Overview:

At a high level the Design Team agreed the following:

* **A** The CSC should established to perform those activities currently undertaken by NTIA in overseeing the performance of IANA functions as they relate to naming services.**A**
* **B** The CSC is only responsible for monitoring and ensuring the performance of IANA and will not engage in policy related topics or policy related disputes. **B**
* **C** The CSC will engage in cooperative communication with IANA on a regular basis to ensure the continued performance of the IANA functions and address any shortfalls. **CD** The CSC will meet once a month via teleconference to review performance reports and conduct other business as required. D
* **E** The CSC will engage 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.
* **F** The CSC shall hold an annual meeting 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 and any changes to the services that are underway or forthcoming.
* **G** Remedial action may be taken by the CSC to address issues of IANA poor performance identified through the reporting and monitoring process. A multi- stage escalation process has been recommended.
* **H** The CSC can be a point of contact for a TLD registry who believes they have received poor service from IANA, but not for matters associated with policy implementation
* **I** The composition of the CSC should be kept small and comprise representatives with direct experience with the IANA naming functions and knowledge of IANA procedures, services and reporting requirements. Suggested minimum composition:
  + 2 x gTLD registry operators
  + 2 x ccTLD registry operators
  + 1 x member of the SSAC
  + 1 x member of the RSSAC

Additionally advisors could be added at the discretion of the CSC to fill skills gaps, as well as Liaisons.

* **J** The CSC shall facilitate public comment periods and other community participation mechanisms in the event that changes are proposed that would affect oversight of the IANA Naming Functions.
* **K** The CSC is not mandated to initiate a change in the IANA Functions Operator; however, the escalation process provides for and independent review to be triggered of ICANN operations to recommend organizational change and determine whether IANA operator can continue – in the event of continued poor performance results in a third escalation.

**Dependencies**

The CSC has identified additional issues that it believes may fall within the scope of the CSC’s oversight responsibilities, pending the outcomes of other Design Team work, as follows:

* Management of Periodic Reviews of the IANA Functions and the IANA Statement of Work (Pending output of Design Team N);
* Management of issues related to the .INT TLD (Pending output of Design Team H); and
* 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 may propose additions to the scope outlined above on that basis.

The table below represents the current NTIA contract requirement and the proposed CSC requirement post transition.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Requirement** | **Current NTIA contract requirement** | **CSC Perform?** | **CSC post transition requirement** |
| C.2.9.a,b | Root Zone and WHOIS Change Requests | Two key performance indicators: 1) **Timeliness** - End-to-end processing for changes pertaining to routine maintenance of delegated TLDs are performed within 21 days; and 2) **Accuracy** - The requests that have passed validation are implemented correctly at the conclusion of a change request. | Yes | The CSC will continue to monitor performance as it relates to timeliness and accuracy.  The CSC may, as a result of periodic reviews, change the targets or add additional metrics.  1. Changes an appointed registry makes:  ● 1.1. Changes to the root zone (technical changes)  ● 1.2. Changes not resulting in changes to the root zone (for example changes to WHOIS database, change of technical contact etc) (SSAC 069) |
| C.2.9.2.c | ccTLD Delegation and Redelegation | Two key performance indicators: 1) **Timeliness** - End-to-end processing times for changes pertaining to delegation or redelegation of country-code top-level domains are within 120 days; and 2) **Accuracy** - The requests that have been approved by the applicant are implemented correctly at the conclusion of a change request. | Yes | The CSC will have no role in defining or reviewing the content of the delegation and redelegation reports.  The CSC will continue to monitor performance as it relates to timeliness and accuracy. The CSC may, as a result of period reviews, change the targets or add additional metrics. This will be done in consultation with IANA.  2. Changes of who is the appointed registry for an already existing TLD (SSAC 069) |
| C.2.9.2.d | gTLD Delegation and Redelegation | Three key performance indicators: 1) **Timeliness** - End-to-end processing times for changes pertaining to delegation or redelegation of generic top-level domains are within 30 days; **Timeliness** — Requests to delegate new gTLDs are dispatched to the Root Zone Administrator within 14 days of validation (passing technical checks and other confirmations); and 3) **Accuracy** — The requests that have been approved by the applicant are implemented correctly at the conclusion of a change request. | Yes | The CSC will have no role regarding the merits of delegation or redelegation.  The CSC will continue to monitor performance as it relates to timeliness and accuracy. The CSC may, as a result of period reviews, change the targets or add additional metrics. This will be done in consultation with IANA. |
| C.3.2 | Secure Systems Notification | IANA shall implement and thereafter operate and maintain a security notification system at a minimum, capable of notifying all relevant stakeholders of the discrete IANA functions, of such events as outages, planned maintenance and new developments. |  | This requirement is to remain and IANA shall notify the CSC of any of any outages, planned or unplanned. |
| C.3.4 | Security Plan | IANA shall develop and execute a Security Plan that meets the requirements of this contract and Section C.3. The Contractor shall document in the security plan the process used to ensure information systems including hardware, software, applications, and general support systems have effective security safeguards, which have been implemented, planned for, and documented. |  |  |
| C.4.2 | Monthly Performance Progress Report | Prepares and submits a performance progress report every month that contains statistical and narrative information on the performance of the IANA functions during the previous calendar month. The report includes a summary of the work performed for each of the functions with appropriate details and particularity. The report shall also describe major events, problems encountered, and any projected significant changes, if any, related to the performance of requirements. | Yes | Monthly Performance Progress Reports will be submitted to the CSC for review post transition.  The CSC will review the monthly progress reports and will have a conference call with the IANA team to discuss the reports soon after they are published. |
| C.4.3 | Root Dashboard |  | ? | In accordance with Section C.4.3 of Contract Number SA130112CN0035 for ICANN’s performance of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions, a “root dashboard” is prepared of average processing times and volumes for root zone related change requests  http://www.iana.org/performance/root-processing-times |
| C.4.4 | Performance Standards Reports | Develops and publishes reports for each discrete IANA function. The Performance Standards Metric Reports will be published via a website every month. | Yes | The CSC will require that IANA continue to publish reports for discrete IANA functions related to naming <http://www.iana.org/performance/metrics/> |
| C.4.5 | Customer Service Survey | Collaborate with NTIA to develop and conduct an annual customer service survey consistent with the performance standards for each of the discrete IANA functions. The survey shall include a feedback section for each function. | Yes | IANA to collaborate with CSC to develop the annual customer service survey consistent with the performance standards for each discrete IANA function and other issues that may have been flagged in monthly reports.  Survey will be reviewed by CSC and IANA and where necessary, agree remedies to address any service deficiency identified by the Survey. |
| C.4.6 | Final Report | Publication of the Final Report | Yes | Is this related to the Customer Survey? |
| C.5.1 | Audit Data | Generates and retains audit record data for one year and provides an annual audit report. All root zone management operations shall be included in the audit, and records on change requests to the root zone file. | Yes | What’s contained in the audit data?  Shall continue in CSC |
| C.5.2 | Root Zone Management Audit Data | Generates and publishes via a website a monthly audit report based on information in the performance of Provision C.9.2 (a-g) Perform Administrative Functions Associated With Root Zone Management. The audit report shall identify each root zone file and root zone “WHOIS” database change request and the relevant policy under which the change was made as well as identify change rejections and the relevant policy under which the change request was rejected. |  | The CSC will require that IANA continue to publish this data no later than 15 calendar days following the end of the month.  http://www.iana.org/performance/root-audit |
| C.5.3 | External Auditor | Have an external, independent, specialized compliance audit which shall be conducted annually and it shall be an audit of all the IANA functions security provisions against existing best practices and Section C.3 of this contract. | ? | Review Team |
| C.7.2 | Contingency and Continuity of Operations Plan |  | No |  |
| C.7.3 | Transition to Successor Contractor annual update | http://www.iana.org/reports/2014/transition-plan-201404.pdf | No |  |
| DT-1 | SLAs |  |  | Monitors performance against published SLA/SLEs that have been agreed with TLD operators. |

**Process for remedial action in the event of poor performance of IANA:**

Frequent, cooperative communication will be a hallmark of the notification and escalation processes. All notifications will be accompanied by conference calls and frequent emails to facilitate mutual understanding of issues, responsibilities and next steps.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Notification | 1st Escalation | 2nd Escalation | 3rd Escalation |
| Occurs | * Process control limit exceeded * IANA customer presents evidence that IANA did not meet SLA * IANA periodic report indicates SLA not met | * Corrective action plan late * Corrective action plan milestones missed * Two or more additional “notification” violations occur while corrective action plan is open | * Corrective action plan late * Corrective action plan milestones missed * Two or more additional “notification” violations occur while corrective action plan is supposed to be in place | * Corrective action plan from 2nd escalation not delivered or executed timely. * Additional similar violations occur when corrective action from 2nd escalation is supposed to be in place |
| Addressee | IANA Manager | IANA Manager | GDD President Will probably be contested | ICANN Board, CEO Will probably be contested |
| Message Content | * Identify SLA breach and evidence * Conference call request to discuss issues raised by CSC message. * Corrective action requirement * Time frame * Identify party requiring response | * Identify SLA breach and evidence * Conference call request to discuss issues raised by CSC message. * Corrective action requirement * Time frame | same as previous  Will probably be contested | same as previous  Will probably be contested |
| Response Req’t | * Agreement that SLA violation occurred(or evidence to contrary) * Cause * Correction made on individual case * Corrective action plan to:   + remedy current situation   + prevent future occurrence * Corrective action plan required in 14-days | * Reissue corrective action plan to:   + Remediate earlier failed plan   + Include new violations * Corrective action plan milestones missed * Two or more additional “notification” violations occur while corrective action plan is open | same as previous plus  Will probably be contested   * organizational, operational changes to correct lack of corrective action | same as previous plus  Will probably be contested   * independent review triggered of ICANN operations to recommend organizational change and determine whether IANA operator can continue |

**Process for individual TLD operators to make complaints to the CSC about IANA performance:**

It is acknowledged that IANA current as a Customer Service Complaint Resolution Process whereby individuals using the IANA functions can report issues or where they feel that IANA has been too slow, made a mistake or suffered bias in the performance of their activities. This process is available here: <http://www.iana.org/help/escalation-procedure>

In addition, TLD operators may also seek assistance from the CSC in resolving a dispute between themselves and IANA.

Where a TLD registry operator has a dispute regarding agreed levels of service or performance with the IANA Functions Operator, and the parties have been unable to negotiate a satisfactory outcome, the TLD registry operator should be able to lodge a written complaint with the CSC. The CSC should then request a written response from the IANA Functions Operator within 10 working days, assess the circumstances, and attempt to facilitate an agreed outcome between the parties. All disputes between the IANA Functions Operator and TLD registry operators should be archived for future reference.

Should this process fail there should be an escalation path that eventually feeds into the Independent Appeals Process (IAP) being developed by the Accountability track.