



**I A B**

c/o Internet Society  
1775 Wiehle Avenue, Suite 201  
Reston, VA 20190-5108

December 16, 2011

Mona-Lisa Dunn,  
Contracting Officer  
14th & Constitution Avenue NW  
Room 6521  
Washington, District of Columbia 20230

Dear Ms. Dunn:

On behalf of the IETF, the Internet Architecture Board (IAB) is pleased to submit our evaluation of the past performance of ICANN with respect to the IANA Protocol Parameter function and .arpa zone management.

Sincerely yours,

Bernard Aboba  
IAB Chair  
iab-chair@iab.org

**PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE**

**A. Name of Contractor:**

ICANN

**B. Contract Number: SA1301-06-CN-0048**

E-Mail: [iab-chair@iab.org](mailto:iab-chair@iab.org)

**C. Description of organization for whom services were provided.**

The IETF is the principal body engaged in the development of new Internet standard specifications.

**D. Description of contract effort and major deliverables.**

1. Assign and register Internet protocol parameters only as directed by the criteria and procedures specified in RFCs, including Proposed, Draft and full Internet Standards and Best Current Practice documents, and any other RFC that calls for IANA assignments. For details, see RFC 2860.

2. .arpa zone management. Manage and operate the .arpa zone under guidance from the Internet Architecture Board (IAB). For details, see RFC 3172 and <http://www.iana.org/domains/arpa> .

**E. Contract type:**

Protocol parameter function: Memorandum of Understanding documented in RFC 2860, performed at no cost.

**G. Period of performance:**

Protocol parameter function: The MOU with ICANN (RFC 2860) has been in effect since 2000.

.arpa zone management: Management guidelines and operational requirements for .arpa (RFC 3172) have been in effect since 2001.

**I. PERFORMANCE QUALITY**

How well did the contractor provide quality services under the contract and the extent to which the services conformed to the contractual requirements.

Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory	N/A
	X				

*Comments, if any.*

Protocol parameter function: The performance quality evaluation is 'Very Good' based on IETF experience over the last 11 years. Over the last 4 years, performance quality has been high, reliably meeting the service level agreement we have with ICANN, so that performance over this recent period is 'Exceptional'.

See <http://iaoc.ietf.org/documents/ICANN-IETF-Agreement-2011-Executed.pdf> and <http://www.iana.org/about/performance/ietf-statistics>

.arpa zone management: The performance quality evaluation is also 'Very Good'. IAB has from time to time asked IANA to make changes to the ARPA zone or has approved changes requested by IANA. In general, there have been no problems with the quality of the work.

## II. SCHEDULE PERFORMANCE

How well did the contractor adhere to delivery and administrative schedules under the contract or technical milestones; was the contractor's response to technical direction or the contractor's ability to meet interim and final milestone schedules on a timely basis?

Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory	N/A
	X				

### *Comments, if any.*

Protocol parameter function: The performance evaluation is 'Very Good' based on IETF experience over the last 11 years. Over the last 4 years, performance has been high, reliably meeting the service level agreement we have with ICANN, so that performance over this recent period is 'Exceptional'.

See <http://iaoc.ietf.org/documents/ICANN-IETF-Agreement-2011-Executed.pdf> and <http://www.iana.org/about/performance/ietf-statistics>

.arpa zone management: The schedule performance evaluation is also 'Very Good'. IAB has from time to time asked IANA to make changes to the ARPA zone or has approved changes requested by IANA. There have been no unreasonable delays in processing routine requests. During the duration of the contract ICANN has also carried out two projects at the IAB's request: the transitioning of in-addr.arpa from ARIN to ICANN and the implementation of DNSSEC within the .arpa zone. While the projects were successfully completed, we observed communication issues, as well as schedule slippage.

## III. BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP

What was the quality of the business relationship that the contractor maintained with your organization?

Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory	N/A
	X				

#### IV. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Please rate the quality of the contractor's oral and written communications, including oral presentations and written reports and studies.

Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory	N/A
	X				

*Comments, if any.*

#### V. RESPONSE INFORMATION

The following information will assist in the analysis of the data. **This information will be kept confidential.**

Name of evaluator: Bernard Aboba (iab-chair@iab.org)

Address: Internet Architecture Board, c/o Internet Society, 1775 Wiehle Avenue, Suite 201, Reston, VA 20190-5108

Phone/FAX/Email: iab-chair@iab.org

Position/Title: IAB Chair

Length of involvement in Program/Contract: 11 years

Source of Information/Documentation utilized to rate Performance Level:

IANA Statistics for IETF-related requests: <http://www.iana.org/about/performance/ietf-statistics>

ICANN-IETF MoU: <http://iaoc.ietf.org/documents/ICANN-IETF-Agreement-2011-Executed.pdf>

Management guidelines and Operational Requirements for .arpa: <http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3172>

ICANN web page on .arpa zone management: <http://www.iana.org/domains/arpa>

Date Questionnaire Completed: December 16, 2011

**V.**

#### COMMENTS

VI. NOTE: Additional comments are appreciated.

Currently ICANN and the IETF have a service level agreement and maintain a well defined workflow. The working relationship has been established, and after some performance issues has been functioning smoothly since 2007. In general, ICANN has met the requirements documented in "Memorandum of Understanding Concerning the Technical Work of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority" RFC 2860 and the needs of the IETF and technical community as documented in "Defining the Role and Function of IETF Protocol Parameter Registry Operators" RFC 6220. It is important that the selected vendor also accept these requirements and agree to meet them. Based on our experience with ICANN, where it has taken significant time and effort to fine tune the working relationship and establish the level of performance we see today, we would expect a change in the selected vendor to require a significant adjustment period in which potential quality and schedule issues would be likely to arise.