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**1. Individual proposal assessment**

Upon receipt of a complete, formal transition proposal from an individual operational community addressing the transition of the stewardship of the names, numbers, or protocol parameters IANA function, the ICG will conduct an assessment to determine:

1. Completeness – check if any RFP components are missing
2. Clarity – check if anything in the proposal does not make sense or requires clarification from the operational community
3. NTIA criteria – check if the proposal fulfills the NTIA criteria
4. Community comments – check if input/comments the ICG received directly were shared with the operational community and addressed

If the proposal passes all of these checks, the ICG should publicly document the fact that the proposal is ready to move on to step 2. If not, the ICG should convey the outstanding issues back to the operational community and suggest a timeline for the community to respond.

*[Questions for ICG consideration in this step:*

*Is the list above complete? What else belongs here?*

*How should we handle this step procedurally? Should we delegate step 1 to one ICG member or a small group for each proposal, to conduct the analysis and report back to the group to review (as we’ve done with documents, secretariat, etc.)?]*

**2. Unified proposal assessment**

Once multiple community proposals have completed step 1, the ICG will conduct an assessment to determine *[these are taken directly from our charter]*:

1. Compatability and interoperability – Do the proposals work together? Do they suggest any arrangements that are not compatible with each other?
2. Accountability – Do the proposals together include sufficient independent accountability mechanisms for running the IANA function?

If the proposals pass both of these checks, the ICG should publicly document the fact that the propoals are ready to move on to step 3. If not, the ICG should convey the outstanding issues back to the operational communities as necessary and suggest a timeline for the communities to respond.

*[Questions for ICG consideration in this step:*

*Is the list above complete? What else belongs here?*

*Should we do this analysis pair-wise, as soon as we have two proposals that have passed step 1? Or should we wait until we have proposals for numbers, names, and protocol parameters that have passed step 1 before starting the analysis in step 2?*

*How should we handle this step procedurally? Should we delegate step 2 to one ICG member or a small group to conduct the analysis and report back to the group to review (as we’ve done with documents, secretariat, etc.)?]*

**3. Public comment and proposal finalization**

*[This text is mostly a direct quote from our charter.]*

Once step 2 has produced a unified proposal, the ICG will put the unified proposal up for public comment involving a reasonable period of time for reviewing the draft proposal, analyzing and preparing supportive or critical comments. The ICG will then review these comments and determine whether modifications are required. If no modifications are needed, and the coordination group agrees, the proposal will be submitted to NTIA.

If changes are required to fix problems or to achieve broader support, the ICG will work with the operational communities to get those problems fixed. If, in the ICG’s opinion, broad public support for the proposal as articulated by the NTIA is not present, the parts of the proposal that are not supported will be returned to the operational communities.

*[Do we need to add any more detail here, or is this description sufficient?]*