

Design Team N.	Periodic Review of IANA Functions
Draft Transition Proposal Reference	III.A.1.4
Summary Description	<p>Regardless of the model selected for post- transition oversight of the IANA Function, the IANA Naming Functions will have to be reviewed on a regular basis. Reviews should include the overall services provided by the IANA Functions Operator, with respect to the naming functions, as well as a review of the IANA Statement of Work (SOW).</p> <p>The review requirement brings on several additional requirements related to the IANA SOW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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)? <p>Review current periodic reports required by existing IANA Contract and make recommendations regarding retaining, revising or discarding same.</p> <p>Additional issues to be covered includes defining other aspects of the naming related IANA functions that would</p>

	benefit from regular review, but may not be explicitly referenced in the IANA Statement of Work
Detailed description	<p>Considerations that need to be included in the considerations of the SOW review length include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● 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? <p>Considerations on the standard period for a SOW review include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● 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? <p>What other reviews need to be carried out in the overall review of the IANA naming functions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● What is the scope of periodic reviews?● What additional services or parameters should be regularly reviewed that may not be explicitly referenced in the SOW?● Where are these services or parameters defined?● How often should these reviews take place?● By what process should these reviews be carried out and changes be made to these parameters and services? <p>Consideration on process for all reviews and renewal include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Who are the relevant stakeholders?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● What body should coordinate reviews?<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ How should it be composed?○ How should it be structured?○ What is the scope of its responsibility for leading the review?● What sort of process structure is warranted?● Should all elements covered under a periodic review follow the same process, structure, and timeline?● What are the goals of periodic reviews?● How is the wider community involved in such a review? <p>Periodic [Operational] Review of IANA Functions</p> <p>Identify, assess and determine whether to include or exclude existing reports from the current NTIA-ICANN contract. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● annual program review (contract C.4.1)● annual site visit (contract C.4.1)● review of various reports<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The Performance Standards Metric Reports (C.4.4)○ annual customer service survey consistent with the performance standards for name services (C.4.5)● review of audit reports<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ security process (C.5.1)○ RZM data audit (C.5.2)○ Annual External audit (C.5.3)● Conflict of Interest review<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ COI Policy (C.6.1)
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Conflict Of Interest Enforcement and Compliance Report (C.2.4)○
Proposed Membership	
Proposed by / Lead	provisional volunteer - Avri Doria
Status	Step 0
Determination by CWG Chairs	Priority 1 (Provisional)

Note: these need to be coordinated with the other design teams that may have indicated not only the reviews to be done, but the intervals in which they are to be done.

Ref	Review Type	Frequency	Responsible	Dependency	Notes
	Statement Of Work (SOW)		CSC		
	Review monthly performance report	Monthly	CSC		
	Site visit	Annual		DT-C	Questions whether this is needed?
	Review CSC report on SOW report		Community Function		
	Program review	Annual	Community function		
	Review performance metrics		CSC		
	Review customer survey report		CSC		
	Review security		CSC		

	process report				
	Review RZM audit report		CSC RZOs		
	Review annual audit report		CSC		
	Review COI requirements		Community Function		
	Review COI Enforcement audit report		Community Function		

Tasks

- Need to check SSAC 69 i.e. DT E
- and need to be guided by the Registries’ guidance document
- good that we are checking the output of the other DTs

Statement of Work Duration and Review Periodicity

What period (duration) should be covered by the first SOW post-transition?

It is critical that any proposal provide opportunities to improve the performance of the IANA functions as well as to review the proposed oversight structure against the needs of its customers and the ICANN community. This is especially critical in the initial period following the transition of the IANA Naming Functions, in order to account for lessons learned as a result of the transition and to review the effectiveness of new structures created pursuant to the transitions and any implications for IANA performance. As a result, we recommend that the initial IANA SOW for the naming functions be reviewed no more than **[two years]** from the date of transition. This review would be led by a multi-stakeholder body drawn from the ICANN community and consider the following:

- The performance of the IANA Functions Operator against the requirements set forth in the IANA Statement of Work;

- Any necessary additions to the IANA statement of work to account for the needs of consumers of the IANA naming functions or the ICANN community at large;
- Openness/transparency procedures for the IANA Functions Operator and any oversight structures, including reporting requirements and budget transparency;
- The effectiveness of new structures created to carry out IANA oversight in monitoring performance and, as needed, initiating remediation with the IANA Functions Operator and
- The relative performance of the IANA Functions pre- and post-transition according to established service levels.

At minimum, the following inputs would be considered as a part of the review:

- The current IANA Statement of Work;
- Regular reports provided by the IANA Functions Operator during the defined review period including:
 - Monthly performance reports;
 - Delegation/redelegation reports;
 - Annual IANA Audits;
 - Security Process Reports;
 - RZM Data Audits; and
 - Response to IANA Customer Satisfaction Surveys.¹
- Inputs by the Customer Standing Committee including:
 - Issues flagged in reviewing above reports;
 - Public transcripts and meeting minutes; and
 - Inputs related to the effectiveness of any remediation efforts with the IANA Functions Operator.
- Community inputs through Public Consultation Procedures defined by the Periodic Review Team, potentially including:
 - Public Comment Periods;
 - Input at in-person sessions during ICANN meetings;
 - Responses to public surveys related to IANA Performance; and
 - Public inputs during meetings of the Periodic Review Team.

In reviewing the above data points the goal of the Periodic Review Team would be to evaluate the performance of the IANA Functions Operator and any related oversight bodies vis-a-vis the needs of its direct customers and the expectations of the

¹ It is expected that these reports be retained for the duration of the reporting period, and be made available to members of the Periodic Review Team (to the extent that they are not published publically).

broader ICANN Community. Any recommendations would be expected to identify improvements in these areas that were supported by data and associated analysis about existing deficiencies and how they could be addressed.

Following the initial review period of two years from the date of the IANA Transition, a longer period in between reviews would be advisable to avoid the constant trash of reviews, while accounting for emerging or evolving needs of IANA Customers and the ICANN community. We recommend that subsequent reviews occur **[no less than once every seven years]** with a recommended standard period of **[once every five years]** though reviews could occur more frequently if necessary to account for emerging needs.

Reviews would be focussed on identifying necessary changes or amendments to the existing statement of work and not upon a reconsideration of the statement of work.

What should be the process for reviewing or amending SOWS (including approval by the community and acceptance by ICANN)?

Scope of Periodic Reviews

What is the scope of periodic reviews?

What additional services or parameters should be regularly reviewed that may not be explicitly referenced in the SOW?

Where are these services or parameters defined?

What are the goals of periodic reviews?

Should all elements covered under a periodic review follow the same process, structure, and timeline?

Composition of Review Teams

Who are the relevant stakeholders?

What body should coordinate reviews?

How should it be composed?

How should it be structured?

What is the scope of its responsibility for leading the review?

What sort of process structure is warranted?

How is the wider community involved in such a review?

-