

Design Team **A - SLEs**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendations**1. Reviewed the current IANA functions operations and to capture the SLA that NTIA has with ICANN/IANA:
	1. Analysis of the current Service Level Agreement that NTIA has with IANA
	2. Analysis of real world transaction activity
2. Defined SLEs for post-transition
3. Automation
4. DT A endorses the concept of an IANA Customer Group (CSC) specifically to monitor and also to fulfill escalation path for breach of service expectations.
 | **Outstanding Work/Issues*** Update of work processes and procedures (DT F), to reflect the registry is the ultimate authority (DT D)
* Escalation path to be described by DT C
* How to make continuous improvements (DT C / DT N)
 |



Design Team **A - SLEs**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions for/by CWG**1. Do you agree with review and recommendations?
 | **Next Steps** |



Design Team **C - CSC**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendations**1. CSC should perform those activities currently undertaken by the NTIA in overseeing the performance of the IANA functions as they relate to naming services
	1. Engage in cooperative communication with IANA functions operator on a regular basis
	2. Monthly meeting to review performance reports and conduct other business
2. Engagement with IANA, the direct customers of the IANA naming function, and the ICANN community to discuss emerging technologies and issues that might impact the provision of IANA services
3. Formal regular meeting (at least annually) with the IANA Functions Operator, the direct customers of the IANA Naming Functions, and the ICANN community to discuss the performance of the IANA Naming functions
4. Limited Scope of work: CSC is only responsible for monitoring and ensuring the performance of the IANA functions operator Not engage in policy related topics or policy related disputes
5. Remedial actions: CSC may take action to address issues of IANA poor performance identified through the reporting and monitoring process
6. CSC can be a point of contact for a TLD registry asserting they have received poor service from IANA
7. ‘hand-over’ of responsibilities from the NTIA to the CSC, process should involve IANA functions operator
8. Creation of CSC
	1. A working group of direct IANA-function customers should be established to develop a Charter for the CSC
	2. CSC will be responsible for developing its own working methods
9. Composition requirements: light weight, small body. Members, experts in technical/operational area. No travel funding
 | **Outstanding Work/Issues*** Input DT H (.INT) needed, to determine whether CSC has role in oversight .INT
* Monitoring performance relating to the authorisation process (Pending output of Design Team D);
* Development of a specific escalation path (Pending output of Design Team M – escalation
* Management of Periodic Reviews of the IANA Functions and the IANA Statement of Work (Pending output of Design Team N)
* Incorporate SLA/SLE inputs of Design Team A
* Management of IDN Repository Issues (TBD).

If such working groups identify additional oversight roles and responsibilities that are appropriately carried out by the CSC then Design Team C might propose additions to the scope outlined above on that basis.* Membership composition
 |



Design Team **C - CSC**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions for/by CWG**1. Do you agree with the recommendations?
 | **Next Steps**1. Update DT C report, following discussion and output related DTs.
2. Update submission for inclusion for RFP v2
 |



Design Team **M - Escalation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendations**Require a progressive set of escalation steps that can be performed for Incident Management (Individual Registry Issue or other relevant issues) as well as Problem Management (Critical, Persistent or Systemic Failures), as applicable, by individual ccTLD or gTLD registry operators, or others with relevant IANA operational issues. Incident management escalation steps would include:1. Contact IANA customer service (email or telephone)
2. If issue not addressed:
	1. Report to CSC (for record only, not action)
	2. (optional) Escalate to ombudsman or equivalent
3. If issue not addressed, involve CSC to mediate
4. If issue is not addressed, CSC to involve a mediator
5. If issue is not addressed, CSC to consider whether issue is problem (critical, persistent or systematic failure) and escalates to problem management procedure
6. If issue is not addressed and not considered to be a problem (critical, persistent or systematic failure), registry operator could decide to initiate an Independent Appeal

Problem management escalation steps would include:1. CSC reports significant failure to the IANA Functions Operator and requests response in 30 (?) days.
2. If CSC determines the IANA Functions Operator response to be inadequate, the CSC directs remedial action
3. CSC confirms completion of remedial action.
4. If remediation is unsatisfactory, CSC involves a mediator.
5. If mediation fails, binding Independent Appeals Panel is initiated.
 | **Outstanding Work/Issues**1. The DT recognises that there may be issues that are not clear cut IANA operational issues but may be IANA related and would need a clear path of escalation and/or redirection if raised through the proposed escalation steps.
2. The DT also recognises that implementation details will need to be completed for any of the steps identified that are supported by the CWG and plans to do that after receiving direction from the CWG in Istanbul
3. Confirm DT A & DT C recommendations in relation to escalation and confirm the roles as envisioned for the CSC as well as ensure that these align with the DT M recommendations
 |



Design Team **M - Escalation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions for/by CWG**1. Do you agree with the recommendations as they currently stand?
 | **Next Steps**1. Consider input received during Istanbul F2F meeting
2. Review DT A & DT C recommendations in relation to escalation and confirm the roles as envisioned for the CSC as well as ensure that these align with the DT M recommendations
3. Finalize proposed escalation mechanisms for CWG review
 |



Design Team **D - Authorization**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendations**1. No Authorization Function for TLD changes is needed
2. Risk of out of policy TLD changes, TLD creations or other deviations from process are best addressed through other IANA-related accountability mechanisms.
 | **Outstanding Work/Issues*** Completion of Rationale and analysis of liability in case authorization is maintained through other entity (DT D)
* Update of work processes and procedures, to reflect there will be no Authorization Function will be recommended (DT F), with input from DT to reflect recommendation in SLE.
 |



Design Team **D - Authorization**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions for/by CWG**1. Do you agree with the recommendations?
 | **Next Steps*** Kick-off DT F
* Update Proposal V2.2 to incorporate recommendations
 |



Design Team **L - Separation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendations/ What has been done**1. The Technical Transition Framework (TTF) is built off of the existing plan required in section C.7.3 of the IANA Functions Contract.
2. Is a description of functional aspects of transitioning to a new IANA Functions Operator.
3. TPP will not examine the circumstances of that transition or the requirements for initiating the transition plan.
4. In reviewing C.7.3, DT-L identified elements to enhance in the post-transition TTF.  The TTF may include processes for:
* Training time in order to adequately transfer resources;
* Transferring of Root Zone Key to the new operator;
* Transferring of all essential software and machinery from the old operator to the new operator
* A process for the old operator to permanently delete all data
 | **Outstanding Work/Issues**DT-L still is still in the process of examining the following elements:1. Issues related to the transfer of [IANA.org](http://iana.org/) [DT-G]
2. IANA Functions registry data
3. Root Zone Automation System
4. Historical Data relating to IANA requests
5. Secure Notification System
6. Root KSK Transition Process
7. IANA Staff Knowledge Transition
8. Management of Transition Process
 |



Design Team **L - Separation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions for/by CWG**1. Will need input on transfer of copyright on documents authored by IANA staff that are currently held by ICANN
2. Should the TTF address the possibility that IANA may separated?
3. Should the TTF address associated HR issues, legal issues, procurement issues, IT issues, cultural issues, finance issues, etc.
 | **Next Steps**1. Receive documents from ICANN through DIDP process
2. Review input received during Istanbul F2F meeting
3. Continue work on the framework document
 |