

An Update and Look Ahead



Who are we?

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 – on request, none received

1 Liaison appointed by PTI

- Elise Gerich (PTI)

5 SO/AC Liaisons, appointed by their organizations:

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

What do we do?

- Monitor
- Inform Community
- Consult & Review

- 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' on 'as needed' basis
- The whole process is working very well
 - problem areas are being identified immediately and corrective measures being developed cooperatively
 - areas where SLE's may be too restrictive are also coming out
- ICANN community needs to begin to plan to play their role for reviews
 - GNSO and ccNSO need to begin process for CSC Charter review to commence October 2017

Activities since October 2016

- Reviewed 4 PTI reports and issued 4 monthly CSC reports
- Approved the PTI customer dashboard
- Discussed PTI/IANA 2016 Customer Survey
- Discussed process for PTI related complaints
 - To date NO outstanding complaints
- Developed Internal Procedures

- Monthly meetings
 - Receive & discuss PTI report
 - Decide on CSC report
 - Other topics
- Meetings are open
 - Recordings published on our website
 - Reports sent to an extensive distribution list

Monitoring: the CSC's Core Responsibility

- CSC monitors and reports on PTI's compliance to the *IANA 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 DT-A, one of the CWG 'Design Teams'

Monitoring

Example: SLE is met

- Overall performance to date has been 'satisfactory'
- The SLE for PTI processing of a request for "the creation or transfer of a gTLD" is 10 days
- To be considered to have met this metric, PTI needs to meet the threshold 90% of the time
- PTI met the metric in December for the 10 gTLD requests received. The longest took only 2.91 days

Monitoring

Example: SLE not fully met

Technical checks for “gTLD creation or transfer” SLE is 3 minutes, 90% of the time.

- In December, 16 requests exceeded the technical check SLA, meaning that the SLE was not met
- PTI explained that the problem arose because the system sequentially processes and measures requests. The time in the queue as well as the time to execute the technical check is measured.

CSC discussed issue with PTI

- Implementation is consistent with definitions (CWG Design Team A)
- CSC may recommend that SLEs be revised by the GNSO
- Currently PTI evaluating a rewrite of the technical check portion, with the next RZMS revision to allow for concurrent testing.

Performance and Complaints:

CSC and PTI Remedial Action Procedure (RAP)

- Persistent performance issue identified by CSC
- Issue flowing from a complaint is 'Systemic or Persistent'
 - CSC still needs to develop criteria to determine if issue is 'systemic or persistent'
- CSC and PTI need to agree on Remedial Action Procedure (RAP)
 - Illustrative RAP included in CSC charter

Performance and Complaints: ~~Complaint Resolution Process~~ PTI- PTI customer

- Very limited role for CSC
 - Receive notification of escalations (from PTI or complainant)
 - If issue is “systemic or persistent” => RAP
- Procedure detailed in IANA Naming Functions Agreement

- **PTI completed 2016 customer survey**
 - Overall, very high satisfaction with PTI
 - Next survey: CSC to work with PTI to improve the response rate

- **Informing community**
 - Dashboard launched
 - Monthly reports
 - Presentations to ICANN community

- Community Consultation with PTI on PTI performance (Surveys, community consultations)
- Review of Processing times for emergency requests
- Evolve Internal Procedures
 - For example procedure for handling complaints
- Review transition plan (once every 5 years)
- Request a review or change of SLE's
 - Updated SLE's to be approved by ccNSO and GNSO

Upcoming Work – Community Led reviews

- First CSC Charter review:
 - Start of review October 2017
 - Committee ccNSO and RySG
 - Any changes to be agreed by GNSO and ccNSO
- SLE review; in particular change of service level targets
 - Recommendations from CSC to GNSO and ccNSO
 - Changes need to be agreed by GNSO and ccNSO
- Effectiveness review: CSC – October 2018
 - Method to be determined by ccNSO and GNSO
- IANA Function Review– to begin in fall of 2018, CSC to provide liaison
 - In case of Special IFRT – on demand, CSC to provide liaison

- **Major re-architecture.** The core codebase for RZMS is based on early 2000s technology, using frameworks that make it difficult to improve the software. The software team is re-implementing the software in modern frameworks and making the system less monolithic so individual modules can be updated more rapidly.
- **New authorization model.** Removes the tight linkage between the Administrative/Technical Contact's role in being listed as the WHOIS contact for a TLD, and the role of authorizing change requests. This will allow TLDs much more flexibility on managing how changes to their TLD are approved and makes it easier to list customer service helpdesks as contacts in the WHOIS. The new authorizer contact model will also support multi-factor authentication for increased security, and will implement specific changes in the ccNSO's Framework of Interpretation for a new "delegation contact".
- **New technical check system.** By de-coupling the logic of technical checks from the workflow management system, it will allow the technical check system to adapt to new requirements more easily. It will also provide richer feedback to customers on what has failed in their TLD's configuration and how to remedy problems.
- **Customer API.** Providing customers with API-access to submit root zone change requests and manage their accounts. This is a growing requirement as some TLD operators manage portfolios of hundreds of domains, and submitting the change requests individually can be burdensome. An API allows either customers to build their own tools, or us to provide customers with specific tools for unique circumstances.
- **Implement TLD deletion workflow.** Currently deleting a TLD (due to retirement or revocation) is performed manually out-of-band. Under the RZMA agreement with Verisign we are obligated to communicate these via EPP by 1 October 2017. This is envisaged by implementing TLD delegation capability in RZMS similar to how TLD creation and maintenance is performed.
- **New internal admin interface.** By taking the experience of staff from the existing RZMS deployment, the interface is being redesigned to simplify workflows and reduce time it takes for staff to perform common actions.

High Level Timeline for 2017 Improvements

- 2017Q1 — Re-implementing existing functionality in v3 platform. Initial work on defining new authorization model.
- 2017Q2 — Implement new authorization model and TLD delegation workflow.
- 2017Q3 — Implement Customer API and technical check system. Commence integration testing.
- 2017Q4 — Continue testing and deployment.