

**New committees & groups to be formed post-transition (Page 1 of 6)**

<b>IANA Function Review Team (IFRT)</b>			
<b>Description</b>	<b>Occurrence</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Composition</b>
To review PTI's SOW and PTI's performance against ICANN-PTI contract and SOW	Periodic (Within 2 years from the transition, then no more than every 5 years thereafter)	Cross Community Working Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 ccNSO</li> <li>- 1 ccTLD (non-ccNSO)</li> <li>- 2 RySG</li> <li>- 1 RsSG</li> <li>- 1 CSG</li> <li>- 1NCSG</li> <li>- 1 GAC</li> <li>- 1 SSAC</li> <li>- 1 RSSAC</li> <li>- 1 ALAC</li> <li>- 1 CSC Liaison</li> </ul> Liaison <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 from Numbers community</li> <li>- 1 from Protocol community</li> </ul>
<b>CWG Proposals Reference</b>			<b>Affected Parties</b>
<p><b>1119:</b> The members of the IANA Function Review Team (IFRT) will be selected by the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees and will include several liaisons from other communities. While the IFRT is intended to be a smaller group, it will be open to non-member “participants” in much the same way as the CWG-Stewardship is.</p> <p><b>1283:</b> All stakeholder groups represented at ICANN will be relevant for the reviews done by the IANA Function Review Team. Additionally, the Number and Protocol operational communities will each be offered the opportunity to name a liaison to the review group.</p> <p><b>1289:</b> Supporting Organizations or Advisory Committees, in accordance with their respective internally defined processes, will appoint individuals who have submitted Expressions of Interest. In the case of the non-ccNSO ccTLD representative, the ccNSO will be the appointing body; in appointing the non-ccNSO representative it is strongly recommended that the ccNSO also consult with the Regional ccTLD Organizations, namely AfTLD, APTLD, LACTLD, and CENTR.</p>			ccNSO ccTLD RySG RsSG CSG NCSG GAC SSAC RSSAC ALAC CSC Number Community Protocol Community
<p><b>1295:</b> this review group will be co-chaired by someone designated by the GNSO and someone designated by the ccNSO.</p>			ccNSO GNSO

**New committees & groups to be formed post-transition (Page 2 of 6)**

<b>Special IANA Function Review Team (Special IFRT)</b>			
<b>Description</b>	<b>Occurrence</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Composition</b>
To review the issues identified by CSC (only ccNSO and GNSO can initiate Special IFR)	As needed	Cross Community Working Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 ccNSO</li> <li>- 1 ccTLD (non-ccNSO)</li> <li>- 2 RySG</li> <li>- 1 RsSG</li> <li>- 1 CSG</li> <li>- 1NCSG</li> <li>- 1 GAC1 SSAC</li> <li>- 1 RSSAC</li> <li>- 1 ALAC</li> <li>- 1 CSC</li> </ul> <p>Liaison</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 from Numbers community</li> <li>- 1 from Protocol community</li> </ul>
<b>CWG Proposals Reference</b>			<b>Affected Parties</b>
<p><b>1125:</b> Following the exhaustion of ... escalation mechanisms, the ccNSO and GNSO will be responsible for checking and reviewing the outcome of the CSC process ... and the IANA Problem Resolution Process ... and for determining whether or not a Special IFR is necessary. After consideration, which may include a public comment period and must include meaningful consultation with other SO/ACs, the Special IFR could be triggered. In order to trigger a Special IFR, it would require a vote of both of the ccNSO and GNSO Councils (each by a supermajority vote according to their normal procedures for determining supermajority). The Special IFR will follow the same multistakeholder cross community composition and process structure as the periodic IANA Function Review.</p>			ccNSO ccTLD RySG RsSG CSG NCSG GAC SSAC RSSAC ALAC CSC
<p><b>1127:</b> If the IFR determines that a separation process is necessary, it will recommend the creation of the Separation Cross-Community Working Group (SCWG). This recommendation will need to be approved by both of the ccNSO and GNSO Councils (each by a supermajority vote, according to their normal procedures for determining supermajority), and will need to be approved by the ICANN Board after a public comment period, as well as a community mechanism derived from the CCWG-Accountability process. A determination by the ICANN Board to not approve an SCWG that had been supported by a supermajority of the ccNSO and GNSO Councils will need to follow the same supermajority thresholds and consultation procedures as ICANN Board rejection (by a supermajority vote) of a PDP recommendation that is supported by a GNSO supermajority.</p>			ccNSO GNSO

**New committees & groups to be formed post-transition (Page 3 of 6)**

<b>Customer Standing Committee (CSC)</b>			
<b>Description</b>	<b>Occurrence</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Composition</b>
To monitor the performance of the IANA naming function	On-Going	Standing Committee	Members: - 2 gTLD ROs - 2 ccNSO ROs - 1 TLD representative not considered cc/gTLD (not mandatory member) - 1 liaison from PTI 1 Liaison each from: - GNSO (non-registry) - ALAC - NRO (or ASO) - GAC - RSSAC - SSAC
<b>CWG Proposals Reference</b>			<b>Affected Parties</b>
<p><b>1131:</b> The CSC is not mandated to initiate a change in the IANA Functions Operator via a Special IANA Function Review, but could escalate to the ccNSO and GNSO Councils or either body in the specific case where the issue in question applies only to ccTLDs or gTLDs respectively, which might then decide to take further action using agreed consultation and escalation processes.</p> <p><b>1336:</b> A representative for a TLD registry operator not associated with a ccTLD or gTLD registry, will be required to submit an Expression of Interest to either the ccNSO and GNSO Council. The Expression of Interest must include a letter of support from the registry operator. This provision is intended to ensure orderly formal arrangements, and is not intended to imply those other registries are subordinate to either the ccNSO or the GNSO.</p> <p><b>1337:</b> The full membership of the CSC must be approved by the ccNSO and the GNSO. While it will not be the role of the ccNSO and GNSO to question the validity of any recommended appointments to the CSC they will take into account the overall composition of the proposed CSC in terms of geographic diversity and skill sets.</p>			ccNSO GNSO
<p><b>1336:</b> While the ccTLD and gTLD members will be appointed by the ccNSO and RySG respectively and liaisons by their applicable groups, ccTLD or gTLD registry operators that are not members of these groups will be eligible to participate in the CSC as members or liaisons. The ccNSO and RySG should consult prior to finalizing their selections with a view to providing a slate of members and liaisons that has, to the extent possible, diversity in terms of geography and skill set.</p> <p><b>1348:</b> The CSC will provide regular updates, no less than three per year, to the direct customers of the IANA naming function. These updates may be provided to the RySG and the ccNSO during ICANN meetings.</p>			ccNSO RySG

**New committees & groups to be formed post-transition (Page 4 of 6)**

<b>[CSC Charter Review]</b>			
<b>Description</b>	<b>Occurrence</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Composition</b>
To review CSC Charter	As needed (1 year after the first CSC meeting, then as requested thereafter)	Cross Community Working Group	Representatives from the ccNSO and the RySG
<b>CWG Proposals Reference</b>			<b>Affected Parties</b>
<p><b>1357:</b> The Charter will initially be reviewed by a committee of representatives from the ccNSO and the RySG one year after the first meeting of the CSC. The review is to include the opportunity for input from other ICANN stakeholders, via a Public Comment process. Any recommended changes are to be ratified by the ccNSO and the GNSO.</p>			ccNSO RySG GNSO
<p><b>1358:</b> Thereafter, the Charter will be reviewed at the request of the CSC, ccNSO or GNSO and may also be reviewed in connection with the IANA Function Review.</p>			ccNSO GNSO

<b>[CSC Review]</b>			
<b>Description</b>	<b>Occurrence</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Composition</b>
To review the effectiveness of CSC	Periodic (2 years after the first CSC meeting, then every 3 years thereafter)	Cross Community Working Group	n/a (ccNSO and GNSO to determine)
<b>CWG Proposals Reference</b>			<b>Affected Parties</b>
<p><b>1359:</b> The effectiveness of the CSC will initially be reviewed two years after the first meeting of the CSC; and then every three years thereafter. The method of review will be determined by the ccNSO and GNSO.</p>			ccNSO GNSO

<b>[CSC Service Level Target Review]</b>			
<b>Description</b>	<b>Occurrence</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Composition</b>
To review the requests of review or change to the service level targets	As needed	Cross Community Working Group	ccNSO and GNSO
<b>CWG Proposals Reference</b>			<b>Affected Parties</b>
<p><b>1360:</b> The CSC or the IANA Functions Operator can request a review or change to service level targets. Any proposed changes to service level targets as a result of the review must be agreed to by the ccNSO and GNSO.</p>			ccNSO GNSO

**New committees & groups to be formed post-transition (Page 5 of 6)**

<b>Root Zone Evolution Review Committee (RZERC)</b>			
<b>Description</b>	<b>Occurrence</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Composition</b>
To advise the ICANN Board of the architectural and operational changes to the root zone environment	As needed	Standing Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An ICANN Board member</li> <li>- A senior IFO administrator or delegate</li> <li>- A chair or delegate from:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o SSAC</li> <li>o RSSAC</li> <li>o ASO</li> <li>o IETF</li> </ul> </li> <li>- A representative of:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o GNSO RySG</li> <li>o ccNSO</li> <li>o Root Zone Maintainer</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>CWG Proposals Reference</b>			<b>Affected Parties</b>
<p><b>1155:</b> The Board shall grant approval on the recommendation of a standing committee with a proposed membership of: an ICANN Board member (possibly as Chair), a senior IANA Functions Operator administrator or delegate, and Chairs or delegates of the SSAC, RSSAC, ASO and IETF, a representative of the GNSO RySG, a representative of the ccNSO and a representative of the Root Zone Maintainer.</p>			SSAC RSSAC SAO IETF RySG ccNSO

**New committees & groups to be formed post-transition (Page 6 of 6)**

<b>Separation Cross Community Working Group (SCWG)</b>			
<b>Description</b>	<b>Occurrence</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Composition</b>
To review the issues raised by the Special IFR and make recommendation	As needed	Cross Community Working Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 ccNSO</li> <li>- 1 ccTLD (non-ccNSO)</li> <li>- 3 RySG</li> <li>- 1 RrSG</li> <li>- 1 CSG</li> <li>- 1 NCSG</li> <li>- 1 GAC</li> <li>- 1 SSAC</li> <li>- 1 RSSAC</li> <li>- 1 ALAC</li> <li>- 1 CSC</li> <li>- 1 IFRT</li> <li>- 1 liaison from Protocol operational community</li> <li>- 1 liaison from Numbers operational community</li> </ul>
<b>CWG Proposals Reference</b>			<b>Affected Parties</b>
<p><b>1394:</b> Each group will be responsible for appointing its own representative to the SCWG. In the case of the non-ccNSO ccTLD representative, the ccNSO will be the appointing body; in appointing the non-ccNSO representative it is strongly recommended that the ccNSO also consult with the Regional ccTLD Organizations, namely AfTLD, APTLD, LACTLD, and CENTR.</p> <p><b>1395:</b> It is strongly recommended that the representatives appointed to the SCWG be different representatives than those that participated in the Special IFR (with the exception of the liaison to the IANA Function Review Team appointed by the CSC). This will provide an additional check, accounting for the fact that different skill sets may be required for the two processes, and provide for broader community representation in the IANA oversight process.</p> <p><b>1396:</b> To the extent possible, it is recommended that individuals with experience managing an RFP process be appointed to the SCWG. For communities appointing more than one representative to the SCWG it is strongly advised that, to the extent possible, the appointed representatives come from different ICANN geographic regions, to provide for diversity on the SCWG.113</p> <p><b>Footnote 113:</b> One specific expectation is that with six total registry seats on the SCWG, including ccTLD and gTLD registries, all five ICANN geographical regions be represented.</p>			ccNSO ccTLD (AfTLD, APTLD, LACTLD, CENTR) RySG RrSG CSG NCSG GAC SSAC RSSAC ALAC Protocol operational community Numbers operational community
<p><b>1399:</b> A determination by the ICANN Board to not approve a recommendation by the SCWG that had been supported by a supermajority of the ccNSO and GNSO Councils will need to follow the same supermajority thresholds and consultation procedures as ICANN Board rejection (by a supermajority vote) of a PDP recommendation that is supported by a supermajority of the GNSO.</p>			ccNSO GNSO