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- What brought this on?
- What do we measure?
- What are our obligations today?
- What are the caveats?
- An approach
What brought this on?

- One ccTLD asked for specific service levels prescribed in their accountability framework with ICANN
- ICANN believes it is not appropriate to have differentiated service levels on a TLD-to-TLD basis, instead there should be one agreed by the whole community.
- IANA has been approached by APTLD and CENTR to talk about possible service level agreements
What do we measure?

- IANA maintains all root zone related requests in a ticketing system:
  - “root-mgmt” queue for Root Zone Change Requests
  - “questions” queue for questions on process (shared with other tasks)

- Statistics generated from root-mgmt queue:
  - Time/duration of tickets
  - Class of ticket
  - Time divided into IANA time, third party time, DOC time and Verisign time
RZM Performance (1)

- Red tickets do not meet current timeframe requirements
RZM Performance (2)

- Average pending queue (red) trending down
- Reached “steady state”
RZM Performance (3)

- Long requests trending down
What are IANA’s obligations already? (1 of 5)

- Within **three business days** of date of receipt (which is measured from a **business day** between 9am and 5pm US Pacific Time) IANA must send a confirmation of receipt of a request and a transaction number to the requestor.
What are IANA’s obligations already? (2 of 5)

- After issuance of a receipt confirmation, IANA will determine if the requestor has provided all information necessary to complete the request, if not, within **seven calendar days** issue a notice of deficiency to the Requestor.
What are IANA’s obligations already? (3 of 5)

- If a Requestor fails to cure any deficiency in its request within fourteen calendar days, IANA will close the request.
What are IANA’s obligations already? (4 of 5)

- Once a request is deemed “complete”, Requestor is provided with seven calendar days to confirm changes. If not received, a reminder is sent and an additional seven calendar days is provided, after which the request is closed.

- If after closure, the requestor confirms the ticket within thirty calendar days, the request should be re-opened.
What are IANA’s obligations already? (5 of 5)

- After confirmations are received, IANA has **thirty calendar days** to complete a request.
- IANA reports explicitly on each breach to the Department of Commerce in its monthly report.
The reality

- IANA is far more lenient on requestors than these stipulations
  - IANA provides many months for some requests to have deficiencies cured (particularly redelegations) when there appears to be forward progress toward fulfilling the task.
  - IANA issues a “notice of administrative closure” giving 30 calendar days for the applicant to cure all deficiencies before administrative closure, in cases where the request appears to not be progressing to resolution.
  - Note that these closures are without prejudice - applicant may submit a new template at any time when they are ready, and the process begins again.
What are the caveats?

- IANA does not control most of the delays in a root zone change request
  - Internal delays essentially resolved through thorough process reviews in 2005-2006. Minor additional IANA human delays will be reduced by pending automation software.

- IANA has little control over the process currently conducted
  - Accreted through years of precedent, ccTLD expectations, contracts (i.e. IANA contract, VRSN-DOC contract)

- Differing levels of sophistication between first-world and third-world operators (i.e. expectation of completeness)

- Anything deviating from straightforward routine requests can cause substantial delays
  - Redelegations, change of contact, etc.
A possible approach

- Set a suitable advisory benchmark as a starting point
  - e.g. mean time to perform requests, or current DOC benchmark

- Perform periodic reviews (say, every 1-2 years):
  - Analyse data over the performance period
  - Collaborate on what key issues explain deviation
  - Identify on whether to alter the benchmark

- Identify what level of “bindingness” this benchmark has
  - Anything more than informative likely needs to involve ccNSO more formally
Where to from here?

- We want to hear what you need:
  - What performance of IANA is important to you? What is IANA not succeeding in today?
  - SLAs work both ways - what time frames should be incumbent on requestors and other actors?
  - How would you like this procedure to move forward?
- IANA is happy to have logical metrics for performance
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