# IANA Update

Kim Davies
Director, Technical Services

ICANN 53, Buenos Aires, Argentina

# RDAP

- Next generation WHOIS protocol, recently standardized by the IETF
- IANA manages the “bootstrap” registry, which RDAP clients use to find top-level RDAP services
  - Empty bootstrap registries posted
  - RIRs invited to post entires relating to IP numbers and AS numbers
  - Internal development on RZMS support for RDAP
- IANA planning to implement its own RDAP server next FY.
  - Provides data on records we are definitive for
    - TLDs, .INT registrants, special-use IP address blocks, reserved blocks, etc.

# Framework of Interpretation

- Board expected to approve FOI this week, and direct staff to plan implementation
- ccNSO appoints advisors to help ICANN develop an implementation plan
- Implementation plan put for public comment and finalize

- Terminology changes (documentation, software, etc.)
- Process changes relating to AC/TC and redelegations
- Proforma for stating consent
- Others

# Transition related work

- Support for Design Teams, etc.
- Internal planning for expected changes
- Service Level Expectations
- Regime for measurement
- 5x5 matrix
  - Key measure dimension
  - Workflows dimension
- Interim approach
- Long term approach

# SLA Principles

1. **Attributable measures.** Unless clearly impractical, individual metrics should be reported attributing time taken to the party responsible. For example, time spent by IANA staff processing a change request should be accounted for distinctly from time spent waiting for customer action during a change request.
2. **Overall metrics.** In addition to the previous principle, overall metrics should be reported to identify general trends associated with end-to-end processing times and processing volumes.
3. **Relevance.** All metrics to be collected should be relevant to the validation of customer service. In addition some are the critical metrics that are considered important to set specific thresholds for judging breaches in ICANN's ability to provide an appropriate level of service.
4. **Clear definition.** Each metric should be sufficiently defined such that there is a commonly held understanding on what is being measured, and how an automated approach would be implemented to measure against the standard.
5. **Definition of thresholds.** The definition of specific thresholds for performance criteria should be set based on analysis of actual data. This may require first the definition of a metric, a period of data collection, and later analysis by IANA customers before defining the threshold.
6. **Review process.** The service level expectations should be reviewed periodically, and adapted based on the revised expectations of IANA's customers and relevant updates to the environment. They should be mutually agreed between the community and the IANA Functions Operator.
7. **Regular reporting.** To the extent practical, metrics should be regularly reported in a near real-time fashion.

# Other service enhancements

- Technical check redefinition
  - Early consultation with community (technical groups)
  - Public comment period
  - Clarify new issues seen
    - Network diversity, DS records, SOA coherency
    - self-skippable tests
- Technical check reporting improvement
  - Reimplementation, clearer messaging, debug logging
- Improved induction process for users

# Thanks!