.**

**[Notes from RFP3 meeting of 19/1:**

*Composition (page 2)*

- How is the names community defined? Symantic distinction maybe revert back to 'other MS organizations'?
- CSC focused on direct customers, but with a small number of representatives of other groups/organizations bringing specific expertise to the group (e.g. SSAC, RSSAC).
- Currently customers already review IANA reports and information and report back accordingly. No barriers to issues being raised or brought forward, but focus should be on customers and technical function.
- CSC may not need to meet for more than once every year or every two years
- Functions of CSC should be narrowly focused
- 1 non-customer representative, possibly drawn from MRT (liaison that could also speak on behalf of broader non-customer base?)
- CSC would not be the new authorization function -  
would meet monthly to have a quick check of reports and if there are any issues, discuss how to resolve these (as currently already happens) by speaking directly to IANA. Only if issues are not resolved would these be escalated to MRT (no ability to interrupt / delay any IANA services).
- Proposal -  
Min of 2 ccTL registry reps/ min of 2 gTLD registry reps, with others able to opt in over time.

*How will the member seats on the CSC be allocated?*

- By CWG or MRT? Or by registries?
- Registries (gTLD/ccTLD) should allocated registry seats.
- SSAC/RRSAC/MS seats -  
consider a similar model as used by SSAC? Consider applications based on skills / expertise including peer review.
- Selection process driven by those that have seats on CSC including some form of selection / credentialing.
- Observers should be allowed (e.g. mailing list publicly archived, meeting recordings made available)
- Should ccTLD registry representative seats be allocated by region? -  
up by each group (gTLD registries/ccTLD registries) to determine how many representatives are needed and whether any geographic diversity is required.

*Term length and limits*

- Term limit could be aligned with contract cycle -  
e.g. if term is 5 years, minimum term should be 5 years.

*How will decisions be made?*

- What would CSC be voting on? Possibly when to escalate something to MRT -  
but generally it would be expected to be rough consensus driven without any need for votes.

*Capture*

- Is there anything that this group could do that is beyond its remit? Capture needs to be looked at on a case by case basis. CSC has oversight role, escalation and reporting - what would be there to be captured?

*Site visits*

- Are part of the current contract - should these be continued by CSC or MRT? Are these still needed?]