**CSC Findings of PTI Performance Report for the Month of**

**June 2017**

Date: 17 July 2017

**Overall Finding**

The CSC completed review of the June 2017 PTI Performance Report and finds that PTI’s performance for the month was:

Excellent- PTI met the service level agreement at 100% for the month of June 2017.

**Metrics That the CSC is Tracking Closely**

Currently, there are no metrics requiring close tracking.

Previous reported issues were minor issues that the CSC discussed with PTI regarding the details of the exceptions. There are no indications of a persistent issue.

**Service Level Agreement(s) that the CSC is considering or recommending be adjusted**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Metric | Current SLA | Actual Performance | Proposed Adjusted SLA | Explanation |
| Technical Check – Retest and Supplemental | 1-5 minutes | 5-8 minutes | 10 minutes | No impact on customer and better reflection of historical trend |
| Publication of IDN tables | No current SLAs | Data being gathered | To be determined | The CSC recommends that a SLA be determined for the maintenance of IDN tables and label generation rulesets. The Naming Function Contract calls for the maintenance of such a repository. |

**Report of Escalations**

To-date, PTI has notified the CSC of 2 escalations. The CSC took note of the escalations and has asked that PTI keep the CSC informed with respect to the resolutions.

Appendix of PTI performance report for the month of June 2017 is attached.

\* The overall SLA compliance score is correctly identified in the PTI report as "Percentage of SLA thresholds met of those defined." However, prior to this report the calculation has not followed this definition and has instead been based on the compliance of each individual request made, as documented in CSC reports. This calculation has changed for this report and subsequent reports to correctly meet the requirements of the SLA specification. The CSC has considered the reissuing of previous reports with the correct calculation but decided against it because the change would not be significant.