

Description of categories:

Category I: Routine updates impacting Root Zone File
 Category II: Routine updates not impacting Root Zone File
 Category III: Creating or Transferring a gTLD
 Category IV: Creating or Transferring a ccTLD
 Category V: Other Change Requests

		DT-A proposal - Istanbul - March 15*	ICANN/IANA proposal - July 16	DT-A proposal - Jul 16	Notes / Comments
Performance Measurement and Reporting					
<i>(Measures against which specific thresholds should be set)</i>					
Process performance - per category (5 categories)					
R1	Time for ticket confirmation to be sent to requester following receipt of change request via automated submission interface				[7/21 call] ICANN proposal received support from group.
	Cat. I	≤ 30 min (95%)	≤ 60 s (95%)		
	Cat. II	≤ 30 min (95%)	≤ 60 s (95%)		
	Cat. III	≤ 30 min (95%)	≤ 60 s (95%)		
	Cat. IV	≤ 30 min (95%)	≤ 60 s (95%)		
	Cat. V	≤ 30 min (95%)	≤ 60 s (95%)		
R2	Time for lodgement of change request into RZMS by ICANN staff on behalf of request sent by email				[7/21 call] Further discussion needed. [7/27 note]The ICANN July-15 proposal had no data for this measurement. Per the group's suggestion, a value has now been added, for further discussion.
	Cat. I		3 days	2 days	
	Cat. II		3 days	2 days	
	Cat. III		3 days	2 days	
	Cat. IV		3 days	2 days	
	Cat. V		3 days	2 days	
R3	Time to return results for technical checks following submission of request via automated submission interface				[7/21 call] ICANN proposal received support from group, except for cat III, where suggestion was made to align Cat. III to same value as Cat. IV.
	Cat. I	≤ 2 hrs (95%)	≤ 50 min (95%)		
	Cat. II	≤ 2 hrs (95%)	n/a		
	Cat. III	≤ 2 hrs (95%)	≤ 10 min (95%)	≤ 50 min (95%)	
	Cat. IV	≤ 2 hrs (95%)	≤ 50 min (95%)		
	Cat. V	≤ 2 hrs (95%)	≤ 50 min (95%)		
R4	Time to return results for subsequent performance of technical checks during retesting due to earlier failed tests				[7/21 call] ICANN proposal received support from group.
	Cat. I		≤ 3 min (95%)		
	Cat. II		n/a		
	Cat. III		≤ 3 min (95%)		
	Cat. IV		≤ 3 min (95%)		
	Cat. V		≤ 3 min (95%)		
R5	Time for authorization contacts to be asked to approve change requests after completing previous process phase				[7/21 call] ICANN proposal received support from group.
	Cat. I		≤ 60 s (95%)		
	Cat. II		≤ 60 s (95%)		
	Cat. III		≤ 60 s (95%)		
	Cat. IV		≤ 60 s (95%)		
	Cat. V		≤ 60 s (95%)		
R6	Time for [authorization contact] response to be affirmed by IANA				[7/21 call] ICANN proposal received support from group.
	Cat. I		≤ 60 s (95%)		
	Cat. II		≤ 60 s (95%)		
	Cat. III		≤ 60 s (95%)		

		Cat. IV		≤ 60 s (95%)		
		Cat. V		≤ 60 s (95%)		
R7	Time to complete all other validations and reviews by IANA and release requests for implementation					[7/21 call] further discussion needed.
		Cat. I	≤ 4 hrs (95%)	≤ 7 d (90%)	≤ 5 d (90%)	
		Cat. II	≤ 10 d (95%)	≤ 7 d (90%)	≤ 5 d (90%)	
		Cat. III	≤ 25 d (85%)	≤ 12 d (90%)	≤ 5 d (90%)	
		Cat. IV	≤ 110 d (75%)	≤ 60 d (50%)	20 d	<p>[7/27 note] Current SLA : End-to-end processing times for changes pertaining to delegation or redelegation of country-code top-level domains are within 120 days (Target: 50%) . Cf http://www.iana.org/performance/metrics/20160630</p> <p>[7/28 - Jay Daley] I'd like to comment further on R7/Cat IV (redelegation of a ccTLD). We need to remember that the NTIA target was an end-to-end target of 120 days and the new target will not be end-to-end but solely for the IANA element. As I understand it, the parts that take the longest in the end-to-end process involve responses from the parties or others in the local community. Responses from parties involved are excluded by definition in the new measure and so the important question here is whether the time taken for community members to respond to any form of consultation is included in the SLA time or not. Personally I think it should be excluded because it is out of the control of IANA. Excluding it would also allow it to be changed as needed by policy without a knock on effect on the SLA.</p> <p>If we assume that to be the case, and</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> take into account the clarity of process provided by the Framework of Interpretation; and recognise that these are among the more complex of the activities that IANA undertakes; and remember that any time taken between IANA completing its work and the ICANN board approving the decision is out of scope for the SLA <p>then I regard a target of 20 days as much more reasonable.</p> <p>As an aside, point 3 above (ICANN board approving IANA work) does raise an interesting point that has so far not been addressed. I would be grateful if anyone can comment on how they see any need for board approval of an IANA action to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> affect the SLA; be measured and reported; be kept within a performance framework set by the community. <p>I'd also like to ask about the root zone maintainer agreement with Verisign. This gives them 72 hours (at 99%) to publish the zone and consequently that time is fixed in the proposed SLE. My view is that 72 hours is too long and as shown in the data 24 hours at 99% would be more suitable. Can anyone explain</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the implications of DT-A recommending that this figure be lower and what powers the CSC will have to adjust that figure post-transition?
		Cat. V		none		
R8	Time for third party review of requests (e.g by Board)					Not an ICANN SLA - excluded
		Cat. I		n/a		
		Cat. II		n/a		
		Cat. III		n/a		
		Cat. IV		n/a		
		Cat. V		n/a		
R9	Time to return results for performance of technical checks during Supplemental Technical Check phase					[7/21 call] ICANN proposal received support from group, except for cat III, where suggestion was made to align Cat. III to same value as Cat. IV.
		Cat. I		≤ 60 s (95%)		
		Cat. II		n/a		
		Cat. III		≤ 60 s (95%)	≤ 5 min (95%)	
		Cat. IV		≤ 5 min (95%)		
		Cat. V		≤ 5 min (95%)		

R10	Time for root zone changes to be published following completion of validations and reviews by IANA				[7/21 call] Not reviewed during call (ran out of time).
		Cat. I	≤ 72 hr (99%)		
		Cat. II	n/a		
		Cat. III	≤ 72 hr (99%)		
		Cat. IV	≤ 72 hr (99%)		
		Cat. V	≤ 72 hr (99%)		
R11	Time to notify requester of change completion following publication of requested changes				[7/21 call] Not reviewed during call (ran out of time).
		Cat. I	≤ 2 hr (95%)	≤ 60 s (95%)	
		Cat. II	≤ 2 hr (95%)	≤ 60 s (95%)	
		Cat. III	≤ 2 hr (95%)	≤ 60 s (95%)	
		Cat. IV	≤ 2 hr (95%)	≤ 60 s (95%)	
		Cat. V	≤ 2 hr (95%)	≤ 60 s (95%)	
Accuracy					
	Root zone file data published in the root zone matches that provided in the change request				[7/21 call] Not reviewed during call (ran out of time).
		Cat. I	100%		
		Cat. II	n/a		
		Cat. III	100%		
		Cat. IV	100%		
		Cat. V	100%		
	Root zone database is correctly updated in accordance with change requests (does not include impact of normalization and other processing standardization - which in any event shall never detrimentally impact the update)				[7/21 call] Not reviewed during call (ran out of time).
		Cat. I	100%		
		Cat. II	n/a		
		Cat. III	100%		
		Cat. IV	100%		
		Cat. V	100%		
Online Services Availability and Enquiry Processing					
	RZMS availability — availability of an online interactive web service for credentialed customers to submit change requests to their root zone database entries.		≥ 99.0%		[7/21 call] Not reviewed during call (ran out of time).
	Website availability — availability of root zone management related documentation (i.e. on http://www.iana.org)		≥ 99.0%		[7/21 call] Not reviewed during call (ran out of time).
	Directory service availability — availability of the authoritative database of TLDs		≥ 99.0%		[7/21 call] Not reviewed during call (ran out of time).
	Credential recovery — time to dispatch confirmation email of forgotten username or password	≤ 5 min (95%)	≤ 60 s (95%)		[7/21 call] Not reviewed during call (ran out of time).
	Credential change — time to implement new password within the system	≤ 5 min (95%)	≤ 5 min (95%)		[7/21 call] Not reviewed during call (ran out of time). [7/28, IANA] In the absence of data, IANA suggests following DT-A's proposal
	Dashboard update frequency — average time to update the dashboard to ensure up-to-date reporting	≤ 30 min (100%)	≤ 30 min (100%)		[7/21 call] Not reviewed during call (ran out of time). [7/28, IANA] In the absence of data, IANA suggests following DT-A's proposal

	Dashboard accuracy — the data presented on the dashboard is accurate	100%	1		[7/21 call] Not reviewed during call (ran out of time).
	Dashboard availability — availability of the dashboard online	≥ 99%	≥ 99%		[7/21 call] Not reviewed during call (ran out of time). [7/28, IANA] In the absence of data, IANA suggests following DT-A's proposal
	SLE report production — time to produce reports following the conclusion of the reporting period	monthly	monthly		[7/21 call] Not reviewed during call (ran out of time). [7/28, IANA] In the absence of data, IANA suggests following DT-A's proposal
	SLE report availability — availability of the SLE reports and associated data online	≥ 99%	≥ 99%		[7/21 call] Not reviewed during call (ran out of time). [7/28, IANA] In the absence of data, IANA suggests following DT-A's proposal
	SLE report publication — schedule of reporting periods	< 10 days after month end	Due no later than the 10th calendar day of the following month		[7/21 call] Not reviewed during call (ran out of time). [7/28, IANA] In the absence of data, IANA suggests following DT-A's proposal, but wishes to clarify the date the report is due.
	Time to send acknowledge of enquiry — time taken to send initial acknowledgement of receipt of a general enquiry pertaining to root zone management (but not pertaining to interactions in a change request context)		≤ 60 s (95%)		[7/21 call] Not reviewed during call (ran out of time).
	Time to send initial response to enquiry — time taken for staff to respond to enquiry, either in part or in whole		≤ 5 d (90%)		[7/21 call] Not reviewed during call (ran out of time).

Notes:

(*) The measurements discussed in Istanbul in March-15 were different from the final measurements listed here, and mapping was left to staff's appreciation. Some values may have been improperly mapped here - all feedbacks will be appreciated.