

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
April 9, 2015
11:30 am CT**

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you. I sent you a copy of the report on Friday. Have you had a chance to look at it, Paul?

Paul Kane: Yes, I've had a quick skim-through, yes. And happy to talk around it - yes, very happy.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay so why don't I hand it over to Elise and Kim and maybe we can start a dialogue about some of the issues they have around what they've seen so far. Elise, are you okay with that? Elise, I don't know if you are talking but we're not hearing you.

Paul Kane: Might be on mute.

Kim Davies: Hi, it's Kim. Can you hear me?

Bernard Turcotte: Yes, we can hear you very well so I'll hand it over to you.

Kim Davies: So while Elise is getting hooked up so we received this, you know, this draft document via Bernie I guess it was about a week and a half, two weeks ago

now. We did a quick read through and we compiled our thoughts down and we provided them back to Bernie, I think that's the document that you've read just (unintelligible) took some general points as we went through.

I guess I'll try and summarize sort of in broad strokes some of the concerns that we have with regards to implementability of the document as it's kind of written right now.

I think in terms of one overarching concern we have is that it presents this simplified flow chart that sort of describes the best case scenario for change requests. The difficulty there is that, you know, the devil is in the details with regard to change requests. It's precisely those non-normal changes requests where you run into SLA issues, the kinds of requests where the customer is not responsive, the kinds of requests where there's, you know, very detailed processing, that kind of thing.

Paul Kane: So can I just interject?

Kim Davies: Sure.

Paul Kane: First of all, hello, Kim, lovely to hear you on the call. And I'm just assuming that we're able to have this conversation. I know when we were having our conversations in February privately there was some concern over the NDAs that you have with NTIA. So I'm assuming there's not a problem on that basis going forward.

So first of all let me just say to you and to all of the IANA staff the CC community, and I believe the gTLD community, are very happy with the performance of that IANA staff have delivered to the community in the past.

The purpose of this SLE is in the name. It's the expectation. And you raise a very good point, when we did analysis on the data one of the largest impediments was actually the registry manager not responding to IANA. And the reason for it being included in the SLE is really to give an indication to the registry manager that they are expected to reply and they're expected to reply within a certain timeframe.

But obviously the IANA staff cannot be held responsible for the system slowing down because the registry manager failed or the admin technical contact failed to respond. So don't feel - please don't feel just because it is highlighted in the SLE that a registry manager should respond within a timeframe. But that impacts the IANA.

The times that have been specified in the SLE you already far exceed on the whole. There are a few instances where you don't. So I just want to really emphasize you are quite right to raise it but there are elements in the SLE that are outside of your control and don't feel that you will be impacted by stuff that's outside of your control.

The other issue is the simplified flow chart. If the process flow is more complicated than the simplified flow chart, and I recognize it is simplified, we welcome, you know, having an accurate flow chart so the whole community knows how IANA functions. So we're very happy to work with you on that, as you know, I did send the flow chart out months ago asking for comment, but I quite understand NTIA have contractual relationships with ICANN that do not allow you to share that information.

And so we need to ask specific questions of NTIA if they are willing to allow you to give us the information. But at the moment we don't know what we don't know. So we're happy to ask the question of NTIA but it would be

helpful if we have your guidance as to what we need specifically to ask permission on. Because we don't know how constrained your agreement with NTIA is.

Kim Davies: So there's a few different points in there, I'll try and be responsive to them as best I can. I guess, you know, just at a very high level, you know, we see the service level agreement expectation, whatever you may call it, you know, even if there's actors involved that are not us that, you know, it's our responsibility to try and let's say modify their behavior to address that.

You know, we currently measure end to end processing time including customer time in the current service level agreements. And part of the reason we do that is that if customers are slow in responding then that's a reflection on a problem with the process. It might be indirect, it might be that, you know, our documentation isn't clear enough, it might be that the customer doesn't understand the process well enough.

There's many factors that might contribute to that. But we believe it's reflective of the whole, you know, the system as a whole if other actors beyond sort of what ICANN can control directly are slow or non performing and that's why we report in that fashion.

Matched with that is a recognition that, you know, when you set the sort of percentile reporting limits as to whether a SLA has been (unintelligible) or not you recognize that which is why we have - we have, you know, target times but then there's not a very high threshold for not meeting that SLA. And that kind of keys into another sort of criticism that we have, I shall of get to that in a moment.

But that's our philosophy that's gone into designing that. I think that if there's a sort of a philosophical shift in terms of what the service levels are there to illuminate I think that needs to be fleshed out, you know, what the basis of the measurements are and so on so it's understood that these are not intended to be a like for like replacement for the SLAs that are in place today. But they're actually designed to do something differently if that's the case.

Paul Kane: So just on that last point, so first of all I don't want you or IANA to be responsible for or feel responsible for other actors. You can only be responsible for the work that you do and certainly we need to clarify that. If your process isn't clear to the actors maybe, as I say, the flow chart so people can understand from the get go how the system is expected to work and enhancing flow charts would be welcome.

With respect to the SLAs that you have with NTIA and what we are proposing there is a difference, and we have tried to capture that in the document. The SLAs that you have with NTIA, 29 days, 23 days for a name server change, is just not fit for purpose. We are all, you know, working in a much more demanding environment today and we need to make sure that we do have an understanding that name server changes will happen significantly better.

So what we have done is we've taken - well just under 400 data points both using data we got from you, using data we got from CC registry managers who interact with IANA and using real facts have come up with effectively the outside.

I know your performing much better than is described within the SLE but what we're trying to do is update the SLE to reflect real world transaction times. So you're right, it's different from the NTIA one, but I'm happy to ask

the question of NTIA if they think it's prudent to be updating the SLE to make sure it's in accordance with today.

There are some on the design team - Design Team A - who actually believe that IANA should operate the same service standard that ICANN requires of the gTLD registries. That is something that we haven't advocated in this document and that is possibly something to evolve to.

But what I was trying not do was a non-threatening document that basically says this is what they're currently doing, let's document the current service level that the community (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Bernard Turcotte: Yes, I was going to say how about we give Elise a chance to get in a few words here.

Elise Gerich: Okay except I think maybe Kim really wanted to close off that one comment. I was mostly going to speak to your question that had to do with the flow chart and some of the questions we had about that. And I think they all tie together but perhaps Kim could just respond to what you just said, Paul, and then I can jump in if that's good with you guys?

And can you hear me?

((Crosstalk))

Bernard Turcotte: Yes, we can.

Kim Davies: So just to, I mean, I guess try and close that little mini section, you know, we actually originally in the current IANA contract did propose more granularity so you could see who was responsible for what time of an individual request and, you know, that didn't - that didn't succeed to the end of that process.

So that concept itself is not something that where again, obviously we would need to do some thorough analysis in terms of what can be measured and how it can be measured. And I think that's - that sort of belies another challenge we have with the document as written is that we don't actually understand a lot of the different metrics as they're written, what they're actually seeking to measure so we can't sort of comment intelligently in terms of what the operational impact would be of measuring those things.

I guess on the flow chart issue, you know, we have a process with NTIA to seek permission to release certain documents that are not currently public. We've done this without the design teams. You know, we can certainly, you know, pursue that with this design team to release the flow chart work flow that we used for the root zone management. So we do have a process to do that if that's necessary.

I don't believe we'd have the request to release that today but I'll let Elise chime in on that.

Elise Gerich: Hi, I guess it's my turn. So Paul, before I talk about what Kim just said which is the documentary information disclosure policy, I wanted to mention one of the concerns we had with the simplified work flow was not that it was simplified because I think that's, you know, a fine thing to do, is that it appeared to be sort of a mix of simplification and very detailed prescription.

And so there were examples where it said that the request is submitted through RZM and by the requestor and we receive it multiple different ways so therefore there are different paths depending on which way something comes in, they all ultimately end up in RZM. And that's just like one simple example of where the flow chart was quite descriptive even though it's supposed to be simplified.

Another one - I should be pulling it up in front of me - was very prescriptive about a step where if we'd taken out some word it would have been simplified and would have been accurate but by having that one specific prescriptive step it made it locked into that behavior when that's not the way things happen.

And then the other one was the fact that on your swim lanes the requestor was only in one particular area, there was no ability to go back and question the requestor. And I don't think that would over-complicate the work flow but it took out a critical piece of the simplification - in the simplification.

So those were our concerns. And it was very difficult for us to make redlines to it without then wandering into the confidentiality bit that we have with NTIA. And to Kim's point the - we call it the DIGP - the documentary information disclosure policy - is something that has been used throughout this process of the stewardship transition planning to have us go through that process and get permission to publish things.

So that is an option instead of the CWG having to call NTIA directly within the ICANN process you can get that information or at least get the request through the proper channels. So I'll take a breath and let you respond, Paul.

Paul Kane:

So thank you. So I - this effort is designed to try and ensure that the registry community that are using the IANA services, and I want to emphasize I think

all registries are happy with the service IANA currently delivers, is very clear in the way it functions.

I hear you but that you haven't had a formal request. But I'm looking back at the email exchange, admittedly private, because there are some issues that I think we should keep private relating to how the IANA function - going back to February.

And I've been asking for comments from IANA since February. The work flow I'm certain is not perfect. The work flow is based on information that we could receive - we received - or we've gleaned from various quarters. And I would sincerely welcome IANA asking NTIA for permission to disclose the work flow.

Because if it identifies stuff that is no longer applicable, for example, referring things to NTIA for approval post transition, will not be applicable. We should be discussing that in the design team with IANA staff to make sure that what you think is needed is actually what the registry community would welcome and would actually help both of us - both sets of communities fulfill their jobs in the most efficient way.

So I would welcome, I'm sure that the other members of the design team would welcome you asking NTIA for permission to give us further and better particulars of how the IANA functions, and we will work collectively, cooperatively with you to make sure that post transition that your current work flow meets the needs of the registry community.

If that helps, I mean, this is designed as a helpful approach where expectations are clearly known to all parties involved. And I agree with Kim in his opening remarks, some of the biggest problems are - or the biggest delays, they aren't

problems - are the registry managers themselves, or registry contacts not acknowledging or approving the change as identified.

And even when - and this is something that came from the research - even there have been instances where stuff has been approved by IANA staff, and approved by the registry and it gets through to the VeriSign operator - the root zone operator, VeriSign, who identifies the substantial issues with the update or proposed update. And so it - the checks and balances are good that are there but we just need to get the process documented with proper SLEs in place recognizing you can't control parties that are outside of your purview.

Bernard Turcotte: Paul, given we've only got you for 30 minutes, I'm going to try and shepherd this along a bit. Elise, I'll give you a reply for a few minutes and then...

Elise Gerich: You cut off, are you still there, Bernie?

Bernard Turcotte: Yes I am.

Elise Gerich: Hello? Okay. So, Paul, I'm sorry for this confusion. There is an email address that where an official request goes in so it's not that, you know, our department - the IANA department can make the DIGP through you and I can obviously send you the email, I'll post it in the thing, but the working group really should be requesting if officially. It's not through private emails that these things happen best.

And I didn't understand that you were asking us to go and do that. So I apologize that I missed that early on in the process. But I can understand the concerns about getting the correct process so that we can get the right expectations. As Kim mentioned, and as you've mentioned, I think what we're concerned about is that we don't understand some of these metrics that have

been defined and, as Kim pointed out mathematically, some of them we don't understand how we could ever meet.

And so that's where, instead of having these written in concrete as a post transition requirement, we were thinking in discussions with you it would be better to have a more collaborative discussion once the transition has been defined so that we could come up with mutually agreeable requirements.

Bernard Turcotte: Paul, I'll hand it over to you for a minute and then I'll come back in and make a couple of suggestions if that's okay with everyone.

Paul Kane: I'm very - so I would like to work with you, as I said on the letter my email of the 26th, our goal is to jointly work together and agree a set of metrics and develop the process surrounding the SLEs. I've been trying, admittedly, I might have been going about it at the wrong way, and that I've been writing privately I've had very good and very helpful feedback from David Conrad, the CTO there, that was very helpful.

And I'm very grateful to David for doing that. But at the end of the day it's the IANA - you guys who are actually delivering the service. I can come and physically sit in your office next week if that helps. I can be there Thursday if that helps. I would like to get this SLE - or more accurately the working group's interpretation of the SLE clearly understood, and if there's any ambiguity we either change it or the explanation as, you know, we need to give further and better particulars of what we - how we did it and why we think it's important.

But I'm happy - you know, I could literally be in your office Thursday this week if that would help.

Bernard Turcotte: All right, I see Jeffery has his hand up, let's give some floor time to someone else and then we'll try to come to some comments. Jeffery.

Jeffery Eckhaus: Thank you. Thank you and, you know, just want to thank Paul for shepherding our group together. For those who don't know me I work at (unintelligible) Registry, a gTLD operator, and we are the registry operator for our own TLDs and for Donuts so I guess, you know, somewhere over 200 gTLDs.

And we've been, you know, working Paul who's been helping us trying to get some of these levels on the SLE to put together. And just, you know, I think one of the overall feelings this group has had is we put our best effort in on some of the metrics and what we would like to - what we would like to see and some of the expectations.

I think that on some of these we might be, you know, sort of a little apples and oranges discussion where you might have said, you know, these metrics are impossible to meet and I saw some of the notes. And I can completely understand that, I don't think we'd want to argue that. I think what we'd like to figure out is we as ccTLD and gTLD operators have a pretty good idea of what we were looking for in some of the metrics and what we'd like to see.

And I don't think the overall thought of the group is to be too onerous but I would agree with Paul that it might be worth, you know, everyone, you know, just getting on a call and figuring out and saying these are the metrics we see and this is how we'd like to abide by it and then coming up from there - because I think it was Kim who mentioned the point about an end to end process where if the requestor doesn't respond you consider that as part of the SLE and what the expectation for the turnaround time is.

Where our group said you shouldn't be accountable if the registry operator doesn't respond in X amount of hours. So I think we are in alignment of what we want to do. I think just some of the terms we might need to, you know, be clear on so that we can get this path - smooth this path out and come to agreement on the expectations because I really don't think we're that far apart here. Thanks.

Bernard Turcotte: All right thank you, Jeffery. Kim, a quick note and then I'm going to toss myself in here.

Kim Davies: Yes, Bernie. You know, I agree with the sentiment. And I don't think we're that far apart. I mean, you know, a large part of my role is engaging the TLD operators and understanding what they want us to do. So it could be there's a huge split in understanding there but I would be surprised.

I think our biggest concern is, you know, it would be great to thrash out these issues and have that kind of collaborative dialogue, we think that would be very useful. The challenge is of course the deadline for the product of this design team.

I'm not sure how flexible that deadline is or what the impact of that is, I'll let others comment on that. But I think at a high level, you know, whatever the SLEs are I think if they are to be codified in some fashion that there's a formal SLE, there's a formal percentage, there's a formal set of limit that's documented.

Now we would want to firstly make sure that, you know, each of those we understand exactly what's being proposed. We would like to go back and firstly work out can our systems even measure it. And so on before we would be comfortable, you know, agreeing to that. And ideally providing some sort

of measurement based on historical performance on how we've done that for the design team to consider.

I don't see how we could go through that sort of deliberate review process in sort of, you know, a timeframe that's counted in days. I think for me personally, you know, as the person that is probably will be tasked with technically implementing all the measurement systems required for the SLEs I think that's what I find the biggest challenge that we need to overturn right now.

Bernard Turcotte: All right, ladies and gentlemen, I promised all he would get away at the top of the hour and I'm trying to be mindful of that. And since I'm - guess I'm sort of chairing this indirectly, for the moment, what I'm hearing from this discussion - and please correct me if I'm wrong - Paul, is that I think there's sort of a general agreement to identify what should be measured and have a discussion around that.

And if you will have some sort of - and probably this might make sense as a first step - is sort of the principles of what is being measured. And with that I think once we settle on some of these things that we're looking at I think that may be an achievable target to start producing something.

On the timing, which has been referred to on both sides, I'll take a wild step forward here and I'll say that pretty much like the CWG itself getting it right is probably more important than getting it done fast. And I think that's a general sentiment.

So Paul, could I have your thoughts on the notion of now that we've managed to start this dialogue with IANA that a first good step would be for DT-A to get together and identify the high level principles that would dictate how one

would look at what is trying to be measured in these SLEs, would that make sense to you?

Paul Kane: I'm happy to run multiple tracks. I'm going to be sending in an email to Elise asking for permission from NTIA for us to have the detailed work flow diagrams that are currently not available to us. I think yes, good idea to have high level principles but those need to be supported with real world facts as well so we actually have a document before the - so we have a formal document before transition can occur where everyone is aware of the expectations required. So, yes, very happy to get cracking, you know, right now. Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Bernard Turcotte: All right so...

Paul Kane: We have a very tight timeline.

((Crosstalk))

Bernard Turcotte: Yes, yes, definitely. Elise and Kim, does that approach sound okay for you?

Elise Gerich: Yes, I think that's fine. And, Paul, please I've sent the DIGP@icann.org email address too, when you send it to be privately would you please add that email address because that takes it to our legal department which is how we can process these disclosures requests.

Bernard Turcotte: All right so I'll (unintelligible) that the two main players in this, which is DT-A and IANA - have started a dialogue, we're going to run multiple tracks

identifying the real processes as per Kim's comments I think make a lot of sense and I think that's been initiated.

And we'll look at booking another meeting as soon as possible to at least try and clear out, you know, I think it would be helpful for everyone to do a first high level cut and understand the general objectives that are okay for both and then I think we can make some pretty good progress.

Also, if we do that then we've got something to report fairly early on. So I'm thinking that we've got general support for that kind of an approach. If you're not happy with that please stand up and scream at this point.

Elise Gerich: I guess...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Kane: ...I just would like to have just a proper professional SLE that the market, the industry requires of today. But I think this is a very good pragmatic approach to run parallel tracks. Thank you very much for all participating on the call.

Bernard Turcotte: All right so I'm taking Paul's okay with that and I'm not prejudging - I think what you guys have to agree to, as I said, let's start at a top level and when we get those keys in there I think the rest will work out fine. Elise, last words to you.

Elise Gerich: I guess I agree with Paul that we would like to have a regular standard SLA that can be delivered upon. But for the deliverable the timing of the deliverable, and I understand the idea of getting it right versus rushing something, but are we suggesting that the principle that the DT-A team wants to propose by the end of this week if they're getting up with something is that

there will be ongoing work to come up with a standard SLE that's done collaboratively and that's what the proposal is going to go in at the end of this week or is nothing going in at the end of the week? I'm kind of confused on that. Sorry, Bernie.

((Crosstalk))

Elise Gerich: I thought you tied it up nicely but then I'm confused.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay I'm guilty of that, all right. Let me clear that up for everyone if you're confused then I've probably confused everybody else. I'm sort of removing the timeline from this in deliverables. Actual SLEs will not be done for the end of this week and included in the public consultation. I think that's just not possible to achieve so let's not worry about that right now.

What I'm saying is if we can get another meeting going and we can have some discussions maybe if we get to the principles we could possibly have the principles in for that close of discussion on Friday. But I'm not saying we have to do that. So my best hope is we've had another conversation, we've cleared up the principles and we will keep working after the deadline of 10-April.

And if we don't get the principles I think we can get - we still can get some key elements from a discussion we're working on and that we've had right now and I think given the conversation we've had that people are saying we're not that far, I would really think that we could move this thing along in the remaining timeline we've got if everyone is participating.

So that's my understanding of the thing, does that make sense for you, Elise?

Elise Gerich: Yes I understand it. Thank you. I'm sorry to have asked you to clarify.

Bernard Turcotte: No problem, always good to ask questions. All right, we're five past the hour. I'm not going to hold everyone back. So what we will do is we will try to schedule another meeting this week. Please watch your emails and we'll try to get that conversation continued if that's okay with everyone. Thank you very much for participating, look forward to talking to you later this week or early next week, we should have a lot of time if all goes for against having a meeting this week. Thank you. Bye-bye.

Elise Gerich: Okay thanks, Bernie.

END