Response to the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG)
Request for Proposals on the IANA Protocol Parameters Registries

Abstract

   The U.S. National Telecommunications and Information Administration
   (NTIA) solicited a request from the Internet Corporation for Assigned
   Names and Numbers (ICANN) to propose how the NTIA should end its
   oversight of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA)
   functions. After broad consultations, ICANN in turn created the IANA
   Stewardship Transition Coordination Group. That group solicited
   proposals for the three major IANA functions: names, numbers, and
   protocol parameters. This document contains the IETF response to
   that solicitation for protocol parameters. It was included in an
   aggregate response to the NTIA alongside those for names and
   numbering resources that are being developed by their respective
   operational communities. A reference to that response may be found
   in the introduction, and additional correspondence is included in the
   Appendix.

Status of This Memo

   This document is not an Internet Standards Track specification; it is
   published for informational purposes.

   This document is a product of the Internet Engineering Task Force
   (IETF). It represents the consensus of the IETF community. It has
   received public review and has been approved for publication by the
   Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG). Not all documents
   approved by the IESG are a candidate for any level of Internet
   Standard; see Section 2 of RFC 7841.

   Information about the current status of this document, any errata,
   and how to provide feedback on it may be obtained at
   http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7979.

Copyright Notice

Table of Contents

1. IETF Introduction

   In March of 2014, the U.S. National Telecommunications and
   Information Administration (NTIA) announced its intent to transition
   oversight of Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) functions
   [NTIA-Announce]. In that announcement, NTIA asked the Internet
   Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) to establish a
   process to deliver a proposal for transition. As part of that
   process, the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG) was
   formed. The charter for the ICG can be found in Appendix A. The ICG
   in turn solicited proposals regarding post-transition arrangements
   from the names, numbers, and protocol parameters communities in order
   to put forth a proposal to the NTIA. The final request for proposal
   (RFP) can be found in Appendix B. The response from the ICG to the
   NTIA may be found at [ICG-Response].

   While there are interactions between all of the IANA functions and
   IETF standards, this document specifically addresses the protocol
   parameters registries function. Section 1 (this section) contains an
   introduction that is sourced solely within the IETF. Section 2
   contains the questionnaire that was written by the ICG and a formal
   response by the IETF. We have quoted questions from that
   questionnaire with ">>> ", and we have prefaced answers to questions
   being asked with "IETF Response:". Note that there are small changes
   to the questions asked in order to match the RFC format.

   We note that the following text was stated as a footnote in the
   original RFP:

        In this RFP, "IANA" refers to the functions currently
        specified in the agreement between NTIA and ICANN
        [http://www.ntia.doc.gov/page/iana-functions-purchase-order] as
        well as any other functions traditionally performed by the IANA
        functions operator. SAC-067
        [https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-067-en.pdf]
        provides one description of the many different meanings of the
        term "IANA" and may be useful reading in addition to the
        documents constituting the agreement itself.

2. The Formal RFP Response

   The entire Request for Proposals, including introduction, can be
   found in Appendix B.

   >>>
   >>> 0. Proposal Type
   >>>
   >>> Identify which category of the IANA functions this
   >>> submission proposes to address:
   >>>

   IETF Response:
                     Protocol Parameters

   This response states the existing practice of the IETF, and also
   represents the views of the Internet Architecture Board and the IETF.

   >>>
   >>> I. Description of Community's Use of IANA Functions
   >>>
   >>> This section should list the specific, distinct IANA services
   >>> or activities your community relies on. For each IANA service
   >>> or activity on which your community relies, please provide the
   >>> following:
   >>> A description of the service or activity.
   >>>

   IETF Response:

   Many IETF protocols make use of commonly defined protocol parameters.
   These parameters are used by implementers, who are the primary users
   of the IETF standards and other documents. To ensure consistent
   interpretation of these parameter values by independent
   implementations, and to promote universal interoperability, these
   IETF protocol specifications define and require globally available
   registries containing the parameter values and a pointer to any
   associated documentation. The IETF uses the IANA protocol parameters
   registries to store this information in a public location. The IETF
   community presently accesses the protocol parameter registries via
   references based on the iana.org domain name, and makes use of the
   term "IANA" in the protocol parameter registry processes [RFC5226].

   ICANN currently operates the .ARPA top level domain on behalf of the
   Internet Architecture Board (IAB). This zone is used for certain
   Internet infrastructure services that are delegated beneath it. The
   IETF considers .ARPA part of the protocol parameters registries for
   purposes of this response.

>>>
>>> A description of the customer(s) of the service or activity.
>>>

IETF Response:

The IANA protocol parameters registries operator maintains the
protocol parameters registries for the IETF in conformance with all
relevant IETF policies, in accordance with the Memorandum of
Understanding [RFC2860] and associated supplemental agreements that
include service level agreements (SLAs) established between the IETF
and ICANN [MOUSUP].

The IETF is a global organization that produces voluntary standards,
whose mission is to produce high quality, relevant technical and
engineering documents that influence the way people design, use, and
manage the Internet in such a way as to make the Internet work better
[RFC3935]. IETF standards are published in the RFC series. The IETF
is responsible for the key standards that are used on the Internet
today, including IP, TCP, DNS, BGP, and HTTP, to name but a few.

The IETF operates in an open and transparent manner [RFC6852]. The
processes that govern the IETF are also published in the RFC series.
The Internet Standards Process is documented in [RFC2026]. That
document explains not only how standards are developed, but also how
disputes about decisions are resolved. RFC 2026 has been amended a
number of times [BCP9info]. The standards process can be amended in
the same manner that standards are approved. That is, someone
proposes a change by submitting a temporary document known as an
Internet-Draft, the community discusses it, and if rough consensus
can be found the change is approved by the Internet Engineering
Steering Group (IESG), who also have day-to-day responsibility for
declaring IETF consensus on technical decisions, including those that
affect the IANA protocol parameters registries. Anyone may propose a
change during a Last Call, and anyone may participate in the
community discussion.

```
   >>>
   >>> What registries are involved in providing the service or
   >>> activity.
   >>>
```

IETF Response:

The protocol parameters registries are the product of IETF work.
These also include the top-level registry for the entire IP address
space and some of its sub-registries, autonomous system number space,
and a number of special use registries with regard to domain names.
For more detail please refer to the documentation in the "overlaps or
interdependencies" section.

Administration of the protocol parameters registries is the service
that is provided to the IETF.

```
   >>>
   >>> A description of any overlaps or interdependencies between your
   >>> IANA requirements and the functions required by other customer
   >>> communities.
   >>>
```

IETF Response:

In this context, the IETF considers "overlap" to be where there is in
some way shared responsibility for a single registry across multiple
organizations. In this sense, there is no overlap between
organizations because responsibility for each registry is carefully
delineated. There are, however, points of interaction between other
organizations, and a few cases where the IETF may further define the
scope of a registry for technical purposes. This is the case with
both names and numbers, as described in the paragraphs below. In all
cases, the IETF coordinates with the appropriate organizations.

It is important to note that the IETF does not have formal
membership. The term "the IETF" includes anyone who wishes to
participate in the IETF, and IETF participants may also be members of
other communities. Staff and participants from ICANN and the
Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) regularly participate in IETF
activities.

o The IETF has specified a number of special use registries with
   regard to domain names. These registries require coordination
   with ICANN as the policy authority for the DNS root, including
   community groups that are responsible for ICANN policy on domain
   names such as the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) and
   the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO). There are

already mechanisms in place to perform this coordination, and the
capacity to modify those mechanisms to meet new conditions as they
might arise. [RFC6761]

o The IETF specifies the DNS protocol. From time to time there have
   been and will be updates to that protocol. As we make changes we
   will broadly consult the operational community about the impact of
   those changes, as we have done in the past.

o The IETF specifies minimum requirements for root servers.
   [RFC2870] Those requirements are currently under review, in
   consultations with the root server community.

o The routing architecture has evolved over time, and is expected to
   continue to do so. Such evolution may have an impact on
   appropriate IP address allocation strategies. If and when that
   happens, the IETF will consult and coordinate with the RIR
   community, as we have done in the past.

o The IETF is responsible for policy relating to the entire IP
   address space and AS number space. Through the IANA protocol
   parameters registries, the IETF delegates unicast IP address and
   AS number ranges to the RIRs [RFC7020],[RFC7249]. Special address
   allocation, such as multicast and anycast addresses, often require
   coordination. Another example of IP addresses that are not
   administered by the RIR system is Unique Local Addresses (ULAs)
   [RFC4193], where local networks employ a prefix that is not
   intended to be routed on the public Internet. New special address
   allocations are added, from time to time, related to the evolution
   of the standards. In all cases, these special assignments are
   listed in the IANA protocol paramters registries.

o The IETF maintains sub-registries for special IPv4 and IPv6
   assignments. These are specified in [RFC3307], [RFC5771], and
   [RFC6890]. The IETF coordinates such assignments with the RIRs.

o Changes to IETF standards may have impact on operations of RIRs
   and service providers. A recent example is the extensions to BGP
   to carry the Autonomous System numbers as four-octet entities
   [RFC6793]. It is important to note that this change occurred out
   of operational necessity, and it demonstrated strong alignment
   between the RIRs and the IETF.

>>> II. Existing, Pre-Transition Arrangements

>>>
>>> This section should describe how existing IANA-related
>>> arrangements work, prior to the transition.
>>>
>>> A. Policy Sources
>>>
>>>
>>> This section should identify the specific source(s) of policy
>>> which must be followed by the IANA functions operator in its
>>> conduct of the services or activities described above. If there
>>> are distinct sources of policy or policy development for
>>> different IANA activities, then please describe these
>>> separately. For each source of policy or policy development,
>>> please provide the following:
>>>
>>> Which IANA service or activity (identified in Section I) is
>>> affected.
>>>

IETF Response:

The protocol parameters registries.

>>>
>>> A description of how policy is developed and established and
>>> who is involved in policy development and establishment.
>>>

IETF Response:

Policy for overall management of the protocol parameters registries
is stated in [RFC6220] and [RFC5226]. The first of these documents
explains the model for how the registries are to be operated, how
policy is set, and how oversight takes place. RFC 5226 specifies the
policies that specification writers may employ when they define new
protocol registries in the "IANA Considerations" section of each
specification. All policies at the IETF begin with a proposal in the
form of an Internet-Draft. Anyone may submit such a proposal. If
there is sufficient interest, a working group whose scope includes
the proposed work may choose to adopt it, the IESG may choose to
create a working group, or an Area Director may choose to sponsor the
draft. In any case, anyone may comment on the proposal as it
progresses. A proposal cannot be passed by the IESG unless it enjoys
sufficient community support as to indicate rough consensus
[RFC7282]. In each case, a "Last Call" is made so that there is
notice of any proposed change to a policy or process. Anyone may

comment during a Last Call. For example, this process is currently
being used to update RFC 5226 [I-D.leiba-cotton-iana-5226bis].

>>>
>>> A description of how disputes about policy are resolved.
>>>

IETF Response:

Most disputes are handled at the lowest level through the working
group and rough consensus processes. Should anyone disagree with any
action, Section 6.5 of [RFC2026] specifies a multi-level conflict
resolution and appeals process that includes the responsible Area
Director, the IESG, and the IAB. Should appeals be upheld, an
appropriate remedy is applied. In the case where someone claims that
the procedures themselves are insufficient or inadequate in some way
to address a circumstance, one may appeal an IAB decision to the
Internet Society Board of Trustees.

>>>
>>> References to documentation of policy development and dispute
>>> resolution processes.
>>>

IETF Response:

As mentioned above, [RFC2026] Section 6.5 specifies a conflict
resolution and appeals process. [RFC2418] specifies working group
procedures. Note that both of these documents have been amended in
later RFCs as indicated in the [RFC-INDEX].

>>>
>>> B. Oversight and Accountability
>>>
>>> This section should describe all the ways in which oversight is
>>> conducted over IANA functions operator's provision of the
>>> services and activities listed in Section I and all the ways in
>>> which IANA functions operator is currently held accountable for
>>> the provision of those services. For each oversight or
>>> accountability mechanism, please provide as many of the
>>> following as are applicable:
>>>
>>> Which IANA service or activity (identified in Section I) is
>>> affected.
>>>

   IETF Response:

   The protocol parameters registries.

   >>>
   >>> If not all policy sources identified in Section II.A are
   >>> affected, identify which ones are affected.
   >>>

   IETF Response:

   All policy sources relating to the protocol parameters registry are
   affected.

   >>>
   >>> A description of the entity or entities that provide oversight
   >>> or perform accountability functions, including how individuals
   >>> are selected or removed from participation in those entities.
   >>>

   IETF Response:

   The Internet Architecture Board (IAB) is an oversight body of the
   IETF whose responsibilities include, among other things, confirming
   appointment of IESG members, managing appeals as discussed above,
   management of certain domains, including .ARPA [RFC3172], and general
   architectural guidance to the broader community. The IAB must
   approve the appointment of an organization to act as IANA operator on
   behalf of the IETF. The IAB is also responsible for establishing
   liaison relationships with other organizations on behalf of the IETF.
   The IAB's charter is to be found in [RFC2850].

   The IAB members are selected and may be recalled through a Nominating
   Committee (NOMCOM) process, which is described in [RFC3777] and its
   updates. This process provides for selection of active members of
   the community who themselves agree upon a slate of candidates. The
   active members are chosen randomly from volunteers with a history of
   participation in the IETF, with limits regarding having too many
   active members with the same affiliation. The selection of the
   active members is performed in a manner that makes it possible for
   anyone to verify that the correct procedure was followed. The slate
   of candidates selected by the active members are sent to the Internet
   Society Board of Trustees for confirmation. In general, members are
   appointed for terms of two years. The IAB selects its own chair.

   The IAB provides oversight of the protocol parameters registries of
   the IETF, and is responsible for selecting appropriate operator(s)
   and related per-registry arrangements. Especially when relationships

among protocols call for it, registries are at times operated by, or
in conjunction with, other bodies. Unless the IAB or IETF has
concluded that special treatment is needed, the operator for
registries is currently ICANN.

>>>
>>> A description of the mechanism (e.g., contract, reporting
>>> scheme, auditing scheme, etc.). This should include a
>>> description of the consequences of the IANA functions operator
>>> not meeting the standards established by the mechanism, the
>>> extent to which the output of the mechanism is transparent and
>>> the terms under which the mechanism may change.
>>>

IETF Response:

A memorandum of understanding (MoU) between ICANN and the IETF
community has been in place since 2000. It can be found in
[RFC2860]. The MoU defines the work to be carried out by the IANA
functions operator for the IETF and the Internet Research Task Force
(IRTF), a peer organization to the IETF that focuses on
research.[RFC2014] Each year a service level agreement is negotiated
that supplements the MoU.

Day-to-day administration and contract management is the
responsibility of the IETF Administrative Director (IAD). The IETF
Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC) oversees the IAD. The
members of the IAOC are also the trustees of the IETF Trust, whose
main purpose is to hold certain intellectual property for the benefit
of the IETF as a whole. IAOC members are appointed by the Internet
Society Board of Trustees, the IAB, the IESG, and the NOMCOM
[RFC4071]. The IAOC works with the IANA functions operator to
establish annual IANA performance metrics [METRICS] and operational
procedures, and the resulting document is adopted as an supplement to
the MoU each year [MOUSUP]. Starting from 2014, in accordance with
these supplements, an annual audit is performed to ensure that
protocol parameter requests are being processed according to the
established policies. The conclusions of this audit will be
available for anyone in the world to review.

To date there have been no unresolvable disputes or issues between
the IETF and the current IANA functions operator. [RFC2860]
specifies that should a technical dispute arise, "the IANA shall seek
and follow technical guidance exclusively from the IESG." In the
unlikely event that a more difficult situation should arise, the IAOC
and the IAB would engage ICANN management to address the matter. The
MoU also provides an option for either party to terminate the
arrangement with six months notice. Obviously such action would only

be undertaken after serious consideration. In that case a new IANA
functions operator would be selected, and a new agreement with that
operator would be established.

>>>
>>> Jurisdiction(s) in which the mechanism applies and the legal
>>> basis on which the mechanism rests.
>>>

IETF Response

This mechanism is global in nature. The current agreement does not
specify a jurisdiction.

>>>III. Proposed Post-Transition Oversight and Accountability
>>>Arrangements

>>>
>>> This section should describe what changes your community is
>>> proposing to the arrangements listed in Section II.B in light of
>>> the transition. If your community is proposing to replace one or
>>> more existing arrangements with new arrangements, that
>>> replacement should be explained and all of the elements listed
>>> in Section II.B should be described for the new
>>> arrangements. Your community should provide its rationale and
>>> justification for the new arrangements.
>>>
>>> If your community's proposal carries any implications for
>>> existing policy arrangements described in Section II.A, those
>>> implications should be described here.
>>>
>>> If your community is not proposing changes to arrangements
>>> listed in Section II.B, the rationale and justification for that
>>> choice should be provided here.
>>>

IETF Response:

No new organizations or structures are required. Over the years
since the creation of ICANN, the IETF, ICANN, and IAB have together
created a system of agreements, policies, and oversight mechanisms
that already cover what is needed. This system has worked well
without any operational involvement from the NTIA.

IANA protocol parameters registry updates will continue to function
day-to-day, as they have been doing for the last decade or more. The
IETF community is very satisfied with the current arrangement with

ICANN. RFC 2860 remains in force and has served the IETF community
very well. RFC 6220 has laid out an appropriate service description
and requirements.

However in the absence of the NTIA contract a few new arrangements
may be needed in order to ensure the IETF community's expectations
are met. Those expectations are the following:

o The protocol parameters registries are in the public domain. It
   is the preference of the IETF community that all relevant parties
   acknowledge that fact as part of the transition.

o It is possible in the future that the operation of the protocol
   parameters registries may be transitioned from ICANN to subsequent
   operator(s). It is the preference of the IETF community that, as
   part of the NTIA transition, ICANN acknowledge that it will carry
   out the obligations established under C.7.3 and I.61 of the
   current IANA functions contract between ICANN and the NTIA
   [NTIA-Contract] to achieve a smooth transition to subsequent
   operator(s), should the need arise. Furthermore, in the event of
   a transition it is the expectation of the IETF community that
   ICANN, the IETF, and subsequent operator(s) will work together to
   minimize disruption in the use the protocol parameters registries
   or other resources currently located at iana.org.

In developing our response we have been mindful of the following
points that the IETF community has discussed over the last year
[ProtoParamEvo14] that have led to the following guiding principles
for IAB efforts that impact IANA protocol parameter registries.
These principles must be taken together; their order is not
significant.

1. The IETF protocol parameters registries function has been and
continues to be capably provided by the Internet technical community.

The strength and stability of the function and its foundation within
the Internet technical community are both important given how
critical protocol parameters are to the proper functioning of IETF
protocols.

We think the structures that sustain the protocol parameters
registries function need to be strong enough that they can be offered
independently by the Internet technical community, without the need
for backing from external parties. And we believe we largely are
there already, although the system can be strengthened further, and
continuous improvements are being made.

2. The protocol parameters registries function requires openness,
transparency, and accountability.

Existing documentation of how the function is administered and
overseen is good [RFC2860], [RFC6220]. Further articulation and
clarity may be beneficial. It is important that the whole Internet
community can understand how the function works, and that the
processes for registering parameters and holding those who oversee
the protocol parameters function accountable for following those
processes are understood by all interested parties. We are committed
to making improvements here if necessary.

3. Any contemplated changes to the protocol parameters registries
function should respect existing Internet community agreements.

The protocol parameters registries function is working well. The
existing Memorandum of Understanding in RFC 2860 defines "the
technical work to be carried out by the Internet Assigned Numbers
Authority on behalf of the Internet Engineering Task Force and the
Internet Research Task Force." Any modifications to the protocol
parameters registries function should be made using the IETF process
to update RFC 6220 and other relevant RFCs. Put quite simply:
evolution, not revolution.

4. The Internet architecture requires and receives capable service
by Internet registries.

The stability of the Internet depends on capable provision of not
just IETF protocol parameters, but IP numbers, domain names, and
other registries. Furthermore, DNS and IPv4/IPv6 are IETF-defined
protocols. Thus we expect the role of the IETF in standards
development, architectural guidance, and allocation of certain name/
number parameters to continue. IP multicast addresses and special-
use DNS names are two examples where close coordination is needed.
The IETF will continue to coordinate with ICANN, the RIRs, and other
parties that are mutually invested in the continued smooth operation
of the Internet registries. We fully understand the need to work
together.

5. The IETF will continue management of the protocol parameter
registry function as an integral component of the IETF standards
process and the use of resulting protocols.

RFC 6220 specifies the role and function of the protocol parameters
registry, which is critical to IETF standards processes and IETF
protocols. The IAB, on behalf of the IETF, has the responsibility to
define and manage the relationship with the protocol registry
operator role. This responsibility includes the selection and

management of the protocol parameter registry operator, as well as
management of the parameter registration process and the guidelines
for parameter allocation.

6. The protocol parameters registries are provided as a public
service.

Directions for the creation of protocol parameters registries and the
policies for subsequent additions and updates are specified in RFCs.
The protocol parameters registries are available to everyone, and
they are published in a form that allows their contents to be
included in other works without further permission. These works
include, but are not limited to, implementations of Internet
protocols and their associated documentation.

These principles will guide the IAB, IAOC, and the rest of the IETF
community as they work with ICANN to establish future IANA
performance metrics and operational procedures.

>>> IV Transition Implications

>>>
>>> This section should describe what your community views as the
>>> implications of the changes it proposed in Section III. These
>>> implications may include some or all of the following, or other
>>> implications specific to your community:
>>>
>>> o Description of operational requirements to achieve continuity
>>>   of service and possible new service integration throughout
>>>   the transition.
>>> o Risks to operational continuity
>>> o Description of any legal framework requirements in the
>>>   absence of the NTIA contract
>>> o Description of how you have tested or evaluated the
>>>   workability of any new technical or operational methods
>>>   proposed in this document and how they compare to established
>>>   arrangements.
>>>

IETF Response:

No structural changes are required for the handling of protocol
parameters. The principles listed above will guide IAB, IAOC, and
the rest of the IETF community as they work with ICANN to establish
future IANA performance metrics and operational procedures, as they
have in the past.

   As no services are expected to change, no continuity issues are
   anticipated, and there are no new technical or operational methods
   proposed by the IETF to test. The IETF leadership, ICANN, and the
   RIRs maintain an ongoing informal dialog to spot any unforeseen
   issues that might arise as a result of other changes.

   What is necessary as part of transition is the completion of any
   supplemental agreement(s) necessary to achieve the requirements
   outlined in our response in Section III of this RFP.

      >>>
      >>> V. NTIA Requirements
      >>>
      >>> Additionally, NTIA has established that the transition proposal
      >>> must meet the following five requirements:
      >>>
      >>>   "Support and enhance the multistakeholder model;"
      >>>

   IETF Response:

   Because the IETF is open to everyone, participation is open to all
   stakeholders. IETF processes outlined in Section I were used to
   develop this proposal. Those same processes have been and shall be
   used to amend governance of the protocol parameters function. As
   mentioned previously, anyone may propose amendments to those
   processes, and anyone may take part in the decision process.

      >>>
      >>> "Maintain the security, stability, and resiliency of the
      >>> Internet DNS;"
      >>>

   IETF Response:

   No changes are proposed in this document that affect the security,
   stability, and resiliency of the DNS.

      >>>
      >>> "Meet the needs and expectation of the global customers and
      >>> partners of the IANA services;"
      >>>

   IETF Response:

   Implementers and their users from around the world make use of the
   IETF standards and the associated IANA protocol parameters
   registries. The current IANA protocol parameters registries system

is meeting the needs of these global customers. This proposal
continues to meet their needs by maintaining the existing processes
that have served them well in the past.

>>>

>>>
>>> "Maintain the openness of the Internet."
>>>

IETF Response:

This proposal maintains the existing open framework that allows
anyone to participate in the development of IETF standards, including
the IANA protocol parameters registries policies. Further, an
implementer anywhere in the world has full access to the protocol
specification published in the RFC series and the protocol parameters
registries published at iana.org. Those who require assignments in
the IANA protocol registries will continue to have their requests
satisfied, as specified by the existing policies for those
registries.

>>>
>>> "The proposal must not replace the NTIA role with a
>>> government-led or an inter-governmental organization solution."
>>>

Policy oversight is performed by the IAB, which is neither a
government-led or an intergovernmental organization.

>>>
>>> VI. Community Process
>>>
>>> This section should describe the process your community used for
>>> developing this proposal, including:
>>>
>>> o The steps that were taken to develop the proposal and to
>>>   determine consensus.
>>>

IETF Response:

The IESG established the IANAPLAN working group to develop this
response. Anyone was welcome to join the discussion and participate
in the development of this response. An open mailing list
(ianaplan@ietf.org) has been associated with the working group. In
addition, IETF's IANA practices have been discussed in the broader
community, and all input has been welcome. Normal IETF procedures

   [RFC2026] [RFC2418] were used to determine rough consensus. The
   chairs of the working group reviewed open issues and, after an
   internal working group last call, determined that all had been
   satisfactorily addressed, and subsequently the IESG did a formal
   IETF-wide Last Call followed by a formal review and determined that
   the document had rough consensus.

   >>>
   >>> Links to announcements, agendas, mailing lists, consultations and
   >>> meeting proceedings.
   >>>

   IETF Response:

   The following list is not exhaustive, as there have been many open
   discussions about this transition within the IETF community in the
   past few months.

   Creation of an open mailing list to discuss the transition:
      http://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/ietf-announce/
      Ztd2ed9U04qSxI-k9-Oj80jJLXc

   Announcement of a public session on the transition:
      http://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/ietf-announce/
      M5zVmFFvTbtgVyMB_fjUSW4rJ0c

   Announcement by the IESG of the intent to form a working group:
      http://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/ietf-announce/
      QsvU9qX98G2KqB18jy6UfhwKjXk

   The working group discussion:
      http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ianaplan/current/
      maillist.html

   2014-10-06 Interim Meeting Agenda, Minutes, and presentations:
      http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/interim/2014/10/06/ianaplan/
      proceedings.html

   Working group last call:
      http://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/ianaplan/
      EGF9rfJxn5QpQnRXmS2QxYKYR8k

   Agenda from IETF 91 IANAPLAN WG meeting:
      http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/91/agenda/agenda-91-ianaplan

   Minutes of IETF 91 IANAPLAN WG meeting:
      http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/91/minutes/minutes-91-ianaplan

    Shepherd write-up:
       http://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-ianaplan-icg-response/
       shepherdwriteup/

    IETF last call:
       http://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/ietf-announce/
       i5rx6PfjJCRax3Lu4qZ_38P8wBg

    >>>
    >>> An assessment of the level of consensus behind your community's
    >>> proposal, including a description of areas of contention or
    >>> disagreement.
    >>>

    IETF Response:

    This document has attained rough consensus of the IETF Working Group
    and of the IETF community as a whole, as judged first by the working
    group chairs and then by the sponsoring Area Director, and then by
    the IESG in accordance with [RFC2026] during the 18 December 2014
    IESG telechat. The IESG has approved the draft, pending insertion of
    this answer in this section and the IAB approval note. The IAB
    approved a statement for inclusion in the document on 19 December
    2014.

    Over the course of the development of the document, several
    suggestions were raised that did not enjoy sufficient support to be
    included. Two general areas of suggestion that generated much
    discussion were

    o A suggestion for a stronger statement over what terms the IAOC
       should negotiate.

    o A suggestion that "iana.org" and other associated marks be
       transferred to the IETF trust.

    At the end of the working group process, although there was not
    unanimous support for the results, the working group chairs concluded
    that rough consensus existed in the working group. The document
    shepherd's summary of the WG consensus for this document can be found
    here:

    https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-ianaplan-icg-response/
    shepherdwriteup/

    During IETF last call, additional people voiced support for the
    document. There were several editorial comments that resulted in
    changes, as well as some discussion of more substantial comments some

of which resulted in text changes. There was some discussion of
comments already discussed earlier in the process, and but no new
objections were raised during the IETF last call. A summary of the
last call comments can be found from here:

http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ianaplan/current/msg01500.html

New draft versions were prepared that took into account all the
agreed changes from the last call. The final version was then
approved by the IESG.

3. IANA Considerations

This memo is a response to a request for proposals. No parameter
allocations or changes are sought.

4. Security Considerations

While the agreement, supplements, policies, and procedures around the
IANA function have shown strong resiliency, the IETF will continue to
work with all relevant parties to facilitate improvements while
maintaining availability of the IANA registries.

5. IAB Note

The IAB supports the response in this document.

6. Acknowledgments

This document describes processes that have been developed by many
members of the community over many years. The initial version of
this document was developed collaboratively through both the IAB IANA
Strategy Program and the IETF IANAPLAN WG. Particular thanks go to
Jari Arkko, Marc Blanchet, Brian Carpenter, Alissa Cooper, John
Curran, Leslie Daigle, Heather Flanagan, Christer Holmberg, John
Klensin, Barry Leiba, Milton Mueller, Andrei Robachevsky, Andrew
Sullivan, Dave Thaler, Greg Wood, and Suzanne Woolf.

7. References

7.1. Normative References

[BCP9info] "Information on "The Internet Standards Process --
           Revision 3"", <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2026>.

[METRICS] IANA, "Performance Standards Metrics Report",
           <http://www.iana.org/performance/metrics>.

   [MOUSUP]   IAOC, "Supplements to RFC 2860 (the Memorandum of
               Understanding between the IETF and ICANN)",
               <http://iaoc.ietf.org/contracts.html>.

   [NTIA-Announce]
               NTIA, "NTIA Announces Intent to Transition Key Internet
               Domain Name Functions", March 2014,
               <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/press-release/2014/ntia-
               announces-intent-transition-key-internet-domain-name-
               functions>.

   [NTIA-Contract]
               NTIA, "The NTIA Contract with ICANN",
               <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/publications/
               sf_26_pg_1-2-final_award_and_sacs.pdf>.

   [RFC2026]   Bradner, S., "The Internet Standards Process -- Revision
               3", BCP 9, RFC 2026, DOI 10.17487/RFC2026, October 1996,
               <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2026>.

   [RFC2418]   Bradner, S., "IETF Working Group Guidelines and
               Procedures", BCP 25, RFC 2418, DOI 10.17487/RFC2418,
               September 1998, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2418>.

   [RFC2850]   Internet Architecture Board and B. Carpenter, Ed.,
               "Charter of the Internet Architecture Board (IAB)",
               BCP 39, RFC 2850, DOI 10.17487/RFC2850, May 2000,
               <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2850>.

   [RFC2860]   Carpenter, B., Baker, F., and M. Roberts, "Memorandum of
               Understanding Concerning the Technical Work of the
               Internet Assigned Numbers Authority", RFC 2860,
               DOI 10.17487/RFC2860, June 2000,
               <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2860>.

   [RFC3307]   Haberman, B., "Allocation Guidelines for IPv6 Multicast
               Addresses", RFC 3307, DOI 10.17487/RFC3307, August 2002,
               <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3307>.

   [RFC3777]   Galvin, J., Ed., "IAB and IESG Selection, Confirmation,
               and Recall Process: Operation of the Nominating and Recall
               Committees", RFC 3777, DOI 10.17487/RFC3777, June 2004,
               <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3777>.

   [RFC3935]   Alvestrand, H., "A Mission Statement for the IETF",
               BCP 95, RFC 3935, DOI 10.17487/RFC3935, October 2004,
               <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3935>.

   [RFC4071] Austein, R., Ed. and B. Wijnen, Ed., "Structure of the
              IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA)", BCP 101,
              RFC 4071, DOI 10.17487/RFC4071, April 2005,
              <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4071>.

   [RFC5226] Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an
              IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", BCP 26, RFC 5226,
              DOI 10.17487/RFC5226, May 2008,
              <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5226>.

   [RFC5771] Cotton, M., Vegoda, L., and D. Meyer, "IANA Guidelines for
              IPv4 Multicast Address Assignments", BCP 51, RFC 5771,
              DOI 10.17487/RFC5771, March 2010,
              <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5771>.

   [RFC6220] McPherson, D., Ed., Kolkman, O., Ed., Klensin, J., Ed.,
              Huston, G., Ed., and Internet Architecture Board,
              "Defining the Role and Function of IETF Protocol Parameter
              Registry Operators", RFC 6220, DOI 10.17487/RFC6220, April
              2011, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6220>.

   [RFC6761] Cheshire, S. and M. Krochmal, "Special-Use Domain Names",
              RFC 6761, DOI 10.17487/RFC6761, February 2013,
              <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6761>.

   [RFC6890] Cotton, M., Vegoda, L., Bonica, R., Ed., and B. Haberman,
              "Special-Purpose IP Address Registries", BCP 153,
              RFC 6890, DOI 10.17487/RFC6890, April 2013,
              <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6890>.

   [RFC7282] Resnick, P., "On Consensus and Humming in the IETF",
              RFC 7282, DOI 10.17487/RFC7282, June 2014,
              <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7282>.

7.2. Informative References

   [I-D.leiba-cotton-iana-5226bis]
              Cotton, M., Leiba, B., and D. Narten, "Guidelines for
              Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", Work in
              Progress, draft-leiba-cotton-iana-5226bis-17, July 2016.

[ICG-Response]
          IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group, "Proposal
          to Transition the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned
          Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions from the U.S. Commerce
          Department's National Telecommunications and Information
          Administration (NTIA) to the Global Multistakeholder
          Community", 11 March 2016,
          <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/
          iana-stewardship-transition-proposal-10mar16-en.pdf>.

[ProtoParamEvo14]
          IAB Chair, "Subject: Re: [Internetgovtech] Guiding the
          Evolution of the IANA Protocol Parameter Registries",
          March 2014, <http://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/
          internetgovtech/4EQ4bnEfE5ZkrPAtSAO2OBZM03k>.

[RFC-INDEX]
          RFC Editor, "RFC Index",
          <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc-index.txt>.

[RFC2014] Weinrib, A. and J. Postel, "IRTF Research Group Guidelines
           and Procedures", BCP 8, RFC 2014, DOI 10.17487/RFC2014,
           October 1996, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2014>.

[RFC2870] Bush, R., Karrenberg, D., Kosters, M., and R. Plzak, "Root
           Name Server Operational Requirements", RFC 2870,
           DOI 10.17487/RFC2870, June 2000,
           <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2870>.

[RFC3172] Huston, G., Ed., "Management Guidelines & Operational
           Requirements for the Address and Routing Parameter Area
           Domain ("arpa")", BCP 52, RFC 3172, DOI 10.17487/RFC3172,
           September 2001, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3172>.

[RFC4193] Hinden, R. and B. Haberman, "Unique Local IPv6 Unicast
           Addresses", RFC 4193, DOI 10.17487/RFC4193, October 2005,
           <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4193>.

[RFC6793] Vohra, Q. and E. Chen, "BGP Support for Four-Octet
           Autonomous System (AS) Number Space", RFC 6793,
           DOI 10.17487/RFC6793, December 2012,
           <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6793>.

[RFC6852] Housley, R., Mills, S., Jaffe, J., Aboba, B., and L.
           St.Amour, "Affirmation of the Modern Paradigm for
           Standards", RFC 6852, DOI 10.17487/RFC6852, January 2013,
           <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6852>.

   [RFC7020] Housley, R., Curran, J., Huston, G., and D. Conrad, "The
              Internet Numbers Registry System", RFC 7020,
              DOI 10.17487/RFC7020, August 2013,
              <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7020>.

   [RFC7249] Housley, R., "Internet Numbers Registries", RFC 7249,
              DOI 10.17487/RFC7249, May 2014,
              <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7249>.

Appendix A. The Charter of the IANA Stewardship Coordination Group
             (ICG)

   Charter for the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group V.10

   (August 27, 2014)

   The IANA stewardship transition coordination group (ICG) has one
   deliverable: a proposal to the U.S. Commerce Department National
   Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) regarding
   the transition of NTIA's stewardship of the IANA functions to the
   global multi-stakeholder community. The group will conduct itself
   transparently, consult with a broad range of stakeholders, and ensure
   that its proposals support the security and stability of the IANA
   functions.

   The group's mission is to coordinate the development of a proposal
   among the communities affected by the IANA functions. The IANA
   functions are divided into three main categories: domain names,
   number resources, and other protocol parameters. The domain names
   category falls further into the country code and generic domain name
   sub-categories. While there is some overlap among all of these
   categories, each poses distinct organizational, operational and
   technical issues, and each tends to have distinct communities of
   interest and expertise. For those reasons it is best to have work on
   the three categories of IANA parameters proceed autonomously in
   parallel and be based in the respective communities.

   The IANA stewardship transition process is taking place alongside a
   parallel and related process on enhancing ICANN accountability.
   While maintaining the accountability of Internet identifier
   governance is central to both processes, this group's scope is
   focused on the arrangements required for the continuance of IANA
   functions in an accountable and widely accepted manner after the
   expiry of the NTIA-ICANN contract. Nevertheless, the two processes
   are interrelated and interdependent and should appropriately
   coordinate their work.

   The coordination group has four main tasks:
   (i) Act as liaison to all interested parties, including the three
       "operational communities" (i.e., those with direct operational
       or service relationship with IANA; namely names, numbers,
       protocol parameters). This task consists of:
         a. Soliciting proposals from the operational communities
         b. Soliciting the input of the broad group of communities
            affected by the IANA functions
   (ii) Assess the outputs of the three operational communities for
        compatibility and interoperability

(iii) Assemble a complete proposal for the transition
(iv) Information sharing and public communication
Describing each in more detail:
   (i) Liaison
      a. Solicit proposals

The ICG expects a plan from the country code and generic name
communities (possibly a joint one), a plan from the numbers
community, and a plan from the protocol parameters community.
Members of the ICG will ensure that the communities from which they
are drawn are working on their part of the transition plans. This
involves informing them of requirements and schedules, tracking
progress, and highlighting the results or remaining issues. The role
of a coordination group member during this phase is to provide status
updates about the progress of his or her community in developing
their component, and to coordinate which community will develop a
transition proposal for each area of overlap (e.g., special-use
registry).

While working on the development of their proposals, the operational
communities are expected to address common requirements and issues
relating to the transition, in as far as they affect their parts of
the stewardship of IANA functions.

b.   Solicit broader input

The ICG is open for input and feedback from all interested parties.
While no set of formal requirements related to a transition proposal
will be requested outside the operational communities, everyone's
input is welcome across all topics.

The ICG expects that all interested parties get involved as early as
possible in the relevant community processes. Input received
directly by the ICG may be referred to the relevant community
discussion.

The ICG members chosen from a particular community are the official
communication channel between the ICG and that community.

(ii) Assessment

When the group receives output from the communities it will discuss
and assess their compatibility and interoperability with the
proposals of the other communities. Each proposal should be
submitted with a clear record of how consensus has been reached for
the proposal in the community, and provide an analysis that shows the

proposal is in practice workable. The ICG should also compile the
input it has received beyond the operational communities, and review
the impacts of this input.

The ICG might at some point detect problems with the component
proposals. At that point the role of the ICG is to communicate that
back to the relevant communities so that they (the relevant
communities) can address the issues. It is not in the role of the
ICG to develop proposals or to select from among competing proposals.

(iii) Assembling and submitting a complete proposal

The assembly effort involves taking the proposals for the different
components and verifying that the whole fulfills the intended scope,
meets the intended criteria, that there are no missing parts, and
that the whole fits together. The whole also needs to include
sufficient independent accountability mechanisms for running the IANA
function. The ICG will then develop a draft final proposal that
achieves rough consensus within the ICG itself. The ICG will then
put this 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 in a
manner similar to what was described in task (ii) above. Updates are
subject to the same verification, review, and consensus processes as
the initial proposals. 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 return to the
liaison phase.

(iv) Information sharing

The ICG serves as a central clearinghouse for public information
about the IANA stewardship transition process. Its secretariat
maintains an independent, publicly accessible and open website, under
its own domain, where status updates, meetings and notices are
announced, proposals are stored, the ICG members are listed, etc. As
the development of the transition plans will take some time, it is
important that information about ongoing work is distributed early
and continuously. This will enable sharing of ideas and the
detection of potential issues.

Appendix B.   IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group Request for
              Proposals

   IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group Request for Proposals

   8 September 2014

   Introduction

   Under the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG)
   Charter, the ICG has four main tasks:

   (i) Act as liaison to all interested parties in the IANA
       stewardship transition, including the three "operational
       communities" (i.e., those with direct operational or service
       relationships with the IANA functions operator; namely names,
       numbers, protocol parameters). This task consists of:

       a. Soliciting proposals from the operational communities
       b. Soliciting the input of the broad group of communities
          affected by the IANA functions

   (ii) Assess the outputs of the three operational communities for
        compatibility and interoperability

   (iii) Assemble a complete proposal for the transition

   (iv) Information sharing and public communication

   This Request for Proposals (RFP) addresses task (i) of the ICG
   Charter. This RFP does not preclude any form of input from the
   non-operational communities.

   0. Complete Formal Responses

   The IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG) seeks
   complete formal responses to this RFP through processes which are to
   be convened by each of the "operational communities" of IANA (i.e.,
   those with direct operational or service relationships with the IANA
   functions operator, in connection with names, numbers, or protocol
   parameters).

   Proposals should be supported by the broad range of stakeholders
   participating in the proposal development process. 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. In order to help the ICG maintain its
   light coordination role, all interested and affected parties are

strongly encouraged to participate directly in these community
processes.

The following link provides information about ongoing community
processes and how to participate in them, and that will continue to
be updated over time:

https://www.icann.org/en/stewardship/community

In this RFP, "IANA" refers to the functions currently specified in
the agreement between NTIA and ICANN
[http://www.ntia.doc.gov/page/iana-functions-purchase-order] as well
as any other functions traditionally performed by the IANA functions
operator. SAC-067

[https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-067-en.pdf]
provides one description of the many different meanings of the term
"IANA" and may be useful reading in addition to the documents
constituting the agreement itself.

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.

A major challenge of the ICG will be to identify and help to
reconcile differences between submitted proposals, in order to
produce a single plan for the transition of IANA
stewardship. Submitted Proposals should therefore focus on those
elements that are considered to be truly essential to the transition
of their specific IANA functions. The target deadline for all
complete formal responses to this RFP is 15 January 2015.

I. Comments

While the ICG is requesting complete formal proposals through
processes convened by each of the operational communities, and that
all interested parties get involved as early as possible in the
relevant community processes, some parties may choose to provide
comments directly to the ICG about specific aspects of particular
proposals, about the community processes, or about the ICG's own
processes. Comments may be directly submitted to the ICG any time
via email to icg-forum@icann.org. Comments will be publicly archived
at <http://forum.icann.org/lists/icg-forum/>.

   Commenters should be aware that ICG will direct comments received to
   the relevant operational communities if appropriate. The ICG will
   review comments received as time and resources permit and in
   accordance with the overall timeline for the transition. That is,
   comments received about specific proposals may not be reviewed until
   those proposals have been submitted to the ICG. The ICG may
   establish defined public comment periods about specific topics in
   the future, after the complete formal responses to the RFP have been
   received.

   Required Proposal Elements

   The ICG encourages each community to submit a single proposal that
   contains the elements described in this section.

   Communities are requested to describe the elements delineated in the
   sections below in as much detail possible, and according to the
   suggested format/structure, to allow the ICG to more easily
   assimilate the results. While each question is narrowly defined to
   allow for comparison between answers, respondents are encouraged to
   provide further information in explanatory sections, including
   descriptive summaries of policies/practices and associated
   references to source documents of specific policies/practices. In
   this way, the responses to the questionnaire will be useful at the
   operational level as well as to the broader stakeholder communities.

   In the interest of completeness and consistency, proposals should
   cross-reference wherever appropriate the current IANA Functions
   Contract[3] when describing existing arrangements and proposing
   changes to existing arrangements.

   0. Proposal type

   Identify which category of the IANA functions this submission
   proposes to address:
    [ ] Names [ ] Numbers [ ] Protocol Parameters

   I. Description of Community's Use of IANA Functions

   This section should list the specific, distinct IANA functions your
   community relies on. For each IANA function on which your community
   relies, please provide the following:

    o A description of the function;
    o A description of the customer(s) of the function;
    o What registries are involved in providing the function;

   o A description of any overlaps or interdependencies between your
     IANA requirements and the functions required by other customer
     communities.

   If your community relies on any other IANA service or activity
   beyond the scope of the IANA functions contract, you may describe
   them here. In this case please also describe how the service or
   activity should be addressed by the transition plan.

   II. Existing, Pre-Transition Arrangements

   This section should describe how existing IANA-related arrangements
   work, prior to the transition.

   [3] http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/
           publications/sf_26_pg_1-2-final_award_and_sacs.pdf

   A. Policy Sources

   This section should identify the specific source(s) of policy which
   must be followed by the IANA functions operator in its conduct of
   the services or activities described above. If there are distinct
   sources of policy or policy development for different IANA
   functions, then please describe these separately. For each source of
   policy or policy development, please provide the following:

    o Which IANA function (identified in Section I) are affected.
    o A description of how policy is developed and established and who
      is involved in policy development and establishment.
    o A description of how disputes about policy are resolved.
    o References to documentation of policy development and dispute
      resolution processes.

   B. Oversight and Accountability

   This section should describe all the ways in which oversight is
   conducted over the IANA functions operator's provision of the
   services and activities listed in Section I and all the ways in
   which the IANA functions operator is currently held accountable for
   the provision of those services. For each oversight or
   accountability mechanism, please provide as many of the following as
   are applicable:

   Which IANA functions (identified in Section I) are affected. If the
   policy sources identified in Section II.A are affected, identify
   which ones are affected and explain in what way.

o A description of the entity or entities that provide oversight or
  perform accountability functions, including how individuals are
  selected or removed from participation in those entities.
o A description of the mechanism (e.g., contract, reporting scheme,
  auditing scheme, etc.). This should include a description of the
  consequences of the IANA functions operator not meeting the
  standards established by the mechanism, the extent to which the
  output of the mechanism is transparent and the terms under which
  the mechanism may change.
o Jurisdiction(s) in which the mechanism applies and the legal basis
  on which the mechanism rests.

III. Proposed Post-Transition Oversight and Accountability
     Arrangements

This section should describe what changes your community is
proposing to the arrangements listed in Section II.B in light of the
transition. If your community is proposing to replace one or more
existing arrangements with new arrangements, that replacement should
be explained and all of the elements listed in Section II.B should
be described for the new arrangements. Your community should provide
its rationale and justification for the new arrangements.

If your community's proposal carries any implications for the
interface between the IANA functions and existing policy arrangements
described in Section II.A, those implications should be described
here.

If your community is not proposing changes to arrangements listed in
Section II.B, the rationale and justification for that choice should
be provided here.

IV. Transition Implications

This section should describe what your community views as the
implications of the changes it proposed in Section III. These
implications may include some or all of the following, or other
implications specific to your community:

Description of operational requirements to achieve continuity of
service and possible new service integration throughout the
transition.

Risks to operational continuity and how they will be addressed.
Description of any legal framework requirements in the absence of the
NTIA contract. Description of how you have tested or evaluated the
workability of any new technical or operational methods proposed in
this document and how they compare to established arrangements.

Description of how long the proposals in Section III are expected to
take to complete, and any intermediate milestones that may occur
before they are completed.

V. NTIA Requirements

Additionally, NTIA has established that the transition proposal must
meet the following five requirements:
  o Support and enhance the multistakeholder model;
  o Maintain the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet
    DNS;
  o Meet the needs and expectation of the global customers and
    partners of the IANA functions;
  o Maintain the openness of the Internet;
  o The proposal must not replace the NTIA role with a government-led
    or an inter-governmental organization solution.

This section should explain how your community's proposal meets these
requirements and how it responds to the global interest in the IANA
functions.

VI. Community Process

This section should describe the process your community used for
developing this proposal, including:
  o The steps that were taken to develop the proposal and to determine
    consensus.
  o Links to announcements, agendas, mailing lists, consultations and
    meeting proceedings.
  o An assessment of the level of consensus behind your community's
    proposal, including a description of areas of contention or
    disagreement.

Appendix C. Correspondence of the IETF to the ICG

   The following messages were sent to the ICG:

   From: Jari Arkko <jari.arkko@piuha.net>
   Subject: Re: [Internal-cg] Question from the ICG
   Date: 20 Feb 2015 23:46:20 GMT+2
   To: Alissa Cooper <alissa@cooperw.in>, ICG <internal-cg@icann.org>
   Cc: Izumi Okutani <izumi@nic.ad.jp>

   Dear Alissa and the ICG,

   We refer to the question that the ICG asked the IETF community
   on 9 Feb 2015

   http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ianaplan/current/msg01610.html

   > The numbers proposal sees these changes as a requirement of the
   > transition and the protocols parameters proposal does not. If
   > these aspects of the proposals are perceived as incompatible would
   > the numbers and protocol parameters communities be willing to
   > modify their proposals to reconcile them?

   We do not observe incompatibilities between the proposals from the
   numbers and protocol parameters communities. The numbers
   community expresses a preference to transfer the trademark and
   domain, while the IETF proposal does not oppose such transfer.
   This is not an incompatibility, it is something that can be
   satisfied by implementation of both number and protocol
   parameters community's proposals, as already specified.

   To confirm this, and to determine whether the transfer
   of the trademark and domain would be acceptable,
   we consulted the community. It is the opinion of the
   IANAPLAN working group that they would support a
   decision by the IETF Trust to hold the trademark and domain
   on behalf of the Internet community. For details, see
   http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ianaplan/current/msg01659.html

   The IETF Trust also looked at this issue. The trustees decided that
   the IETF Trust would be willing to hold intellectual property rights
   relating to the IANA function, including the IANA trademark and the
   IANA.ORG domain name. For details, see
   http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ianaplan/current/msg01664.html

   In short, we find no incompatibility between the proposals and no
   need to modify the protocol parameters proposal.

      Best Regards,
      Jari Arkko and Russ Housley on behalf of the IETF community and
      the IETF Trust

      From: Jari Arkko <jari.arkko@piuha.net>
      Subject: [Internal-cg] IETF response to the time frame inquiry
      Date: 5 Jun 2015 13:39:50 GMT+3
      To: Alissa Cooper <alissa@cooperw.in>
      Cc: ICG <internal-cg@ianacg.org>

      This is a response to a query regarding transition finalisation and
      implementation time frames, sent to the IANAPLAN working
      group list by the chairs of the IANA Transition Coordination
      Group (ICG) on May 27th.

      While I am carrying this response back to the ICG, the substance
      of this response has been discussed in the IANAPLAN working
      group and the relevant parts of IETF leadership. I believe this
      response represents the (rough) consensus opinion that
      emerged in the discussion, as well as the current state
      of IANA arrangement updates that our leadership bodies
      have been working on.

      The IETF is ready today to take the next steps in the
      implementation of the transition of the stewardship.
      In our case, most of the necessary framework is already
      in place and implemented in preceding years.

      The remaining step is an updated agreement with
      ICANN which addresses two issues. These issues are
      outlined in Section 2.III in the Internet Draft
      draft-ietf-ianaplan-icg-response-09.txt:

      o The protocol parameters registries are in the public domain. It
      is the preference of the IETF community that all relevant parties
      acknowledge that fact as part of the transition.

      o It is possible in the future that the operation of the protocol
      parameters registries may be transitioned from ICANN to subsequent
      operator(s). It is the preference of the IETF community that, as
      part of the NTIA transition, ICANN acknowledge that it will carry
      out the obligations established under C.7.3 and I.61 of the
      current IANA functions contract between ICANN and the NTIA
      [NTIA-Contract] to achieve a smooth transition to subsequent
      operator(s), should the need arise. Furthermore, in the event of
      a transition it is the expectation of the IETF community that

   ICANN, the IETF, and subsequent operator(s) will work together to
   minimize disruption in the use of the protocol parameters registries
   or other resources currently located at iana.org.

   The IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC) has
   decided to use an update of our yearly IETF-ICANN Service Level
   Agreement (SLA) as the mechanism for this updated
   agreement. They have drafted the update and from our
   perspective it could be immediately executed. Once the updated
   agreement is in place, the transition would be substantially
   complete, with only the NTIA contract lapse or termination
   as a final step.

   Of course, we are not alone in this process. Interactions
   with other parts of the process may bring additional
   tasks that need to be executed either before or
   after the transition. First, the ICG, the RIRs,
   and IETF have discussed the possibility of aligning
   the treatment of IANA trademarks and domains. The
   IETF Trust has signalled that it would be willing to do this,
   if asked. We are awaiting coordination on this
   to complete, but see no problem in speedy
   execution once the decision is made. From our
   perspective this is not a prerequisite for the transition,
   however.

   In addition, the names community has proposed the
   creation of a 'Post Transition IANA' (PTI). If the existing
   agreements between the IETF and ICANN remain in place
   and the SLAs discussed above are not affected, the IETF
   transition would take place as described above. That is
   our preference. If the final details of the PTI plan require
   further action from the IETF, more work and community
   agreement would be required. The timeline for that work
   cannot be set until the scope is known.

   Jari Arkko, IETF Chair
   (reporting his summary of the situation)

   From: Jari Arkko <jari.arkko@piuha.net>
   Subject: [Internal-cg] Response from IETF IANAPLAN WG regarding the
   ICG question on coordination
   Date: 8 Oct 2015 10:13:07 GMT+3
   To: IANA etc etc Coordination Group <internal-cg@ianacg.org>

   The IANAPLAN working group has discussed the coordination
   question from the ICG. In the working group's opinion,

        informal coordination exists today and will continue, which
        is consistent with the commitment requested by the ICG.

        This is also consistent with an overall coordination commitment
        already indicated in the IANAPLAN proposal. The proposal
        is a consensus document of the IETF. From the proposal:

        The IETF will continue to coordinate with ICANN, the RIRs, and other
        parties that are mutually invested in the continued smooth operation
        of the Internet registries.

        The coordination approach is also consistent with the
        comments that were sent by the IAB to the ICG during the
        public comment period. See
        https://www.iab.org/documents/correspondence-reports-documents/2015-
        2/iab-comments-on-icg-proposal/.

        Jari Arkko,
        IETF Chair and the Area Director for the IANAPLAN WG

Authors' Addresses

        Eliot Lear (editor)
        Richtistrasse 7
        Wallisellen, ZH CH-8304
        Switzerland

        Phone: +41 44 878 9200
        Email: lear@cisco.com

        Russ Housley (editor)
        918 Spring Knoll Drive
        Herndon, VA 20170
        United States of America

        Email: housley@vigilsec.com