

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
May 22, 2015
10:00 am CT**

Paul Kane: Thank you all for participating. This is the Design Team A work call taking place on the 22nd of May at 1500 UTC. And hello (Patricia). Just seeing you have joined - welcome.

Firstly may I think very much IANA and ICANN for providing the work flow documents. Very, very helpful. We've learned a lot about the additional subroutines that to be candid I had limited knowledge of.

What I would welcome knowing is from both ICANN IANA and the rest of the design team is how best you would like to proceed, bearing in mind our objective is to come up with a constructive service level expectation document, mainly because there are many other elements within the proposal that reference this document and we want it to be a constructive document rather than something that is perceived as being threatening.

And so I would welcome comments from anyone as to the time frame that we think we can work to and how best we should work going forward, bearing in mind ideally we would like to come to conclusion on this work item in the detail required sort of within sort of three weeks at the outside so that the

proposal from the CWG can start going through the process of being evaluated by the ICG.

So the floor is open and I welcome anyone's comments as to how best they would like to proceed. Okay so the floor - Kim or Bernie or Elise or any member of the design team, welcome your input.

Kim Davies: Since you mentioned my name first then - I hate to sound too -- you know I guess from our perspective obviously this is a community design team, so I think the direction is rightly set by the community members that are participating here - more so than staff.

I think, you know, we're happy to provide whatever support you think is appropriate. I think - I don't want it to be seen as ICANN is driving the process unless you specifically want us to or, you know - I guess you can see the conundrum that I'm trying to paint.

Paul Kane: Indeed. I think that the issue we have - in the (SLE) document that has been - well the draft that was prepared - we used the statistics that we were able to ascertain based on your current performance but we were not aware of some of the subroutines that you also do or IANA also do.

And it's quite difficult for us to attribute time parameters to those specific processes. And so it would be good to - for us as a group - the DTA, the community representatives then -- to work through with IANA staff what is essential for the vast majority of the registry community, recognizing that there are going to be the outliers and I think we need to park the outliers.

We need to make sure the SLE accommodates the vast majority of the registry community and we put the outliers almost in a special category because it's probably they're outliers because they are in a special category.

And I don't know if that's useful or constructive to both the Design Team A members or ICANN IANA staff. I'm just trying to get an input as to how we go from here because the initial work we've done I think is quite constructive and your feedback was good Kim and very welcome and I was pleased to see that we weren't that far apart.

But we've got to now address the additional information you've given us and how best to incorporate that in the SLE. And that's why I would welcome comments from others.

Elise Gerich: Paul this is Elise and we welcome this opportunity and I know Kim had some very good discussions with this. One of the things we wondered is if you guys had - you the design team - had set some base principles as to what would guide the work, not just the flow chart and the individual steps but what are the, you know, base principles of what's important for the service?

You know, when we put out for public comment a couple of years ago, some of the base principles we heard were that, you know, accuracy was something that was an important service level expectation as well as timeliness. And so are there some basic principles that the design team would like to accomplish?

And I think then we could look at the work flow and indicate from that well, you know, these are the few key critical measurements or metrics that should be met.

Paul Kane: So to be candid the design team has met on relatively few occasions. The document that you have - we have all seen -- was shared initially with the members of the design team to make sure that it met their concerns.

When it came to principles the overarching goal was to recognize fundamentally the current performance that IANA is delivering today to recognize that the current statement of works that IANA has in place does not make any allowance for registry managers who fail to respond.

They submit the request and then fail to respond to IANA. And we wanted to ensure that IANA was not blamed or held accountable for a registry manager's inaction for want of better word, and that is why we thought it best to be somewhat prescriptive with respect to each stage.

So the principle is as a minimum, which has been achieved, which is to capture the current actual performance levels to make sure that there is a duty placed on the registry manager albeit an expectation that the registry manager within a period of time will respond to IANA to ensure that whatever request is being submitted to IANA is undertaken within a prescribed period but make sure that IANA is not held accountable for the registry manager's inaction, which is why it was somewhat prescriptive.

So in terms of high level principles, that's about as far as we went. So steady - you know everything as it currently happens but making sure that the performance of today is certainly documented but also the performance of today continues at that level post-transition

And then we look at subsequently reviewing the SLE at a later period, bearing in mind when NTIA is out of the frame there should be some service improvements anyway.

But we were not wanting to discount the time taken for the IANA - for IANA to deliver the service, mainly because NTIA running parallel with submissions to Verisign. So the time benefit would be hard for us to quantify. So I hope that answers your point.

And I would just like to look at the chat. Jeff Neuman has written, "One thing that would help us is to understand your own internal SLAs or KPIs. So could you answer that one please?"

Elise G: So our internal KPIs and SLAs are very similar to the external ones that we report on. And this is primarily because we have been setting a baseline for the last I guess 18 months to see what would be reasonable to either improve on those internal KPIs.

We have for instance seven years' worth of data for the IATF where we have moved from the external service level expectation which is 90% of all the requests that's fulfilled within the requested timeline. And we have our internal SLA as 95% of all the requests are completed within that committed SLA.

So our internal timelines are very similar to the external ones that you see that we report publicly. And that's on a high level. We have looked occasionally at graphing how much time it takes us to work on something and then we break it out to what time, you know, NTIA took to respond and what time Verisign.

That's been done on more of an annual basis than a regular daily basis. However we do report on the IATF protocol parameters in that way and that was under agreement in their SLA that we were to report the time we spent

only and not - and then we would also spend the end - report the end to end time. So that's not explicit but I could pull up the metrics if you'd like Jeff.

Kim Davies: If I could just add to that real briefly I think talking solely about internal SLAs masks the way we handle root zone management, which is that at any given time there's to do enough pending requests that all of our root zone management staff are familiar with all of them pretty much all the time.

So now day-to-day methodology for dealing with root zone management is there's, you know, stand-up meetings that they walk through every pending request. They ask, you know, who's it blocking on. If it's not blocking on - if it's blocking on an IANA staff member for something, what do we need to do to make it progress?

So it's in a finer detail as opposed to looking at, you know, times of processing. I mean we try to make sure that day in, day out, that if the request is waiting on IANA staff and it's not routine and there's something exceptional about it then we identify what's blocking it and find the most rapid part of remediation to make sure that that happens.

I think that's useful background on how we internally manage our discipline in terms of dealing with these requests.

Paul Kane: So one of the things that would be interesting is we did some - I had one of my guys look into the actual code - the e-IANA code - and I appreciate a number of subroutines have been placed at the top of the IANA and the current root zone management system.

Although the underlying engine seems to be the same -- or I believe it to be the same - there have been a number of supplementary changes. Is that a

correct statement in that the underlying database structure is the e-IANA platform? And then there have been amendments made to the subroutines that happened on top?

Kim Davies: So I would say that's probably incorrect. I mean certainly e-IANA was the base. But we started working off that base, what, I don't know, eight years ago and I think based on what our developers tell us they over the eight years have basically ripped out everything and replaced everything over that period.

So it definitely has a lineage back there and it's an evolution from there. By, you know, frameworks, by the base frameworks and so on, new versions have come out. They're incompatible and certain pieces had to be re-written. So I think if you did a close comparison very little of that original one is still there.

Paul Kane: Okay. And in terms of - I mean originally as you remember it was proposed the e-IANA code would be available and open source effectively. And it was suggested by David Conrad at that time that any and all amendments to the root zone management e-IANA platform would also be open source.

Would it be possible for you to give us access to that because we believe that there is a lot of data that is collected in the current root zone management system - collected and recorded in the database - but the tools for extracting the data - namely the time stamps, don't seem to be there any longer.

And I'm wondering if it's possible to extract that data to actually help achieve realistic time stamps for how long each process takes. And it really builds on from your earlier comment where by knowing where the roadblock is you can identify if it's a systemic failure or it's a registry manager failing to respond within a period of time because I want to come back to the headline comment

I made which is I don't want IANA to be blamed for a registry manager failing to respond in time.

So would you be willing for us as I - well I believed was the original understanding - that the code be available just so we can help you guys extract the data that we believe is stored in the database?

Elise Gerich: So Paul this is Elise. I kind of think that's kind of beyond the scope of a design team, isn't it? My expectation was that the design team would be - like I said earlier - setting principles and service expectations and not delving into day-to-day operational activities and basically, you know, (unintelligible).

Paul Kane: I'm not interested - sorry. I'm not interested in day-to-day operations. What I am trying to do is see if - we believe you have a lot of the time stamps that we have referenced in the original documentation that we sent to you as trying to be a constructive service level. And it would be great if you or your team could look in the database because we believe that is there.

And then that would help allay the fears that you may have with respect to making sure that specific performances are undertaken within a prescribed period of time. But more accurately if a registry manager fails to provide the information required within that time it's - we can able to document that because the service level is prescriptive enough to address it.

Kim Davies: It's Kim here. I think yes I'm not sure about the root zone source code question directly but I think in terms of what our system can capture, you know, we can do that analysis based on the agreed metrics and come back to you with our analysis. And if you really want to delve into that level of detail we can provide you, you know, with perhaps an itemized sort of database construct that we have.

But I mean I don't think that that - it seems to me like a rabbit hole for this group. I think what we're committed to do is, you know, once the group has agreed a set of metrics for us to measure and we have a common understanding of what they actually mean, as long as we can come up with a definition on how it would be measured, we're committing to whatever code changes are required to start measuring in that fashion. That's certainly not an issue.

Obviously there was something in the original draft where we personally weren't at that level of understanding as to how it could be measured. And you know maybe that can be explained and we would get it. I think some of it refers to things we don't do so I think it's possible to measure it.

But nonetheless, I mean with a common set of definitions that we agree I don't think we need to necessarily delve into source code because we're committing that once that is agreed we will get our developers to make sure that the code measures all those different facets of the process.

Paul Kane: Thank you very much Kim. That's very useful. Thank you, appreciate it. So Jeff Neuman has raised another comment. "One of the other things with that data is for the SLAs to be measured independently of the self-reporting by IANA. Or stated differently how do you recommend third parties being able to assess IANA's performance outside of self-reporting?"

Elise Gerich: So one of the things that we have done for the last couple years is had a third party audit. And that third party audit, Price Waterhouse Cooper, has looked at the controls in the systems and has looked to see if we followed our process. So I would assume that those third party audits would act in conjunction and be a - I guess an outside opinion as to whether or not we are

following our processes, which is what again we're measuring and reporting against.

Kim Davies: And to add to that, right now, TLD managers can log into their accounts and see the time stamps on sort of high level stake changes for any individual requests. So they can look at the times that certain things happened.

So they can reconcile that with what we're publicly reporting. I would say that in principle we could release all the time stamps for all requests but you know we've typically operated on the basis of confidentiality, that, you know, anything that discloses the interior details of another TLD's request shouldn't be publicly disclosed.

If that assumption based on agreement with the TLD community was to change, then, you know, I think maybe we could be more open about all the steps or all the tickets in a more (unintelligible) form.

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff. Hopefully my audio works now. Can you guys hear me?

Elise Gerich: We hear you.

Paul Kane: yes.

Jeff Neuman: Great. Okay. So I think I do agree that each individual request should be confidential. But there are ways of categorizing in the aggregate the different requests and then in the aggregate putting time frames in where one can assess from the outside whether you're leading it.

It's one thing to say that an individual registry can assess the response time and then make a conclusion. But it's another when you're reporting in the aggregate.

And so I guess my question is - and having a third party come in and audit and say your controls are - I mean that's great. That's a great practice but just like ICANN when they're measuring the registries with probes - with third party probes out there to measure response times - even if the registry says we have a (staff 70) or a (SSAE16), ICANN still has its probes to measure the time of each individual request.

So I guess kind of the analogy there is, you know, it's great that you have the audit and that should be continued. But we do need some way of being able to assess -- other than through a formal audit one time a year - we need a way to assess the performance.

Elise Gerich: So what do you suggest Jeff? How do you do it for your registry?

Jeff Neuman: Well I'm no longer with NeuStar but how we did it...

Elise Gerich: Well how did you do it with your registry?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. So we report from the time a certain type of query - whatever the request is - comes in till the time it leaves our system. And then we reported that on a monthly basis to the communities. And so that's how we got to the level of let's say it's availability.

Elise Gerich: So we do that today also. And we have the reports published on the IANA Web site under the slash performance for every root zone request.

Kim Davies: Yes I think what's different is Jeff is saying IANA shouldn't be reporting that. It needs to be by a third party. So I guess that's where we need some...

Elise Gerich: But what (unintelligible) was that NeuStar reported it that way just like we are.

Jeff Neuman: Yes I think - I think okay so I misunderstood what you said. I'm trying to think of what Paul was saying with the time stamps and they do report...

All right I have to look again at the reports. So maybe you already do it. Let me go back and look at one of those reports.

Elise Gerich: Yes so I think that's what I was trying to get to is to see how you would do it because if you do go to the IANA Web site where the performance reports are we have a long list of the root zone changes and you know when it came in and when it finished.

And then we also have a - it's an aggregate of all of them for each type of root zone change for the aggregate time - average time I guess - for each type of change for that monthly period. So those are again internally reported so I was trying to understand how when you were at NeuStar you had externally checked those types of internal reports.

Jeff Neuman: Well I mean externally they're done - we do have -and now ICANN does them right? There are probes that come in and they check a request coming in to when it leaves. But I'm not sure if that's really relevant to root zone changes. I don't think that can be done but let me just look at one of these reports.

Elise Gerich: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: Paul you can go on to the next - you can go to the next (question).

Paul Kane: Thank you Jeff. Appreciate it very much. So Bernie the floor is yours. Can't hear you Bernie. Okay it looks like Bernie's typing. Okay so Bernie's going to log in again. So anyone else want the floor? Welcome (Elaine).

Kim Davies: So while everyone's getting combobulated...

Man: (Unintelligible)?

Kim Davies: One thing I'd written down to suggest before this call - and you asked about how you'd like this to proceed - I think it would be useful to distinguish between what you would like IANA to measure and report against versus why this should be a discreet performance level standard with a specific threshold for adherence.

And I think that we can measure and report more necessarily than there are SLAs for and that reporting might inform later SLAs based on data once we have some data there and the community finds that that's just not appropriate then, you know, you can hold us to account and add additional SLAs if necessary.

I think if those two could be distinguished it might be more helpful. I mean we're certainly - we're trying to provide as much sunshine into the process as we can. And I think, you know, knowing what the community wants us to instrument in our systems, report/disclose, it's very useful in that.

Paul Kane: A very good point and I think that's the direction of travel that we are trying to come up within this SLE that we are working on. So thank you for that Kim. Appreciate it. Bernie, your mic is now working I understand.

Bernie Turcotte: Well let's check and make sure that's the case. Can you hear me?

Paul Kane: Yes.

Bernie Turcotte: Excellent, all right. Listen, I've been staying out of this because we're just facilitators here and I will just provide you my view. As Paul knows, you know, I probably started this SLA thing with IANA way too many years ago when I was in the ccNSO and I've been watching it from the sidelines for a while.

Gathering up the thoughts that I heard today combining it with some of the real practical things that are in the transition document in other areas regarding approval and expectations and just general expectations of the community versus IANA when they change things, it strikes me that, you know, we've really - DTA has been approaching this really as a bottom-up thing and as a bunch of practical business people that makes a lot of sense.

I'm wondering if we wouldn't change this around a bit after listening to the conversation today and try a bit of a top-down going to Kim's comments relative to at a higher level defining what we're going to look for because regardless what happens, regardless what we finish, that will be value going forward into the CSC annual reviews for these things and setting the bar for what we're looking for.

And starting from a higher level if you will we can keep drilling down I think probably in a more efficient fashion once we identify some of those key criteria and elements that everyone is looking for.

I think the key comment here as Paul picked up on was that, you know, IANA's more than willing to provide as much sunshine on this as is possible and we thank them for that. And it's wonderful that it's that way these days. And I really do believe that, having seen the stuff on the inside.

But it seems to me, you know, in the bottom-up approach we've got right now we keep hitting some corners and then we bounce back and then we try another path. How about we try it from the other end, see how far we can get but the things we accomplish going down each step will be of value going forward.

Anyway that's my suggestion I don't know what you want to do with it Paul.

Paul Kane: So just picking up on that Bernie and I don't know where other members of the design team what the other members of the design team view that. I would be willing to commit some of my staff resources to really try and come up with a document that we could submit to the design team members and consult with IANA in the development of that document.

Provided we could do it relatively quickly and I'm talking weeks not months. I would be open to that if members of the design team thought that appropriate or helpful.

I just really want to get this off our in trays. I hadn't given that much thought Bernie and I don't know if that would be welcome first of all by the group or would it be welcome by ICANN IANA.

The bottom line is obviously my neck is on the chopping board being a member of the CWG. This design team has yet to finalize the SLE on which other groups do rely and that's one - I put the offer out there if it's welcome.

So I see Bernie and Jeff please. So Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you, yes I think you're quite right and we have to see what your design team feels like. I will note just two other points, actually three. One, you know, there's a general expectation that we all have to get along in this sandbox, which is as much pressure as on everyone as it is on any specific party.

The second one is that this is probably one of the things that looks at a significant change of a current operational process versus the other things. I mean sure in other areas we're looking at extracting NTIA but that's all we're doing.

And in places we're just cutting it off and, you know, patching it in so it doesn't have to be there. In other places we're designing other approval mechanisms to replace them.

But this is the one where we're actually playing with the dials and trying to change things and I think there is a certain amount of concern in the community that we need to do this right.

So and lastly I think that really as I said early and I wanted to reemphasize that, if we get the top level right I think this thing will start flowing a lot easier and will be a going forward value for everyone in the community, thank you.

Paul Kane: So just on that point Bernie the goal I think of this working group is not to change a thing. We want to capture what is happening today and make sure that the work flow documents and the timestamps for each task capture today the real world today.

There has been a perception that we're trying to change stuff. That is not true that is a perception that is not accurate. We're just wanting to capture the status quo of real world activity.

And I agree with your overarching point that we have been working at a community level trying to build consensus from the bottom up and maybe we do need to have a quick look at if we can expedite the process by starting at the other end. Jeff please.

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks and I just want to emphasize exactly what Paul just did is that we're not trying to change anything but there are certain things even with the reports that are out there that are just kind of the black box for us.

And we're doing our best from the outside to draft what we've been asked to draft but, you know, I would certainly welcome (Bernie's) suggestion of, you know, even IANA you all just kind of drafting what you think your SLA document should look like.

And then having us kind of build on that or, you know, review that. So like, you know, when I'm looking at reports like your KPI's for let's say Whois database change request right?

And you have in there timeliness and the timeliness is measured in terms of 21 days. Now most of that my assumption is our responses back from the registry operators and things that are outside your control.

But what we don't have in there is from the moment the request comes into your system to change the Whois to the moment you issue the next communication either back to the registry to followup or, you know, whatever your next steps are in the chart that you've given to us.

And this is just an example, we don't know the time that that takes and we don't know how to measure that. And you don't necessarily at least I can't find them and maybe you do, report on those types of things.

So I mean the KPI's it's great to see the 100% and the target met but we don't see kind of the details in there. And again we're not trying to change anything we're just trying to figure out how as the community how we can measure your performance so that we know the status quo at least is being maintained.

Paul Kane: So thank you Jeff and I see the other Jeff also agrees that we're not trying to change a thing. So Elise the floor is yours.

Elise Gerich: Thank you and Jeff we really appreciated your comments just now and if your invitation is open to actually work on, you know, proposing some measures to you that would show, you know, the time that our department spends on processing versus the time that, you know, we're waiting.

We could clearly come up with something and come back and make that proposal to this design team if that is your desire. I think that would be one way for us to go forward and I appreciate your noting that we do report on the end-to-end like to a 21 day metric and that it is just one big blob where it includes all the responders in that timeframe.

As you on the registry operators as well as NTIA and VeriSign activities. But we welcome your invitation if that's what the design team wishes.

Paul Kane: So thank you Elise. Jeff your hand is still up and I note that (Patricia) has also confirmed that we're not seeking to make changes. So I just want to reassure ICANN IANA that we have never sought to change the process we just want to capture the timeframes. Kim the floor is yours.

Kim Davies: Mostly to reemphasize what Elise just said I think, you know, we're happy to clarify the process and, you know, if you'd like us to suggest potential metrics for the group to consider with your empowerment for us that that's appropriate to do so I think we're happy to contribute in that fashion.

I think just with an implementation hat on just coming back to a few of the previous points. One is that, you know, not all the things we'll come up with will necessarily be measured right away.

And, you know, it's for us to come up with a plan to bridge that gap and commit the development resources required to do those measurements if necessary.

And I think this comes back a bit to the concern about the thresholds for the SLA's as well. I think we can report on that and measure on it but can we give a reasonable estimate about whether it's an appropriate percentage SLA that's a different question. So those are the comments I wanted to make.

Paul Kane: Thanks Kim. So on our screens for those of us in the Adobe room we have routes and processing times being shared. Would someone like to run through why that has been brought to our attention?

I think we are fairly familiar with past transactions but not at a granular detail which is where we're going to I think. So please anyone speak to it.

Elise Gerich: Yes so this is Elise. I posted that link and I guess it's Bart that owns this. So one of the requests I thought that Jeff said was in aggregate we'd like to understand how much time different types of requests take place.

And so Bart had taken the link that I posted and put it up there. The other link that's in the chart room that Kim posted shows what Jeff just spoke to, which was we have a 21 day SLE.

And then there's a table below that that shows for each request four different steps for that request. So this was just an example of some of the things we report on today in aggregate that responded to (Jeff's) earlier comment about aggregate timeframes and average timeframe.

Paul Kane: Thank you, thanks Elise. So any other - so so far we've had a proposal for ICANN to identify what SLE's would work for them. I'm happy to have one of my staff help or work through with ICANN IANA bearing in mind I do think that the base document we have presented to ICANN IANA is not considered or should not be considered to be a threat.

It is really trying to make sure that if a registry fails to fulfill their part of the bargain ICANN IANA is not to blame for it. So if that's a sensible way forward and it meets with the approval of the members of the design team I would be supportive of just trying to get us to a high level document that we can all agree upon.

And then if subsequently we need to go into more detail we can do that but it would I hope expedite the process. I see Bernie has given a green tick so that indicates approval.

If we could just go through other members of the design team if you want, if you think that approach to be appropriate or if you have any reservations about it do feel free to raise your hand or comment in the chat if you find that acceptable or otherwise.

Elise Gerich: I didn't raise my hand can I say something, sorry.

Paul Kane: Please yes, yes.

Elise Gerich: So I'm a little bit unclear. You've asked if we the ICANN department was willing to work together on this and we clearly are. The part I'm unclear about is your comment about high level and then about the base document and how those two fit together. Could you clarify that for me?

Paul Kane: So the group has produced the document that we have seen and has been circulated. And there seems to be some confusion over that document. And so what I am proposing is not to start afresh but to keep the base document in our minds and to see if we can come up with an SLE document that meets the concerns that the design team members have in terms of trying to come up with a reasonable SLE.

But at the same time accommodate the concerns that Kim and others have raised that we don't want it to be too difficult or too far away from current approaches.

So we don't - we're not 100% certain of the current work flow. We learned more but we just wanted a high level to make sure that the SLE proposed one, can be achieved, is capturing today's activity accurately and the timestamps and the processes are accurately addressed.

Bernie I see your hand is up.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you Paul. I think the objective median term is to get to that but I think if I go back to what I was suggesting as a first shot is that on the top down a few of us sit down and work out the first one or two levels of what the objectives are that we're trying to meet and that they make sense for everyone.

And then keep drilling down while keeping in mind the document that you proposed so that we can actually achieve some of the things you're looking at. But my overall objective is to ensure that we're all comfortable from a top down version about what we're trying to get to because regardless of what happens that will be passed on and people won't have to start at that again.

Paul Kane: Thank you Bernie. Jeffrey.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks and apologies for just being on listen-only mode for the first little bit of the call and apologies again this was stated. But I think, you know, going through this in I think the most efficient way forward I'd have to say is I agree with Paul on his process of saying the group, the design team came up with these steps.

And our whole goals as we had said was not to make major changes just to figure out what are the service level expectations that we could hold that, you know, IANA ICANN they would be accountable for.

I think, you know, these steps that you provided us are very helpful and now we understand the handoff's of what goes back and forth. And I think what we're looking for is to say, hey we understand the steps, we understand the handoffs.

We have just, you know, put in some let's call it proposed time, certain efforts but the point is to make sure that you are not as IANA and other groups held accountable for issues or problems that the registry operator or registry manager does not, you know, is responsible for.

So I think, you know, I think I understand the high level, you know, approach but I think we're already there. I feel like we're in agreement on that. It's now sort of in the details saying let's look at the timestamps, let's look at the handoffs.

See what's reasonable between both parties and I think we're very close. And I think the document that the design team came up with is I think it's fairly close and if there are differences in time and the expectations we can talk through those on a point-by-point basis.

But as, you know, just overarching I think I said we don't want to make any major changes we just want to understand what expectations are from both sides.

I think the design team is very reasonable. Hopefully none of the documents came through where you said they are crazy there is no way that's going to happen because then you could tell us and say, yes the reason why that's not possible is because of, you know, A, B, C, and D.

And I think we could go back and say, now we understand the handoffs let's make those changes at that time. So hopefully that makes sense and I think as I said the next step is sort of in those details of going through the different handoff concepts and then maybe resetting some of the expectations. Thanks.

Paul Kane: Thank you. I have to say I agree I think we are very close. I hope we are very close and I certainly want to make sure that we're not seeking to change fundamental processes we just need to capture the processes.

I do like (Bernie's) idea of really just trying to find out if there are any significant issues to make sure the document which does need to be supplemented to make sure it captures the sub routines that have been addressed.

But before we get into the weeds let's take a step back and look at the higher level and working closely with IANA staff come up with a document and then bring that document back to the design team for more detailed consideration if we've missed certain points or specific points would like to be addressed.

I'd like any members of the design team, any other comments please. And exactly I just want to echo I think we now need to focus on the efficiency side and I think it can be done efficiently and Jeffrey says he's okay with that part so that's good.

(Elaine) can I ask you to comment, (Patricia) comment on that approach if that makes sense in ICANN. Comments as well would be welcome. (Elaine) is currently writing.

Well the next question as people are writing, when would be sensible to have another call? How long would it - do people think this high level review would take and what are people's availability?

So if I could ask ICANN first for their availability and whilst you're thinking about that I see Bernie has raised his hands.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you Paul. If you've got - I'm presuming it's a minor availability from Kim next week but just given the efficiency thing in the chat and everyone supporting that.

Why don't we give ourselves an objective of coming up with a draft within a week and maybe we can meet early the week after as a full group. Would that make sense and be efficient enough?

Paul Kane: I see (Elaine) has just written in and I think we're all on the same page we just want to make sure that this process is handled efficiently. I think we could probably work to that if ICANN is able to work to that timeframe ICANN IANA.

Kim Davies: Kim here. I think it's okay but please just confirm my assumption here. You had mentioned that one of your colleagues would volunteer to help work on this.

Is the expectation that ICANN representatives work with your colleague to iterate some early drafts and then bring them back to the design team?

Paul Kane: I just think I can - within the company or unless members of the design team want to be involved within my company I can appoint someone to deliver staff within a specific time period.

We all have fairly hectic day jobs and if ICANN IANA staff will make themselves available I feel comfortable we can operate efficiently. My goal is really to try and live up to the timeframe that Bernie has highlighted.

I know unfortunately I can't due to my day job work commitments but I would be very willing to put someone on it. Because I genuinely like Jeff said

I think we are very close it's just the documentation just needs to align everyone's concerns and I generally think we're there.

So okay so that's good. So anyone else? (Patricia) are you happy with that proposal and Kim are you happy with the proposal because I think you'll be the key point man?

Kim Davies: I think we've very happy to move forward on this basis with developing revisions to it. It sounds like we should be able to breach any understanding gaps and come up with a clear vision for what we're going to do.

I think, you know, there's still open questions that undoubtedly we'll revisit at future meetings such as, you know, the timelines and how they mesh with the transition proposal.

But I think for now just getting a base understanding on what should be measured and what fashion is the first step and perhaps noting down those principles and flushing those out as well.

Paul Kane: Okay so I'd just like to pick up what's going on in the chat. So (Patricia) says yes she's happy with the approach. (Elaine) in the chat says, we've run into some serious inefficiencies in ICANN's transition process.

So I'd like to see the process within IANA aligned with the timeline for the transitions. Too much detail for this discussion but that's a focus to me. And I think (Elaine) we are all on that page.

We want to really try and make sure that the SLE that we come up with meets the concerns of the registry community but at the same time is achievable by ICANN IANA because it's fundamentally capturing current activity.

And we want to feed that into the transition proposal. So I think we are very much all on the same page. And Bernie knows that I have a colleague of mine, (Adam) who has been very helpful to me in preparing the flow charts and the stuff that came out early on in the process and so I would gladly assign (Adam) to work with ICANN IANA to facilitate it.

Okay so that's very helpful. We've had one hour of the call. I think we've covered a fair bit already and that's fantastic. Is there anything else for this call and it would be good and I will do it on the email list if we could have a call a week on Monday, a week on Tuesday that would be fantastic too?

So the 8th or 9th of June that would be good but I'll conduct that on the email list and I hope towards the end of next week all members of this group both design team A members and also ICANN IANA will have copies of the more efficient document or the document that's being worked on.

Elise is currently typing but any other comments please, please raise your hand. I'm hoping this meeting can come to conclusion fairly soon.

Elise Gerich: I was just going to say I'll stop typing. The 8th of June would be preferable. I think that was one of the dates you mentioned at least for me but I'm not on your email list so I thought I'd throw it in now.

Paul Kane: Okay 8th of June. At the same time if that works for everyone that would be good. I don't know how Jay Daly if he's able to join on the 8th of June I don't know what time it would be in New Zealand.

Bart Boswinkel: Paul this is Bart, normally say normally later in the evening works for us. So around 8:00 pm UTC that's doable for New Zealand.

Paul Kane: So that's, what's that?

Bart Boswinkel: It's 9:00 pm your time.

Paul Kane: Nine pm and so for - it's 4 o'clock in the afternoon Eastern Standard Time does that work on the 8th of June?

Elise Gerich: Just a second it's...

Jeff Neuman: What was that Eastern Standard Time did you say can you repeat that?

Paul Kane: I think it's 4:00 pm Eastern Standard Time.

Jeff Neuman: Okay and I'll do the math that's 1:00 pm Pacific Time that would work for me. This is Jeff Eckhaus thanks.

Paul Kane: Brilliant, okay so let's pencil that in. Thank you very much Bart for that timing.

Bart Boswinkel: (Elise), Kim would that work for you?

Kim Davies: Yes.

Elise Gerich: Yes that's good for Elise.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay so we'll send - I'll record it in the notes so all members of (DTA) including (Jake) and (Sead) I will send out a calendar invite for the 8th of June at 8:00 pm UTC.

Paul Kane: Thank you Bart and thanks (Patrician), thanks (Elaine), thanks Kim, thanks Bernie. I think this has been a very productive call and we will crack on and come up with an appropriate document for consultation on the 8th of June at our next meeting. Thank you all.

END