

2025 ICANN-IETF MoU Supplemental Agreement

Introduction

This document is between the IETF Administration LLC (IETF LLC) and the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) to supplement the Memorandum of Understanding between the IETF and ICANN concerning ICANN's performance of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority service ("IANA") dated March 1, 2000 ([RFC 2860](#) and <https://www.icann.org/resources/unthemed-pages/ietf-icann-mou-2000-03-01-en>).

This supplemental agreement between ICANN and IETF LLC specifies additional criteria and procedures referred to in section 4.1 of the MoU and describes the commitments, services, and tasks IANA fulfills, as well as the commitments, services, and tasks members of the IETF community will provide to ICANN at the direction of the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) and/or the Internet Architecture Board (IAB).

This agreement describes a base level of commitment on behalf of both parties. This document has evolved over time as new tasks were identified and existing tasks completed. Annual review will continue to update new and ongoing tasks and if/when service time expectations need to be revised. This supplemental agreement may be modified upon written agreement of the parties.

Services

IANA will:

1. Maintain a publicly accessible, web-based index ("Matrix") of IANA-managed registries for the IETF.

The Matrix, at a minimum, describes:

- (a.i) The title of each registry;
- (a.ii) High-level registration requirements for parameters in that registry;
- (a.iii) The normative reference defining the requirement for the registry, if applicable;

The Matrix will:

- (b.i) Be kept current;
- (b.ii) Use hyperlinks to connect the Matrix to the registries it describes;
- (b.iii) Provide categorization and/or nesting as appropriate to indicate thematically related registries;

If there are any significant changes to the format of the Matrix, the IAB and IESG will be consulted and any major changes will be mutually agreed on.

2. Continue, in confidence to the IESG, to document all newly discovered single points of failure/expertise (in a separate document to the monthly report) and detail efforts undertaken to address and/or ameliorate them.
3. Notify the resource requester WITHIN THREE (3) BUSINESS DAYS of learning when there is an expectation that action on the request will exceed established service levels with an explanation for the delay and, when possible, a forecast as to when action will be completed on the request.
4. When requested by the IESG, provide expedited processing for a specified request.
5. Perform a monthly review of the registries where temporary assignments are present, and notify the registrant and the IESG of any temporary assignments that have expired or are near expiration.

Service Levels

Due to the nature of resource request reviews, IANA and the IETF community are jointly responsible for cooperatively managing the resource request process. IANA has control over the services it performs directly, e.g., receiving requests, making sure they are syntactically and semantically sensible, forwarding the requests to IESG-designated Experts (“Designated Experts”) where appropriate, and creating and modifying the registries. The IETF community has direct or indirect control over services performed by third parties, including Designated Experts, the IESG, the IAB, the RFC Editor, and the requester. As such, the processing of requests has a “total processing time” calendar days goal established for each service and an “IANA processing time” calendar days goal to reflect time expended directly by IANA.

1. When registries requiring Designated Experts are created, it is preferable that the IESG assign Designated Experts for resource registries at time of document publication. If the expert for the registry is not known at the time of document publication, IANA can request the IESG to appoint a Designated Expert after the registry has been created. Prior to the appointment of a Designated Expert, the only registrations that will be included in that registry are the initial ones declared in the RFC. After approval of a Designated Expert, the IETF Secretariat will notify IANA of the appointment. If an expert cannot be designated and there is a high-priority request, the IESG itself can act as the expert until one is named.
2. IANA will meet or exceed goals for service expectations/commitments for 90% of all work requests as defined in “Appendix A – Service Time Commitments”.
3. “Third party processing time”, that is, the total processing time minus the “IANA processing time”, which exceeds the goals in Appendix A (unless otherwise stated elsewhere herein) will trigger the appropriate escalation procedure described in the section entitled “Escalation”.

4. Due dates will be provided in assignments for third-party actions, such as review by Designated Experts, based upon processing times specified for such action herein.

5. As such, the “total processing time” of a request can be further broken down into an “IANA processing time”, “Requester processing time”, and “Other processing time”. When measuring the time taken to process requests, the “overall processing time” refers to the total amount of time (from whatever source) to complete the request. The “IANA processing time” refers to that portion of the time that is directly attributable to IANA activity, etc. This SLA includes target service times for the IANA portion of servicing requests. Target times for some (but not all) of the other components are also defined here.

Escalation

Escalation processes have been established to handle the cases where timely responses are not forthcoming. There are separate processes for escalation with the Designated Experts, the IESG, the Requester and IANA. These have been mutually agreed upon and have been documented in Appendix B. Changes to the procedures can be made at any time after agreed upon by the IESG.

Documentation

IANA will keep documentation up to date for the services performed for the IETF. The processes and procedures to be documented include:

1. Creation of new public registries as called for in IESG-approved documents;
2. Maintenance of public registries including updating registries as called for in IESG-approved documents as well as updating registries via appropriate requests submitted directly to IANA (i.e., for registries not requiring action as part of a document approval process);
3. Review (for IANA Considerations) all documents that appear on IESG telechats (not all of which undergo a formal IETF Last Call);
4. Interactions with document authors (and the IESG) when ensuring the IANA Considerations are sufficiently clear and unambiguous so that the actions can be completed (done prior to the document approval by the IESG);
5. Coordination with the RFC Editor in the final steps of document publication;
6. Maintenance of a publicly accessible list of the Designated Experts associated with those registries that make use of a Designated Expert, as well as a non-publicly accessible list of the contact information for those experts;
7. Provide regular updates, not less than once per business day (unless no changes have been made), of a publicly accessible web page (www.iana.org/performance/ietf-draft-status) that provides a listing of the state of all approved Internet-Draft documents being processed by IANA.

Reports

IANA will:

1. Track Resource allocation statistics as described in item 2 (Reports) below and publicly report on a monthly basis. A notification will be provided to the IAB and IESG when utilization rates for a specific registry show danger of exhaustion or when a single point of failure is identified and corrected.
2. Provide publicly accessible, clear, and accurate monthly statistics showing work that has been done and the work items that are currently queued. These statistics should be drawn over all IETF-related requests broken down into meaningful categories, e.g.:
 - (a.i) IESG-approved documents;
 - (a.ii) Reference Updates;
 - (a.iii) Last Calls;
 - (a.iv) Evaluations;
 - (a.v) Requests to establish new protocol parameter values;
 - (a.vi) Requests to modify and/or delete protocol parameter values

For those requests relating to other IETF-created registries for which the request rate is typically more than five per month, ICANN in performing the IANA Services will track the rate for which requests are coming in and consult with the IESG regarding the need to track separately. The IETF-IANA group, composed of representatives of the IAB, IESG and IANA, will be consulted regarding any changes to monthly statistics reporting.

For each of these categories information should be collected for:

- (b.i) Number of requests in the queue at the beginning of the reporting period;
- (b.ii) Number of new requests received during the reporting period;
- (b.iii) Number of requests completed during the reporting period;
- (b.iv) Number of requests in the queue at the end of the reporting period;
- (b.v) Histogram showing the ages of requests still in the queue at end of reporting period;
- (b.vi) Histogram for cumulative created/closed/resolved IETF requests at the end of the reporting period and the year to date.

For completed requests, information should be reported for:

- (c.i) Mean service times (i.e., “total”);
- (c.ii) Mean service times, showing individual contribution from “IANA”, “Requester”, and “Other”;
- (c.iii) Standard deviation from the average service times;
- (c.iv) Minimum service time;
- (c.v) Median service time;
- (c.vi) Cumulative statistics reflecting outliers, i.e., the totals of all completed requests within their respective categories, including outliers;
- (c.vii) Maximum service time;

- (c.viii) Histogram of cumulative statistics reflecting outliers (as c.v above), data by proportion.
- (c.ix) Number completed within 0-7 days,
- (c.x) Number completed within 8-14 days,
- (c.xi) Number completed within 15-30 days,
- (c.xii) Number completed in more than 30 days

These service times should be collected and published for “total”, “IANA” and “third party” times.

The exact statistics in this document will continue to be reviewed and may change over time based upon experience. Such changes may be made by mutual agreement.

The optimal form for displaying monthly statistics is a work in progress and will likely change over time.

3. ICANN shall engage a third-party reviewer to conduct a review and evaluation of ICANN's implementation of the relevant IETF RFCs and related policies in performing the protocol parameter registry operation pursuant to this Agreement. The third-party reviewer will be selected by mutual agreement. ICANN shall be responsible for any costs that might be associated with the review. The third-party reviewer will generate a written report (Report), which shall be provided to the IAB Chair, IETF Chair and the IETF LLC Executive Director (collectively referred to hereafter as "IETF Leaders") and other individuals whom they designate, by the 30th day of May, or as soon thereafter as practical. If the third-party Report is not completed by the 30th day of May, ICANN shall provide a written rationale for the delay and a timeline as to when the report will be completed. Subject to agreement with the IETF Leaders and the third-party reviewer, a summary of the final report will be posted on the ietf.org website. Within 30 days of the delivery of the third-party report, IANA shall provide a written response to the IETF Leaders including any explanation of deficiencies and/or actions and remediation plans in response to the findings of the report.

Collaboration

1. An effort continues to integrate the tools used by support services for the IETF so that all relevant information can be found within the IETF Datatracker. IANA, the RFC Editor and the IETF Secretariat each have documented the requirements for what integration is needed in [RFC 6359](#). Future deliverables will be determined following discussions with the IETF Leaders.

2. IANA has significant experience with issues that have arisen in the registration process, the clarity of IANA Considerations sections, and other matters that relate to specific registries. As a result, input from IANA personnel is often desirable, as the IETF publishes new RFCs; in many specialized topics, such as requirements for IETF tools from a registry process perspective, such participation can be essential.

3. While IETF policy and registry operation are completely separated, IANA personnel may participate as document authors, proponents, contributors, reviewers, and so on.
4. In this participation, regular IETF process is followed, as with all other work that leads to a publication in the IETF stream. As defined in [RFC 2026](#), IETF decisions are made through a consensus process. As long as the decision is made according to this process with wide input from the community and not just from IANA personnel, due process and fairness can be assured.
5. The Parties agree to review the terms of this document in one year to determine whether any modifications may be required. Prior to this review, this document will be interpreted flexibly.
6. The Parties shall work collaboratively together to develop a consensus on requirements for future reporting tools.

Transfer to Successor

To date there have been no unresolvable disputes or issues; however, the MOU allows for cancellation by the IETF or by ICANN with at least six (6) months notice. If either party cancels, the IETF will select a successor. Regardless of which party cancels the MOU, ICANN agrees to provide reasonable best efforts and cooperation to effect an orderly and efficient transfer to a successor at no cost to the IETF. Any fees charged by the successor chosen by the IETF, or any other party that might charge something as it relates to the transfer, will be the responsibility of the IETF. The transfer period shall not exceed six (6) months. Since its inception in 1998, ICANN has developed several proprietary software programs in support of the IETF protocol parameter registries at private expense. ICANN claims, and the IETF disclaims, any ownership and title in the software and software programs developed by ICANN in support of the IETF protocol parameter registries. ICANN retains complete ownership and title to all their software programs, and will retain title to any program under the agreement. ICANN does not claim any right to the contents of the protocol parameter registries as these are in the public domain.

IANA Services Action Summary Table

| IANA Services Action Summary | | | |
|------------------------------|--|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| | Action | Section/Reference | Delivery Date After Effective Date |
| 1 | Single points of failure documentation to the IESG | Services/3 | As needed |
| 2 | Provide monthly reports to the IESG on upcoming expirations of early allocations | Services/6 | Monthly |
| 3 | Provide publicly accessible, clear and accurate monthly statistics | Reports/2 | Monthly |

| | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|---|
| 4 | Written report to the IETF Leaders on ICANN's implementation of the relevant IETF RFCs and related policies in performing the protocol parameter registry operation | Reports/3 | 30 May |
| 5 | Written response to the IETF Leaders including any explanation of deficiencies and/or actions and remediation plans in response to the findings of the report | Reports/3 | Within 120 days of the end of this Service Level Agreement period |
| 6 | Review terms of agreement with IETF Leaders | Collaboration/5 | In one (1) year |

Effective Date

This agreement will be effective as of 1 January 2025 .

Agreed to on 12/21/2024 **by**

(Month) (Day) (Year)

| | |
|--|--|
| On behalf of ICANN: | On behalf of the IETF LLC: |
|  |  |
| Signature | Signature |
| Kurt Erik "Kurtis" Lindqvist | Jay Daley |
| Name | Name |
| President and CEO | Executive Director |
| Title | Title |
| ICANN | IETF Administration LLC |
| Organization | Organization |

Appendix A – Service Time Commitments

| Resource | Proc Time | Clock starts at | Clock stops at |
|---|---|---|--|
| Documents (including IETF and RFC Editor submissions) | 14 days | Receipt of official IESG approval of the document or receipt of official notice of intent to publish from the RFC Editor. | Sending an “Actions Complete” message to the RFC Editor |
| Last Call Reviews | Last Call Duration | Receipt of official notice of IETF Last Call Announcement | Receipt by IESG of comments regarding document actions |
| IETF-Stream Evaluation Reviews | Evaluation Duration | Receipt of official notice of Evaluation Ballot | Receipt by IESG of comments regarding document actions |
| Non-IETF-Stream Reviews | Telechat appearance or 7 days, whichever is greater | Receipt of official notice of Conflict Review Announcement or Evaluation Ballot | Receipt by IESG of comments regarding document actions |
| Reference Updates (for documents with completed Actions) | 7 days | Receipt of RFC number from the RFC Editor | Completion of the reference updates in protocol registries |
| Protocol parameter requests requiring Designated Expert and/or IETF mailing list review | 14 days | Receipt of initial request | Notification of resource assignment or request closure |
| Protocol parameter requests that do not require technical review | 7 days | Receipt of initial request | Notification of resource assignment or request closure |
| All other requests (including modifications to existing assignments) | 14 days | Receipt of initial request | Notification of resource assignment or request closure |

Additional IANA Service Processing Time and Third Party Service Time Requirements:

- A. The Resource Registry Matrix will be updated with approved IESG-Designated Experts within one (1) week of notification of the appointment.
- B. The processing time goals for third parties will be in calendar days as follows:
 - (1) Designated Experts – fourteen (14) days, unless otherwise specified in the RFC that established the registry
 - (2) Requester – thirty (30) days
 - (3) IESG – fourteen (14) days
 - (4) Other – seven (7) days

Notes:

- In prior years, this Service Level Agreement referred to a group called variously as the “IETF-IANA Working Group” and the “IETF Protocol Registries Oversight Committee” (IPROC). In this agreement, the roles are performed by the IETF-IANA Group (<https://datatracker.ietf.org/iabasg/ietfiana/about/>).
- At implementation there will be a commitment to continuous process improvement leading to the reduction of outliers as reflected on histograms, and of processing times less than or equal to the values in the column entitled “Proc Time”.
- All processing times (“Proc Time”) are given in “net” IANA Services days, in terms of “calendar days”.
- The IETF-IANA Group will be notified in advance if it is anticipated that any of these service time commitments will not be met. In such a case, documentation will be provided on the cause(s) of being unable to meet the commitment(s) and steps taken to address those causes.
- Changes to the service time commitments will be agreed on in the IETF-IANA Group.

Appendix B – Escalation Procedures

For requests that are for registries that are created and maintained by RFCs created through the IETF consensus process, the following escalation procedures apply:

Designated Experts Escalation:

ICANN in performing the IANA Services will:

1. Forward the request to the primary Designated Expert within seven (7) calendar days after receiving a correct and complete request.
2. Wait for a response from the Designated Expert for fourteen (14) calendar days. If a response is not received the request will be re-forwarded to the primary Designated Expert every seven (7) calendar days if no response is received thereafter for a period of thirty (30) calendar days.
3. Unless the RFC that created the registry requires a longer review period, if a response is not received from the Designated Expert within fourteen (14) calendar days, the request will be re-assigned to the secondary Designated Expert, if applicable. The primary Designated Expert will be notified that the request has been reassigned. If the primary Designated Expert continues to be non-responsive for subsequent requests, the IESG will be notified. In cases where there is no secondary Designated Expert, the IESG will be notified of the Designated Expert failure and request resolution of the problem (e.g., by replacing the Designated Expert per RFC 8126 and subsequent revisions) within thirty (30) calendar days.

IESG Escalation:

ICANN in performing the IANA Services will:

1. Upon issuing a request to the IESG, wait for a response from the IESG for fourteen (14) calendar days. If no response is received, the request will be re-forwarded to the IESG at least once per business week thereafter until the thirtieth (30th) day.
2. If a response is not received within thirty (30) calendar days, notify the IAB of the lack of an IESG response to a request in a timely fashion and request instruction as to what to do with the request. The IAB is tasked with working with the IESG and other relevant parties to resolve the issue. In order to preserve the normal appeals chain (RFC 8126 and subsequent revisions), the IAB is not expected to directly resolve the request itself.

Requester Escalation:

ICANN in performing the IANA Services will:

Wait for a response from the requester. If not received, IANA will re-forward the request regularly (e.g., once per week). If no response is received within 30 days, a notification of the administrative closure of the request (without prejudice) will be sent to the requester and the ticket will be closed.

ICANN Escalation:

If attempts to escalate the request through the ticketing system is not successful, the party involved should submit a complaint using the following process:

<https://www.iana.org/help/escalation-procedure>

Change Control:

Change control and approval of these procedures is with ICANN and the IETF Leaders.