IANA ccNSO Update
Recap: IANA functions

- Root Zone
  - ccTLDs -> Following ccNSO policy
  - gTLDs -> Following GNSO policy
  - Other -> IETF standards, etc.
- .INT
- .ARPA
- *.ARPA
- root-servers.net
- IDN repository*

* Not in scope for NTIA contract
Recap: IANA functions

- IPv4 global address space
  - Unicast -> RIRs
  - Multicast -> end users
  - Special allocations -> IETF

- IPv6 global address space
  - (As for IPv4)

- AS number space
  - Normal -> RIRs
  - Special allocations -> IETF
Recap: IANA functions

- Registries specified in RFCs
  - Based on IETF/IAB policies
- A small number of registries*
  - e.g. ICANN Registrar IDs
- Time Zone Database*

* Not in scope for NTIA contract
Audit Success

- Successfully completed first audit ("SOC2") of our IANA Registry Management Systems
- Complements existing audits of our DNSSEC key management.
Delegation/redelegation improvements

• Joint ccNSO-GAC working group on a “framework of interpretation” looks to be concluding its work soon
  ○ ICANN will prepare a draft implementation plan
  ○ Looking at outreach efforts associated with those changes

• Public reporting of pending redelegation requests
New reporting and documentation

- We now publish an increased range of reports on root management
  - “Audit report” of all root changes
  - SLA/performance report
- New documentation on procedures and help articles
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## Key Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeliness</strong></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timeliness — End-to-end processing for changes pertaining to routine maintenance of delegated TLDs (such as NS changes, DS changes, point-of-contact changes, and other administrative updates) are performed within 21 days.

**Accuracy** — The requests that have passed validation are implemented correctly at the conclusion of a change request.

## Requests Performed

The following requests were completed under Section C.2.9.2.a and C.2.9.2.b during the reporting period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Timeliness</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLD</td>
<td>Request received</td>
<td>Request validated</td>
<td>Request dispatched</td>
<td>Request completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>af</td>
<td>2013-08-27</td>
<td>2013-09-10</td>
<td>2013-09-10</td>
<td>2013-09-12</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by</td>
<td>2013-08-28</td>
<td>2013-08-29</td>
<td>2013-08-30</td>
<td>2013-09-03</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bw</td>
<td>2013-08-28</td>
<td>2013-09-04</td>
<td>2013-09-04</td>
<td>2013-09-06</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sz</td>
<td>2013-08-29</td>
<td>2013-08-30</td>
<td>2013-09-03</td>
<td>2013-09-03</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ve</td>
<td>2013-08-29</td>
<td>2013-09-03</td>
<td>2013-09-04</td>
<td>2013-09-06</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gov</td>
<td>2013-08-29</td>
<td>2013-09-10</td>
<td>2013-09-10</td>
<td>2013-09-10</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu</td>
<td>2013-09-02</td>
<td>2013-09-04</td>
<td>2013-09-05</td>
<td>2013-09-05</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>md</td>
<td>2013-09-02</td>
<td>2013-09-10</td>
<td>2013-09-10</td>
<td>2013-09-10</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ykp</td>
<td>2013-09-02</td>
<td>2013-09-02</td>
<td>2013-09-04</td>
<td>2013-09-06</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLD</td>
<td>Change Details</td>
<td>Final status (Reason for non-completion if applicable)</td>
<td>Date of Implementation or Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tc</td>
<td>Updated Nameserver Records</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2013-09-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf</td>
<td>Multiple changes affecting Administrative Contact, Sponsoring Organisation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2013-09-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au</td>
<td>Updated Nameserver Records</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2013-09-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar</td>
<td>Multiple changes affecting Administrative Contact, Technical Contact, Domain Metadata</td>
<td>Administratively Closed (Lacked confirmation by a domain contact)</td>
<td>2013-09-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my</td>
<td>Add name server NS30.COMMUNITYDNS.NET</td>
<td>Administratively Closed (Unresolved technical issues with request)</td>
<td>2013-09-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ro</td>
<td>Multiple nameserver changes involving SEC-DNS-B.ROTLD.RO, SEC-DNS-A.ROTLD.RO</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2013-09-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preparation of an Operational and Technical Plan

This article provides additional detail on preparing an operational and technical plan as it relates to the procedure to delegate or redelegate a country-code top-level domain (ccTLD).

General overview

ICANN's role is to review whether the proposed manager will perform its tasks with a satisfactory level of operational and technical competency. We primarily do this by asking a requestor to provide a technical and operational plan describing how the proposed manager will manage the domain.

It is recognized that the requirements for operating a ccTLD vary significantly by country. The operational approach for a small country with a limited number of domains will be very different from a registry that maintains millions of registrations and has committed to providing a high-level of uptime, 24x7 support, and an automated registration interface such as an EPP-based registry.

The review process is not intended to enforce a particular approach on all requestors. We review the planning assumptions made against the proposed setup of the operation. We apply our understanding of industry norms to consider if the assumptions are reasonable and if the proposed operation is likely to satisfy those assumptions. If the assumptions or plans appear unreasonable, we will make additional enquiries to the requestor to better understand the proposal.

Considering this assessment approach, a key part in developing a plan is documenting the assumptions and policy constraints that apply to the operation. For example, some of the questions to consider would be: What are the number of projected domains within the ccTLD that need to be managed? How many transactions are expected to be processed? What are the service-level obligations (for uptime, responsiveness, etc.) that the registry is committed to? What are the specific policy requirements that the registry is required to implement?

If the plans provided do not document such assumptions, or do not provide a sufficient level of detail so that the proposed operations can be understood, we may not be able to properly assess the technical and operational capacity of the proposed manager.

Requestors should be aware the plans are not just limited to the technical systems, but also to other resourcing of the proposed management of the domain. Plans should include explanations of the software, hardware, network architecture, staffing, expertise and facilities of the proposed manager.
Preparing an Operational and Technical Plan

This article provides additional detail on preparing an operational and technical plan as it relates to the procedure to delegate or redelegate a country-code top-level domain (ccTLD).

General overview

ICANN’s role is to review whether the proposed manager will perform its tasks with a satisfactory level of operational and technical competency. We primarily do this by asking a requestor to provide a technical and operational plan describing how the proposed manager will manage the domain.

It is recognised that the requirements for operating a ccTLD vary significantly by country. The operational approach for a small country with limited number of domains will be very different from a registry that maintains millions of registrations and has committed to providing a high-level of uptime, 24x7 support, and an automated registration interface such as an EPP-based registry.

The review process is not intended to enforce a particular approach on all requestors. We review the planning assumptions made against the proposed set up of the operation. We apply our understanding of industry norms, to consider if the assumptions are reasonable and if the proposed operation is likely to satisfy those assumptions. If the assumptions or plans appear unreasonable, we will make additional enquires to the requestor to better understand the proposal.

Considering this assessment approach, a key part in developing a plan is documenting the assumptions and policy constraints that apply to the operation. For example, some of the questions to consider would be: What are the number of projected domains within the ccTLD that need to be managed? How many transactions are expected to be processed? What are the service-level obligations (for uptime, responsiveness, etc.) that the registry is committed to? What are the specific policy requirements that the registry is required to implement?

If the plans provided do not document such assumptions, or do not provide a sufficient level of detail so that the proposed operations can be understood, we may not be able to properly assess the technical and operational capacity of the proposed manager.

Requestors should also be aware that the plans are not just limited to the technical systems, but also to other resourcing of the proposed management of the domain. Plans should include explanations of the software, hardware, network architecture, staffing, expertise and facilities of the proposed manager.
IANA Customer Survey

• Customer satisfaction survey, independently conducted

Aggregated satisfaction – average of function specific questions

- Documentation quality: 100 (Very Satisfied & Satisfied), 0 (Dissatisfied & Very Dissatisfied)
- Process quality: 100 (Very Satisfied & Satisfied), 0 (Dissatisfied & Very Dissatisfied)
- Transparency: 95 (Very Satisfied & Satisfied), 5 (Dissatisfied & Very Dissatisfied)
- Timeliness: 84 (Very Satisfied & Satisfied), 16 (Dissatisfied & Very Dissatisfied)
- Accuracy: 99 (Very Satisfied & Satisfied), 1 (Dissatisfied & Very Dissatisfied)
- Reporting: 81 (Very Satisfied & Satisfied), 9 (Dissatisfied & Very Dissatisfied)
- Courtesy: 99 (Very Satisfied & Satisfied), 1 (Dissatisfied & Very Dissatisfied)
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Thanks!