Executive Summary

This monthly report provides statistical information of IANA operations as they relate to the IETF. Also included are the deliverables for this reporting period in accordance with
the SLA between ICANN and the IAOC with the effective date 1 January 2009 (currently awaiting approval and signature).

Statistics
As outlined in the IETF–IANA SLA, IANA is tasked with collecting and reporting on IETF-related statistics.

Below you will find the list of statistics as requested by the SLA, a description of what queue’s statistics are being provided to fulfill that deliverable and an analysis of the data for each queue. The actual charts representing the data can be found at http://www.iana.org/reporting-and-stats/index.html.

This month’s statistics were generated through running scripts against a ticketing system log database. The charts were generated using java program using Jfreechart library.

The following types of charts have been defined for each queue for the reporting year 2009:

• Month to month comparison histogram of requests created/closed/open
• Month to month comparison histogram of age groups of closed tickets
• This month’s absolute age of closed requests
• Month to month comparison histogram of age groups of open tickets
• This month’s absolute age and current state of open requests
• Month to month comparison of mean, median and standard deviation for processing times of closed tickets
• Histogram for cumulative IETF requests for created/closed/resolved at the end of the reporting period and the year to date.

IESG approved documents (a)
Requests in the “drafts-approval” queue begin at the time IANA receives a notification of an approval or intent to publish a document and end when the RFC-Editor has acknowledged receipt of the notification of completed actions by IANA

DRAFTS-APPROVAL QUEUE

IANA completed a total of 26 requests for the month of February (7 of which were NO IC). 88% of the total requests (including documents with NO IC) were completed within the goal of 14 IANA days or less. Three documents had IANA processing days of 17, 27 and 61 days. There was extensive back and forth communications with the authors as well as XML experts to determine if IANA could accommodate the format preferences for the registries.

As of the last day of February, there were 2 requests open. One request remains on hold and is waiting for another document before the actions can be performed. The other document is waiting on the authors to review the IANA actions that were performed.
Reference Updates (b)

The requests in the “drafts-update-refs” queue begins at the time the RFC-Editor notifies IANA of the RFC number assigned to a document that had actions performed by IANA and ends with IANA updating all references to the document in IANA registries.

DRAFTS-UPDATE-REFS QUEUE

IANA completed a total of 20 requests for the month of February. 100% of the requests were completed within the 7 IANA day goal range. The highest total processing days for these requests was 2 days. As of the end of the month there were no open requests.

Last Calls (c)

Requests begin at the time IANA receives a notification of Last Call from the IESG and ends with IANA submitting official comments to the IESG. Each request in the statistics represents a separate/individual Last Call, even if the Last Call is being repeated.

DRAFTS-LASTCALL QUEUE

A total of 22 requests were completed for the month of February. 95% of the requests were completed within their time goals (breakdown below). One request was a couple days over the processing goal, however IANA’s response was submitted to the IESG by the last call due date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Call Time Frame</th>
<th>Total Requests</th>
<th>Completed on time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of the end of the month there were 9 open requests. All of the open requests were still within the goal times and were following normal processing.

Evaluations (d)

Requests begin at the time IANA receives a notification of Evaluation from the IESG and ends with IANA submitting official comments to the IESG. Each request in the statistics represents a separate/individual Evaluation, even if the Evaluation is being repeated.

DRAFTS-EVALUATION QUEUE

A total of 22 requests were completed in the month of February. 100% of the requests had IANA days of 7 or less. The IANA days do not include the time that the document is waiting for Last Call to finish. As of the last day of the month there was 1 request open and being processed as normal.
Media (MIME) type requests (e, f)
IANA receives requests for registration of new Media types. Also received, but rarely, are modification and deletion requests for Media types. All of these are processed in the “iana-mime” queue. These requests begin with the receipt of an application for (or modification/deletion of a Media type and end with the request being resolved with a successful registration, removal or modification. In some cases the requests are closed due to withdrawal of the request by the requester or via administrative closure, typically due to lack of response from the requester. We understand that MIME Media types are currently referred to as just “Media Types”. The queue “iana-mime” however, was named prior to this change.

IANA-MIME QUEUE

A total of 11 requests were closed in the month of February. 100% of the requests had IANA days of 14 or less. There were 2 requests that had a large numbers for expert review time, which were 89 and 107 days. Both had multiple back and forth communications between the expert and requester, however most days were on the expert review time. All others had average expert turn around.

At the end of the month, there were a total of 30 open requests. All requests were still under the IANA processing goals of 14 days and under. Twenty of those requests were waiting on the expert to review the request. Ten requests were waiting on the requester for a response. There were a large number of requests with high numbers of expert days. A more careful analysis is being completed to determine if the requests included multiple back and forth communications adding to the total expert time or if it was unresponsiveness and will be presented to the IETF-IANA working group at the next IETF meeting.

New Port number requests (g)
IANA receives requests for assignment of new user port numbers. These requests are processed in the “iana-ports” queue. Port requests begin with the receipt of an application for a user port number and end with the request being resolved with a successful registration, withdrawn by the requester, or administratively closed.

IANA-PORTS QUEUE

There were a total of 24 requests closed in the month of February. 100% of those requests were processed with an IANA time within the 14-day goal. There were multiple requests with a total processing times over 80 days where most of the time was with the expert. A more careful analysis is being completed to determine if the requests included multiple back and forth communications adding to the total expert time or if it was unresponsiveness and will be presented to the IETF-IANA working group at the next IETF meeting.

As of the end of the month there were 27 requests that were open. All of these requests had IANA days of 8 or less and all but 2 were waiting on the expert or requester. Similar
to other expert review queues, the experts appear to have significant number of processing days.

Modification to and/or deletions of Port number requests (h)

PORT-MODIFICATION QUEUE

IANA receives requests for modification of existing port numbers. Also received, but are rare, are deletion requests. Both of these are processed in the “port-modifications” queue. These requests begin with the receipt of a modification (or deletion) request and end with the request being resolved with a successful modification (or removal) or closed due to withdrawal or administrative closure.

During this reporting period, there were a total of 5 closed requests. 100% of these requests were completed within the goal processing time of 7 IANA days or less. The total days for all these requests was not more than 35 days.

At the end of February, there were 5 requests open at the end of the month. All requests had IANA days of 1 and were waiting for a response from the requester.

New Private Enterprise Number (PEN) requests (i)

All PEN (Private Enterprise Numbers) type requests are processed in an automated program that does not go through IANA’s ticketing system. The tool includes new, modification and deletion requests. The tool does not yet produce statistics similar to what is available for the other protocol parameter queues. Raw data shows that 193 new PENs were assigned in February 2009.

Modification to and/or deletions of PEN requests (j)

Modifications and/or deletions of PENs occur in a separate tool in which the statistics production is not yet available. More information can be found above in the “New Private Enterprise Number (PEN) requests” section. Raw data shows that 18 existing PENs were modified in February 2009.

New IANA TRIP ITAD Numbers (k)

IANA receives requests for assignment of new TRIP ITAD numbers. These requests are processed in the “iana-trip” queue. Requests begin with the receipt of an application for a TRIP ITAD number and end with the request being resolved with a successful registration, withdrawn by the requester, or administratively closed.

IANA-TRIP QUEUE

There were a total of 6 IANA-TRIP requests closed in the month of February. 100% of the closed requests had an IANA time of 7 days or less. As of the last day of February, there were 2 requests that remained open and were being processed as normal.
Requests relating to other IETF-created registries for which the request rate is more than five per month (I)

For those registries where there are more than 5 requests per month, IANA creates a separate queue for tracking those tickets.

IANA-MULTICAST QUEUE

There were no multicast requests closed during the month of February. As of the end of the month there were 3 open requests. Both were waiting on the requester and had no more than 5 IANA days as of the end of the month, however these requests had been open more than 20 days at the end of the month. A general analysis will be completed for all expert review queues on response times and will be presented to the IANA-IETF working group at the next IETF meeting.

IANA-PROT-PARAM QUEUE

Note: The IANA-PROT-PARAM queue is for all the miscellaneous requests that are not processed in a separate queue due to the lack of volume for any one type of request. These requests can be first-come first-served, expert review, IESG approval or another review method. In the SLA, processing goals are determined on the type of request. However, for this queue there is no separation of request type.

There were 8 requests closed during the month of February. 83% of the requests were processed within the appropriate IANA time goals (see breakdown below). There was 1 request that had 62 total IANA days. This was partly due to staffing delays in previous months. One request had a total processing time of 123 days. This request required both an expert review and review by Area Directors to make sure the request qualified for assignment. Two requests were administratively closed (not included in the breakdown below) due to lack of requester response and the need for a RFC publication for assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Type</th>
<th>Number of Requests</th>
<th>IANA goal time</th>
<th>Requests completed within goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert Review (with and without mailing list)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14 days or less</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IESG Review</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14 days or less</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 15 requests open as of the end of the month. All requests were waiting on the expert or requester to respond. Only 1 request had IANA processing days of 65 due to IANA delays carried over from the previous months. All other requests were being processed as normal.
Deliverables
In accordance with the SLA, the IANA is reporting on the following deliverables due within two (2) months of implementation of the agreement for the reporting year 2009:

1) Provide publicly accessible, clear and accurate periodic statistics (continual)
2) Track and publicly report on a monthly basis (monthly report - continual)
3) Single points of failure documentation to IETF-IANA Working Group (continual)

Provide publicly accessible, clear and accurate periodic statistics

See “Statistics” section of this report and also http://www.iana.org/reporting-and-stats/index.html.

Track and publicly report on a monthly basis (monthly report)

The SLA describes 3 items IANA will provide monthly reports. These items are outlined below along with a description of actions taken for each.

a. Resource allocation statistics as described in SLA item 18

In item 18 of the SLA, there is a detailed list of statistics to be produced for the monthly report. The agreed upon partial statistics are found in the “Statistics” section of this report.

b. The utilization of all identified finite resources defined within ICANN/IANA registries

The IANA is undertaking a project to review all registries to identify those that are finite and additionally those that are in danger of being exhausted. As of the end of this reporting period, no registries have been identified as being in danger of exhaustion. IANA will continue to report findings in future monthly reports.

c. Efforts that have addressed single points of failure/expertise (see item 3 in the SLA)

Single points of failure documentation to IETF-IANA Working Group (continual)

In conjunction with the monthly report, the IANA submits a separate document to the IETF-IANA Group documenting what steps have taken place to examine all known single-points of failure related to the IETF work. For those known single-points of failure, IANA will describe what actions were taken to correct where the point existed or what plan has been put in place for future resolution. During this reporting period, no single-point of failure was identified.
Conclusions

In February 2009, all queues were back to their normal processing times. We anticipate the SLA for the reporting year 2009 be approved and signed within the next few weeks. IANA will adjust the next monthly as necessary to accommodate changes to the SLA. As described in some sections of this report, IANA will be providing a separate report regarding Expert response times to the IETF-IANA WG for review and discussion.