

The Year in Review – *and a Look Ahead*



From CSC Charter:

- “The mission of the CSC is to ensure continued satisfactory performance of the IANA function for the direct customers of the naming services. The primary customers of the naming services are top-level domain registry operators, but also include root server operators and other non- root zone functions.”
- “The mission will be achieved through regular monitoring by the CSC of the performance of the IANA naming function against agreed service level targets and through mechanisms to engage with the IANA Functions Operator to remedy identified areas of concern.”

2 gTLD members, appointed by RySG

- Kal Feher and Elaine Pruis

2 ccTLD members, appointed by ccNSO

- Jay Daley and Byron Holland (chair)

1 member non-ccTLD or gTLD – none appointed

6 Liaisons, appointed by their organizations:

- Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC), Jeff Bedser (SSAC), James Gannon (GNSO - Non-Registry), Elise Lindeberg, (GAC), Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)
- Naela Sarras (PTI)

Monitoring – Core CSC Responsibility

- CSC monitors and reports on PTI compliance with the Naming Function Agreement including 'Service Level Agreement' (SLA) metrics
- There are 63 individual metrics within 8 groups e.g. technical checks, staff processing time for gTLD creation
- The SLE's are contained in the IANA Naming Function Agreement and were developed by one of the CWG 'Design Teams' – DT-A

- Since October 2016 PTI's overall performance score has ranged from 95.9 to 100%
 - Their lower scores have tended to occur earlier in the year; lately they have had 100% compliance
 - Some of the 'metric misses' resulted from SLA metrics which we are recommending be changed; such changes would have improved the overall performance rating
- The CSC also gives PTI a monthly qualitative score – 'excellent', 'satisfactory' or 'needs improvement'
- Our assessment is that for the year as a whole, their overall performance has been 'excellent'

- CSC Charter provides:

"The CSC will, on an annual basis or as needs demand, conduct a consultation with the IANA Functions Operator, the primary customers of the naming services, and the ICANN community about the performance of the IANA Functions Operator."

"The CSC, in consultation with registry operators, is authorized to discuss with the IANA Functions Operator ways to enhance the provision of IANA's operational services to meet changing technological environments"

- What are your views?
- Do you have any feedback on PTI's performance or the need for service enhancements?

- Customer complaints are to be addressed by PTI alone – CSC’s Charter prevents it from becoming involved in individual complaints
- CSC role in complaints is limited:
 - To monitoring PTI’s overall complaint management system
 - To being informed of the status of individual ‘escalations’ (complaints escalated to PTI management)
 - Since Oct. 2016, the CSC has been informed of 2 escalations; both have been closed.
- Where CSC believes that individual problems represent ‘systemic or persistent’ issues it can invoke ‘remedial action procedures’ (RAP)

Remedial Action Procedures

- Can be invoked by CSC where it has identified a performance issue, or where it determines that a problem is 'systemic or persistent'
- CSC has prepared a draft set of RAPs
- It contemplates a three level escalation procedure:
 - PTI board, then
 - ICANN CEO, then
 - ICANN Board
- PTI approval also required
 - Draft of procedures being reviewed by ICANN legal;
- Final approval is expected soon

- Informing community
 - PTI dashboard
 - 12 monthly reports produced by PTI and 12 by CSC
 - presentations to ICANN community
 - Monthly CSC meetings, open to all
- PTI completed 2016 customer survey
 - overall, very high satisfaction with PTI
 - Survey participation very low
 - More registry engagement needed

Survey 2016 - Response Rate **CSC** | Customer Standing Committee

TLD results

TLD Operators Requesting Routine Root Zone Change Requests

| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Invitations sent | 295 | 242 | 411 | 540 |
| Response count | 34 | 61 | 67 | 82 |
| Response rate | 12% | 30% | 16% | 15% |
| Overall satisfaction rate | 93% | 92% | 91% | 91% |

Low



Low



Survey Results 2016: Delegations or Transfers

ccTLDs

| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Invitations sent | 17 | 31 | 9 | 9 |
| Response count | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Response rate | 0 | 16% | 0 | 0 |
| Overall satisfaction rate | N/A | 88% | N/A | N/A |

**Very
Low**



gTLDs

| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Invitations sent | 0 | 199 | 260 | 399 |
| Response count | 0 | 35 | 35 | 21 |
| Response rate | 0 | 18% | 13% | 5% |
| Overall satisfaction rate | N/A | 87% | 87% | 84% |

Low



- The 2017 Survey has now been sent out
 - It reflects changes suggested by the CSC
 - A third part vendor, Ebiquity, is being used
 - The deadline for responding has been extended to November 17th to give you time to do this – why don't you do it right now!
- Registries are encouraged to respond to the survey
 - We can't know how PTI is doing if you don't give your input
 - Any questions can be directed to IANA@iana.org

- Remedial Action procedures
- Review of PTI Development Plan
- Process for changes to SLE's
 - Current process is inflexible, in particular for minor changes; we are recommending a process proportionate to the nature of the changes.
 - Allow CSC and IFO to make threshold changes without lengthy consultation process.
- Specific SLE changes

Changes to SLE's

| Metric | Current SLA | Actual | Proposed Adjusted SLA | Explanation |
|--|--|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Technical Check – Retest | 95% within 3 min, measured monthly | 5-8 mins | 95% within 10 min | This was an unnecessarily tight target and relaxing it has no impact on customers. |
| Technical Check – Supplemental | 95% within 1 min (routine) 95% within 5 min (TLD creation/transfer) | 5-8 mins | 95% within 10 min | This was an unnecessarily tight target and relaxing it has no impact on customers. |
| ccTLD Creation/Transfer – Validation and Reviews | 100% within 60 days, measured monthly | Varies, up to 67 days (estimate) | 80% within 60 days, 100% within 90 days, measured annually | The number of requests for this process is historically limited in number, and the complexity so variable that it is hard to set a realistic SLA based on evidence. Relaxing the target overall would be unfair on those that provide high quality documentation and so reducing the threshold is the best course of action. However, the low number of requests then means this must be measured annually not monthly. |

Upcoming Work – Community Led Reviews

- CSC Charter review
 - Underway now by a committee from ccNSO and RySG
 - CSC has already met with the Review Team
 - any changes to the charter need to be agreed by GNSO and ccNSO
- Review of CSC Effectiveness – October 2018
 - method to be determined by ccNSO and GNSO
- Periodic IANA Function Review (IFR)
 - First such IFR must begin by Oct. 2018
 - One element is performance of CSC in providing PTI oversight (18.3 (j) of ICANN bylaws)

- PTI performance is extremely good - some minor metrics missed, no customer service impact nor operational problems
- CSC is coming together as a committee and is working through its 'to do list'
- The whole process is working very well
 - problem areas are being identified immediately and corrective measures being developed cooperatively
 - areas where SLE's implementation may need changes have been identified
- ICANN community needs to prepare for their role in the multiple reviews
 - Charter Review now ongoing; two more to begin by October 2018