



I A B

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

May 24, 2012

Sheryl D. Sanders,
Contracting Officer
1401 Constitution Ave NW
Room 6520
Washington, District of Columbia 20230

Dear Ms. Sanders:

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

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 Standards and Best Current Practice documents, and any other RFC that calls for IANA assignments. These procedures are publicly documented in RFC 2860 "Memorandum of Understanding Concerning the Technical Work of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority"¹.

2. .ARPA zone management. Manage and operate the .ARPA zone under guidance from the Internet Architecture Board (IAB). This is publicly documented in RFC 3172 "Management Guidelines & Operational Requirements for the Address and Routing Parameter Area Domain ("arpa")"² 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:

The current contract (and extensions) have been in place since August 2006, so that performance ratings cover this period.

However, the IETF has been using the IANA since the IETF was established in 1986 and has been using the IANA function in ICANN since ICANN took over that 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.

1 <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2860.txt>

2 <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3172.txt>

Protocol parameter function: Since August 2006, performance quality has been high, reliably meeting the service level agreement we have with ICANN, so that performance over this recent period is 'Exceptional'. The performance quality evaluation is 'Very Good' based on IETF experience over the last 11 years. 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 '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: Since August 2006, performance has been high, reliably meeting the service level agreement we have with ICANN, so that performance over this recent period is 'Exceptional'. The performance evaluation is 'Very Good' based on IETF experience over the last 11 years.

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 '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. These issues have since been successfully resolved to the IAB's satisfaction.

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				

Since August 2006, the business relationship with respect to .ARPA zone management has been 'Very Good'. As noted earlier, there have been communication issues.

Since August 2006, the business relationship between the IETF and IANA has been 'Exceptional' with respect to the protocol parameter function. We are in constant communications. An IANA representative actively participates in formal IETF Steering Group 2 1/2 hour calls twice a month in fulfillment of their responsibilities. Each week a list of open issues is provided by the IANA protocol parameter functions contractor to ensure that nothing falls between the cracks.

There is also the IETF-IANA Committee (sometimes called the Working Group) that reviews IANA performance. It is composed of members from the IETF and the IANA. The IANA produces a monthly report that is emailed to the IETF-IANA committee. It is publicly available at <http://www.iana.org/about/performance/ietf-statistics/> . The report includes narrative and statistics presented in graphical form. The IETF-IANA committee held monthly conference calls from 2007 to 2011 to discuss the report. As a result of IANA's excellent performance against the SLA these calls have been reduced to a single call between each IETF meeting. This is in addition to continuing the face-to-face meetings held at the three IETF meetings per year.

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.

Since August 2006, the quality of oral and written communications with respect to .ARPA zone management has been 'Very Good'.

Over the period, the quality of oral and written communication with respect to protocol parameter assignment has been 'Exceptional'. As mentioned above ICANN transparently provides data on service levels at <http://www.iana.org/about/performance/ietf-statistics>. Further, ICANN presents a transparent view into the queue of internet drafts, which contain the instructions on which IANA creates or modifies registries, at <http://www.iana.org/about/performance/ietf-draft-status>.

ICANN and the IETF maintain a close working relation with effective communication channels in place:

- The IETF hosts a IANA-IETF mailing-list available to members of the IETF leadership and IANA staff. The list is used to discuss and resolve issues in a collaborative manner. For example, it is used to fine tune reporting, and to provide status reports on issues on which IETF or IANA action is pending, thereby improving the workflow.
- ICANN provides performance report summaries that are presented at each IETF plenary meeting in a format requested by the IETF chair. These summaries are available at http://iaoc.ietf.org/plenary_reports.html
- At each IETF meeting there are formal and informal meetings between ICANN and the IETF leadership.
- At each IETF meeting ICANN maintains a help desk and makes itself available for IETF participants to answer questions and resolve issues.

A summary of IETF-IANA oversight is available at: <http://www.iab.org/wp-content/IAB-uploads/2012/04/IETF-IANA-Oversight.pdf>.

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 SLAs: <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: May 24, 2012

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 August 2006.

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 that a change in the selected vendor, the introduction of additional COTR review, or the introduction of additional 3rd parties into the workflow, would require a significant adjustment period in which disruptive quality and schedule issues would be likely to arise.