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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
5. Level of Consensus/Support

*[I think we need a bullet to address this quote from the RFP: "Proposals should be supported by the broad range of stakeholders participating in the proposal development process."]*

1. Inclusiveness and Out Reach

*[I think we need a bullet to address this quote from the RFP: "Proposals should be developed through a transparent process that is open to and inclusive of all stakeholders interested in participating in the development of the proposal." & "Communities are asked to adhere to open and inclusive processes in developing their responses, so that all community members may fully participate in and observe those processes. Communities are also asked to actively seek out and encourage wider participation by any other parties with interest in their response."]*

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?*

*[I suggest adding a couple of bullets on the level of consensus/support & the extent of inclusiveness and openness of the process. Both issues are not easy to test nor do they have a binary result, yet I believe both are important to note and check.]*

*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.)?]*

*[I believe all ICG members should be equally involved in all proposals. It is important to have a holistic view. It also avoids any gaps in the overall outcome. Yet it is good to have a lead who holds the pen, ensures continuous progress, compile all comments and remarks made by ICG members and make sure they are accurately reflected (or resolved if conflicting/contradicting). So basically I'm in favour of one team and a different lead for each proposal.]*

**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. Compatibility and interoperability – Do the proposals work together? Do they suggest any arrangements that are not compatible with each other?

*[Does this also cover identifying 'gaps' and/or 'overlaps'?]*

1. 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 proposals 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?*

*[We should either make sure step 2.a covers identifying 'gaps' and/or 'overlaps' or add something to that effect.]*

*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?*

*[I think if 2 are ready we should proceed with analyzing them, and as soon as we have the third ready we should repeat the analysis (hopefully quicker) in light of the three proposals and not depend on the results of the analysis of the first 2. Things may look different when we see the holistic view.]*

*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.)?]*

*[I'm again in favor of one team and separate leads for the reasons stated above.]*

**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?]*

*[Nothing to add but I have a couple of questions. Should we have some place holder to step 4 of our timeline, which is 'Testing'? Should we link the steps above to the dates we have in the timeline?]*