

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
June 08, 2015
3:00 pm CT**

Bart Boswinkel: Hi, Paul. This is Bart. We'll start the recording shortly. Brenda hasn't started yet. The recording has started. We'll take the people in the Adobe room as present. Is there anybody just on audio, so we can note him or her? No? So, over to you, Paul.

Paul Kane: Thank you very much, Bart. So, this is a call taking place at 20:00 hours on the eighth of June, 2015, comprised of the service level expectation design team members, ICANN and IANA staff. So first of all, may I thank you all for joining the call. And the agenda is on your screen. If at any Time you wish to ask a question, raise a point, please just click on the button with the little man with his arm up, and then I'm able to see that you're wishing to join the queue of participants.

So, if you remember at the last call, we decided we would change our working format somewhat, and have Kim and one of my team, (Adam Smith) join - try and work through the SLE. And I think they have worked well together. But, I would like to invite either Kim or (Adam) to just give us an update on how things are progressing, and anything as we the design team should know about. So, Kim, the floor is yours.

Kim Davies: Thanks, Paul. Yes, as you noted, at the last design team made call, we got the signal that we could work closely with (Adam) to try and evolve the [unintelligible], based on our input on behalf of ICANN. So, between (Adam), myself and (Bernie), we've met multiple times in the last couple of weeks. I think every few days, we've had a meeting, and we would edit the document several time throughout. That being said, it's still a work in progress. There's a lot of detail issues to go through. (Adam)'s been very good coming to it from a neutral perspective, not having come from our industry directly. He asks a lot of insightful questions, and help elucidate some of the issues at the heart of designing these SLAs.

So, I think that conversation has been very fruitful, from my perspective. So, that document is still being developed. I guess an additional point from my perspective is recognizing that, that would not be concluded by today. The document that was circulated by Paul pulls out the principles and a lot of the material from that document, but not the SLE specifically. So, I think that it does reflect the direction of the other document in progress, but obviously isn't entirely that document. But, I'll let (Adam) chime in and add his perspective.

Paul Kane: (Adam), the floor is yours. We can't hear your- is your microphone working? If you can't get your microphone to work, just put a note in the chat. Okay, he is writing in the chat. He can't get his microphone to work. Okay, we have a slight technical pitch. Unfortunately, (Adam)'s microphone is not working in the Adobe room. I would also like to recognize (Jeff Eckhaus:) has joined the call, as had (Jay Daley). So, welcome to you both. So, thank you very much, Kim.

So, in summary, there has been good progress on putting the key elements of the SLE together. There is more work to be done. And really, I would like to

ask the design team members, you are representing your respective communities, if you are happy for (Adam), and Kim, and (Bernie) to continue working together post the eighth of June, which is when the CWG is hoping to conclude its proposal.

And if there are any objections to that, would you please raise them now by raising your hand. Otherwise, we will approve it. So, I'll just pause for a second. If you object to Kim, and (Bernie), and (Adam) working together. And I hope that they will come back, or they will come back to this group periodically and inform us of their progress. But, any objections, please raise your hand.

Jeff Eckhaus: It's...

Paul Kane: Jeff Eckhaus:.

Jeff Eckhaus: Paul, it's Jeff Eckhaus here. I don't necessarily have an objection. I have a question though, if I could ask that.

Paul Kane: Please.

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay, thank you. So, if they continue to work, I'm trying to understand how that affects the documentation - after the June eight deadline, how that will affect - how that will be affect - I'm assuming they will be able to continue to work post June eighth. Will it be an issue and do we have, sort of, a deadline for that post June eight time frame for deliverable on that? Thank you.

Paul Kane: Can I ask Kim or - unfortunately, (Adam)'s microphone isn't working. So, Kim, can I ask you how long do you think it'll be until you have an ALE flushed out in draft form for consideration by this design team?

Kim Davies: You know, it's hard to be specific, just due to the fact that the Board of Series meeting about to begin. I'm not sure of (Adam)'s availability, I'm not sure of (Jamey). That's a key factor in deciding that. I think we're close to a final document. I think given those constraints, I think it will be reasonable to say within a month or so, between the three of us, we could have something, sort of, final from our perspective.

Obviously beyond that, we need to go through iteration, both within this design team, if necessary. And then it's not clear to me at all what broader consultation might need to be done on the document. But, I think just in terms of the three people within the team, continuing to work on it the way we have been so far, you know? I think a month is probably reasonable.

Paul Kane: Thank you, Kim. So, Jeff Eckhaus, to answer your question, about a month before we can expect an SLE document, a draft SLE document back to us. The other question you raised was, "What is the standing of this group?" Well, I'm hoping tomorrow, the CWG will support this group continuing to work, in parallel with the ICG process. Mainly because we would like to make sure that the proposal is complete in all aspects.

So, the point you raise is a good one, Jeff. And I can't actually answer that directly, because we are just a design team under the CWG. And the CWG is the party that authorizes us to do our work. But with the information that we are willing to continue to do our work, I will feed that into the CWG and come back to you on list.

Jeff Eckhaus: That would be great. And thank you. I do agree and think it is a good plan for them to continue working. I just wanted to make sure that their working - continuing to work within the CWG and the whole time frame, and that

everybody was, I guess, in agreement with it. And it sounds like we'll find out after you'll speak to them about it, and we will find out shortly on that. Thank you.

Paul Kane: Thank you, Jeff. So...

Jay Daley: Can I talk?

Paul Kane: Yes.

Jay Daley: This is Jay. Sorry, I can't raise my hand because I'm involved in. I'm happy that they continue. But, now that I'm back on board after my extended Time off, I'd like to be involved in that as well. I think it's useful that we have someone who's a direct customer in that smaller group, and to ensure we get the attention to detail and clarity around that process.

Paul Kane: I support you being involved, Jay. Can I suggest that what we do is we just let the group get on for a few more weeks to actually get a document in draft form available for our consideration? And then, I think we would all like to see, in more detail, what they're doing before the document is near finished. So at the moment, I understand they're just going through the general heads of terms.

The general processing points. But, I think what would be helpful is say, a couple of weeks' time, if Kim and (Adam) and (Bernie) can provide us with a draft of their document, at least we can see that it's going in the direction that we are looking for. Would that help you, Jay?

Jay Daley: I think if we could get a draft more frequently than that then that would, yes.

Paul Kane: Okay. So, we'll be all right, Kim, if we were to make it once a week, and Kim and (Adam) make it once a week you give us a draft of the SLE you're working on?

Kim Davies: I'll let (Adam) respond by typing. My point of view, it's his document. I mean, I'm trying to explain as fully as possible our procedures. I'm trying to explain the implications of measuring things a certain way, and what I consider might be the obstacles and so on. But, I give myself the primary author. So, I'll let (Adam) respond.

Paul Kane: (Adam) is typing, but may I assure you, as (Adam) works for me, I volunteer that every week he will be submitting to the group a draft of the SLE. So, that will help. But yes, Jay, it will be great further down the road if you would certainly take more of an active role in making sure it's in shape. So, thank you for that. Any other questions, please, on this particular agenda topic? I don't see any, so thank you very much. So, they will continue to work and report back to us on a weekly basis with an update of the draft that they are considering.

Thank you. So, the other issue, the very important issue that I would like to discuss next is item three on our agenda. And I'm very grateful to all members of the design team for your various inputs. The goal is really to present a statement from the design team that has the support of ICANN, IANA, and the design team members, that can be included in the proposal of the CWG, which will then go to the ICG.

And there have been a number of iterations of the draft statement for your consideration. And I would invite (Bernie) to just run through the statement, if you would. And if at any time anyone has any comments, please raise your hand or shout out if you're on audio. (Bernie), the floor is yours.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you. Hello, everyone. I'll just try to make this a little bigger because I don't have my glasses. There we go. Just to begin, I think from the coat of the CWG, the expectation is that we should be able to map out the areas of agreement, and include that in the final report, which the final chance for a major discussion by the CWG is at its meeting tomorrow. So, it is our hope that this, sort of, principles documents will be good. All right, I'm going to do this. I don't see the hand, so I'll let Paul manage those. Just scream at me if you want me to stop. And here we go.

The service level expectations SLE design team is comprised of three GTLD registry representatives, and three CCTLD representatives. The DT has been working productively with ICANN, including IANA staff. I don't think there should be any questions there. The DT was asked to review the current IANA functions operations, and to work with IANA staff to capture the current workflow processes, for incorporation in the final SLE document. IANA had recently provided some documentation.

And DTA expects to continue to work together with IANA to document the root management process in the coming months. The DT also reviews performance standards established under the IANA construct, between NTIA and ICANN, which was considered inadequate for a registry service of such global importance. In light of that secession of NTIA's independent stewardship and authorization role, it is an appropriate Time for customers to evaluate minimally acceptable service levels, reporting requirements, and breach levels.

I have not heard anything, so I will presume we're doing okay. The DT is not proposing any changes to the current workflow process. The DT is suggesting that there is a requirement placed on IANA as part of the implementation phase of the CWG stewardship proposal, to measure, record, and report

additional transaction Times, for each root's zone management process. Such transparency will provide factual...

Jay Daley: Sorry, Jay in here.

Bernie Turcotte: Is there a question?

Jay Daley: Yes, sorry. The word "suggesting" I think should be "recommending."

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. Bart, are you going to be good to take notes on those things?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I do.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay, excellent. Anything else on that paragraph?

Jay Daley: No, not at all. Thank you.

Bernie Turcotte: All right. Hearing nothing else, I'll continue. Such transparency will provide factual information to assist this TFC, IRT -- I guess we're talking about IFRT here -- and the community to determine and confirm that IANA is continuing to provide non-discriminatory service to the naming community. Further, by having clarity as to process, it can be confirmed that IANA staff may not be the cause of the delay in the execution of the change request.

I guess that should be "a change request," but anyways, we can play with juts minor grammatical things later. On other occasions, due to the wide Time window for completing a task, there is an opportunity for, or the perception for, certain TLD managers to have preferential treatment, and change requests completed in a matter of days, while other request take much longer, and yet

still be in the approved time. So, that's the end of the background section. I'll take any comments, questions.

Paul Kane: Can we just deal with the suggested change, introducing "recommending." The group is recommending rather than suggesting. Kim, do you have a problem with inserting "recommending" rather than "suggesting"?

Kim Davies: Not at all. It's fine by me.

Paul Kane: (Bernie), on behalf of ICANN, do you think that would be a problem?

Bernie Turcotte: I can't speak on behalf of ICANN, but in my role I'm playing in all of this, I think that's fine.

Paul Kane: Right. So, that's adopted. And you mentioned something about IRT. We got the wrong acronym, do we?

Bernie Turcotte: Yes. It'll just be part of the minor clean up afterward. It'll be IFRT, I believe.

Paul Kane: IFRT. Okay, so thank you very much for that. Any other comments from any other members? Yes, please.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes, It's Jeff Eckhaus. thank you. I understand this is on the piece where it says - I understand where it says, "By having clarity after the process, it could be confirmed that IANA staff may not be the cause of the delay in the execution of the change request." That is crystal clear. But then the next line, I'm not sure really what we're saying here.
And maybe that could be - because it says, "On other occasions, due to the wide timeframe for completing a task, there is an opportunity for, or the perception for, certain TLD managers to have preferential treatment in change

requests completed in a matter of days.” And that part, it says, “Due to the wide time window for completing a task.” Is that - why is there a wide time window there? It’s not clear what that wide time window is referring to. And that’s part A. And then part B, I’m not sure that the two parts that - an opportunity for and apperception for, that those jive.

I’m not sure what we’re trying to say there. So, maybe a little explanation about that edit may help, because I’m not sure of what we’re saying at that point. And maybe it might be that - maybe this is a good thing that I’ve been a little behind on some of the reading. So, I’m looking at this maybe with not as much insider knowledge. So, maybe it might be an issue that others look at it the same way. That it’s not that clear. Or, maybe I’m just dense and I’m not sure what we’re trying to get at there. So, I would love a little bit of an explanation and clarity on that, please.

Paul Kane:

So, Jeff , you raise a good point. We’ve only recently rearranged this. The reason - this paragraph. The reason is there have been calls by some members or - sorry, some participants of the CWG, that we use the NTIA SLE as the document moving forward for the basis of transition. That we felt was an unacceptable documents to use, because one NTIA is no longer involved in the process.

But also, the prescribed time period is - the name server changes is 21 days. That, being specifically, the wide window. Rather, it may be argue by people seeking to discredit the good work that IANA is doing, that some registries are receiving preferential treatment, because tasks are being undertaken much faster for certain registries than other registries.

And there have - the idea is basically to say the SLE that NTIA has with ICANN is no longer fit for purpose. And that’s the reason for us seeking to review, in this framework, the mechanisms for determining the service level

that's expected by the registry operators. But, the point you make is well made. We might need to just have clarifying language. It's just in light of the recent re-organization of the paragraphs, the meaning may have been lost.

Jeff Eckhaus: Right. And Paul, thank you, you've very eloquently explained it, and now it makes sense. But I think now - of course, you will not be there to explain it to everyone who reads it. So, I think if we have a little clarifying language that would make it a lot smoother transition for this. Thank you.

Paul Kane: I think we're happy to do that offline. So, thank you for that comment and we'll take that onboard.

Jeff Eckhaus: Oh, yes. We don't need to edit on the fly, please.

Paul Kane: Right. Exactly. Can we move on please, (Bernie).

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you, sir. All right, moving on. Principles. These are a set of guiding principles that will help define the expectation for the monitoring and reporting environment, and guide the definition of the individual criteria used for reporting and assessment of the naming related portions of the IANA functions. Attributable measures. Unless clearly impractical, individual metrics should be reported, attributing Time taken to the party responsible.

For example, time spent by IANA staff processing a change request should be accounted for distinctly from time spent waiting for customer action during a change request. I'm going to pause after each one of these and see if there's something. Okay, I'm not seeing anything or hearing anything, so I'll proceed. Overall metrics. In addition to the previous principle, overall metrics should be reported to identify general trends associated with end to end processing times, and processing volumes.

Okay. Relevance. All metrics to be collected should be relevant to the validation of customer service. In addition, some are the critical metrics that are considered important to set specific thresholds for judging breaches and ICANN stability to an appropriate level of service.

Paul Kane: Elaine has a comment.

Elaine Pruis: Yes, thanks. So, I have read this several times, and I find it confusing. I'd like it to be re-written. And maybe the part that's confusing is the - about customer service. I think that's the only time we've actually used customer service in the entire document. So, is anybody else finding this confusing to, or...? I guess the, "In addition, some of the critical metrics," is a little lacking in clarity.

Jay Daley: All right. Paul, can I jump in there?

Paul Kane: Please. Jay and then Kim.

Jay Daley: Yes. So, I re-wrote that because I didn't understand the previous version of it.

Elaine Pruis: Okay.

Jay Daley: So, the reason I did customer service is because the principle was entitled Relevance. And the initial relevance given in the previous draft for collecting these things was for analysis. And I didn't think analysis was a strong enough meaning. Because I don't think it's fair that we say to IANA, "You need to collect any data we want you to be called for analysis, and that's what relevance means. So, I was trying to narrow it to a relevance meaning, that we only measure things that directly impact on customers.

We don't measure things that we might - you know, how many sandwiches the owner ate today, because that's not of any relevance to us. So, that was the intent. And then the second part about the critical measures was already there, and I was just trying to add that in, so that it worked well.

Paul Kane: Kim, please.

Kim Davies: Thanks, Paul. So, I wrote the originally confusing bit that Jay edited, so I can provide a bit of context into my thinking. What I was trying to say originally was that I think there's a distinction between what IANA is expected to measure and report on, versus what are the formal thresholds, let's say, that ICANN breaches that there's a consequence for.

I think what we're expected to measure and publish will be a broader remit than the specific thresholds for non-compliance, let's say. So, I was trying to tease out that the community should set what they think is relevant, that IANA needs to publish and measure. And then more specifically, what are the critical metrics, against which the community should set specific performance criteria. And if ICANN does not meet these, there will be consequences. That was what I was trying to convey originally, for what it's worth.

Paul Kane: Patricio, please.

Patricio Poblete: Are you hearing me?

Paul Kane: Yes.

Patricio Poblete: Okay. The hearing it all, it does seem confusing now. I sort of had understood it before. Now, it's more confusing than it was before, because by the term

“relevance”, what I understood was that data that should be collected, should be the one that is necessary to check for compliance.

And that says that it conveys and would be relevant if it is connected. It’s something that could possible lead to a breach. So, is Kim saying now that it’s wider than us, right? That anything that the community, by some process, would seem to be relevant. Is that what you’re saying, Kim?

Kim Davies: I think so. I mean, taking the narrow definition of, it should only be measurements that are directly relevant to SLEs. I mean, I think - you know, just counting the number of requests does not lead to an SLE, because you can’t have an SLE saying, “IANA will process less than X per month, or more than X request.” Another request is what it is. Now, I accept that you might just agree that it’s out of scope in its working group.

I mean, undoubtedly, we’ll just publish that data anyway, whether we’re required to or not. I’ll leave it for the team members to decide whether it’s appropriate for that to be formally defined or not. To me, what I was trying to guard against, I guess, was the assumption that for everything we measure, there must be a threshold attached to it. I think there should be a distinction between what we measure, and what has a threshold attached to it. That was really the core of what I was trying to get across.

Paul Kane: So...

Patricio Poblete: By the way, I have a comment.

Paul Kane: Yes, please.

Patricio Poblete: I have a comment on the previous point. If we are done with this, I would like to go back with the tools on slide Number 2.

Paul Kane: Please.

Patricio Poblete: You want to do it now, or should we...?

Paul Kane: Let's do it now, because I'm hoping we can make a note of the issues. And I just read previous iteration. And then maybe we can do a bit of a mix offline. So, we'll see.

Patricio Poblete: Okay.

Paul Kane: Number 2.

Patricio Poblete: Number 2. Yes, my comment is the following. It says there that overall metrics should be reported, and I understand it should be reported by IANA. And that got me thinking about whether other parties could draw conclusions about trends or overall methods, besides IANA, if the [unintelligible] would be available in an open data manner. Have we considered that part of providing the access to the raw data, to other parties could develop a process and [unintelligible]?

Paul Kane: Kim.

Kim Davies: We already published all of the raw data that goes into our current performance standards in XML format, so people can do that. So, we have no intention of stopping from doing that. Whether you want to explicitly call it out is up to you, I suspect. But, we do that and we'll continue to do that.

Patricio Poblete: Perhaps it could be said somewhere in the document, so people would know that the raw data will be available.

Paul Kane: Okay, that's a good point. It's already - so, just to recap. The raw data is already made available by ICANN. And I think Patricio's point is that it would be helpful if we were to highlight that in this statement. So, I'm happy to add the availability of the raw data, just as an adjunct, as it were. The relevance clause, we just need to give that a bit more thought.

But, I think the point is well made, that's its actually trying to distinguish between the analysis of data that's relevant to customer service, rather than data in general. So, we'll work on that one. But, that's a relatively minor tweak, I think. So, Number 4, (Bernie).

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you, sir. Number 4, clear definition. Each metric should be sufficiently defined, such that there is a commonly held understanding of what is being measured, and how an automated approach would be implemented to measure against the standard. Definition of thresholds. The definition of specific thresholds for performance criteria should be set based on analysis of actual data. This may require first the definition of a metric, a period of data collection, and later analysis by IANA customers before defining the threshold.

Review process. The service level expectations should be reviewed periodically, and adapted based on the revised expectations of IANA's customers, and relevant updates to the environment. They should be mutually agreed between the community, and the IANA functions operator. I heard some noise there. So, I'm going to leave it up to the call.

Jay Daley: Yes. Paul, sorry, this is Jay. Going back to the previous one about thresholds. I believe that principle should say, "Initially set based on the actual data." Because if we only ever set it on actual data, then it'll be no improvement. So, or no - sorry, no push through the SLE to ensure improvement. So, we don't want to limit ourselves to never having an SLE that requires improvement from IANA.

Paul Kane: Good point. Are you happy with that, Kim?

Kim Davies: Yes, sure. I mean, the only intent here is not to just, sort of, blindly pick thresholds out of the air, when we have no data to look at. And I think that's where we align with that.

Jay Daley: Well, sorry, can I come back on that? Sorry, Paul, can I just jump in there?

Paul Kane: Yes. You can, yes.

Jay Daley: I'm sorry. I feel actually stronger about this. I think that while the current data is of value for us to understand the impact of the thresholds, the thresholds should be set according to our expectations of customer service. And if that means that we are setting thresholds that are noticeable different from the current practice, then that is because I certainly would feel that the current practice is inadequate and needs to change. And I would not want to have an SLE that we start off with as being knowingly inadequate by some past practice.

Paul Kane: I think the objective is to come up with an SLE that defines what ICANN IANA should be monitoring, and making those - that information available over to this group, or to the customer standing committee group, for the specifics of the SLE to be determined. At the moment, we have estimated,

based on fairly in-depth research that has been done on the available statistics. What we think is reasonable.

But until such time as the mechanism are in place, and many of them are already in place at IANA, I think we just need to be cautious in trying to set specific metrics, or specific thresholds that are hard to meet. So, I think we need to go through a trial period of collecting real-world data, which I hope will re-affirm the data that we have been able to ascertain, based on the statistics available. But, that should then make it possible for a higher level of competence in meeting the standards, and the thresholds that have been set.

So, I think we just need to be a little careful at this juncture of trying to prescribe specific numbers, because we may not- we need to have additional information before those specific numbers can be confirmed, if that makes sense. I take on board the definition of the threshold, and I think we're on the same page. But at the moment, the data collection part is missing or is currently not used by IANA. And we need to get that in use, so we can confirm what thresholds would be reasonable. Would that be...

Jay Daley: Yes, that's acceptable. I think there are two options of things that we could add to that, though. One is that we could leave a particular threshold as undefined, and that it is awaiting data collection and later discussion. And all secondly, we can define a threshold, but note that it is below a minimally acceptable level. But, we are willing to run with it for a particular period, in order for clarity to emerge around that particular process.

Paul Kane: So, that point is noted. And I think the point that you raised initially, that the word initial is key. So then, we actually have a path for service improvement. So, I would propose, just so we can, I hope, support this statement, that we include in Item 5, the word "initial," as you indicated initially. But then

subsequently, in the SLE document itself, refer to your other point, if that's acceptable.

Jay Daley: Sure.

Paul Kane: Thank you. Carry on, (Bernie), please.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you, sir. Since we stopped in the middle of six, I'll restart at that point. Review process. The service level expectations should be reviewed periodically, and adopted based on the revised expectations of IANA's customers and updates to the environment. They should be mutually agreed between the community and the IANA functions operator. Number 7, regular reporting. To the extent practical, metrics should be regularly reported in the near real-time fashion.

Paul Kane: Nothing.

Bernie Turcotte: All right. And that sections concludes that section.

Jay Daley: Sorry, sorry.

Bernie Turcotte: The next section is...

Jay Daley: Can I just...

Bernie Turcotte: Sorry.

Jay Daley: Hi, this is Jay again. Sorry, because I'm just driving back and forth a school with children. So, it's taking me a while to park and - just wanted to talk. The "near real-time" to me seemed excessive. I think isn't the intention to - gap

between collection and publication should be minimal, not that for everything, we require real-time collection.

Paul Kane: Kim?

Kim Davies: You know, I'm always happy to have less demanding requirements placed on us. I mean, our intention and the work I've been doing with (Adam), is really trying to define all the measures, such so they can be automatically collected and published. We don't want anything except reports, that kind of thing, where staff are required to review and annotate data, like with descriptions or text. And as much as possible, just have an automated workflow.

With that in mind, the expectation is that, apart from obviously some lead-time where that data propagates between our systems, we can post that in some kind of dashboard format relatively quickly. We haven't been specific on the cadence here. It might be as often as daily, it might be as often as every ten minutes. I'm not really sure, and I wouldn't want to commit to a specific undertaking at this time. That really depend on what those metrics ultimately are, and the complexity of collecting them. I'm happy to take guidance on this, as to what the design team feels is appropriate.

Jay Daley: Well, can I say a suggestion then? Can I suggest that the end of - at the end of that we add, "as and when collected."

Paul Kane: So, to the extent practical metrics should be regularly reported. And what's you're going to say after that?

Jay Daley: Sorry. After the real-time bit, we add, "as and when collected," just to be clear what real-time means.

Paul Kane: Yes, that's fine. That's on seven. I hope you're making a note of all these, Bart. We are behind the scenes, I hope, re-wording "relevance" for Section 3, because there is some ambiguity there.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Paul, this is I. I'm taking notes in the notepad. Unfortunately Jay can't read it, but if others read and want to add or change something, please say so in the chat.

Paul Kane: Okay. So, I'm making a few notes as well. And I am following as well. So we should, I hope, end it with a document we all agree to. Carry on (Bernie), please.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you, sir. Capturing the current status quo for IANA root management, roots zone management. Introduction. Service Level Expectations, SLEs, for a domain name registry are typically based on measuring specific transaction sent by a client to the registry. The metric for a transaction is generally of the form of transaction A must complete within X period, Y% of the time measured over Z.

For example, a root zone update must complete within 72 hours 95% of the time measured on a monthly basis. The root zone management process currently presents unique challenges in that IANA is not responsible for all phases of processing. Therefore, the SLEs must be written to accommodate for the phases of the process, and to be mindful of the different attribution for these phases.

Paul Kane: No comments.

Bernie Turcotte: No requests? Okay. These SLE metrics are based on the following current assumptions. A, for the purposes of the SLE discussion, the current process is

simplified to five key stages for all change requests. Notification is implicit in each stage. One, confirm the details of the change. Two, verify the change complies with documented technical standards and policies, and all applicable checks pass. Three, obtain authorization, consent, to proceed with the change.

Four, implement, the change. Five, notify the change requester of completion of the change. I'll stop here. Seeing nothing, I will continue. The root zone process for a routine change request are largely automated. This automation includes one, a web-based interface for submitting a change request to the IANA function operator. The web-based interface authenticates the credentials presented by the change requester, and facilitates the creation of root zone file and root zone database change request.

Near real-time confirmation email to the initiator of the change request of its safe receipt by the IANA assistant. Note, in certain circumstances, the request is initiated by other means, such as fax or a written letter. In these situations, email may not necessarily be used in communications. Three, automated technical checks conducted by the IANA system on the change request. These checks ensure conformance of the technical data, with agreed minimum standards, and check for errors in materials submitted.

Four, seeking consenting from the relevant contacts for the domain through an automated email verification process, where approval requests are sent to both at a minimum. The admin and technical contacts at the registry, for both parties to consent to the update. Note, some contacts are slow to respond, which creates inefficiency in the validation process. In certain circumstances, third-party verification is also required, e.g. government approvals. Five, the verified change request is transmitted to NTIA for authorization.

For changes that impact the root zone file, the change request is also transmitted to the root zone maintainer. This is performed via an online interface. Six, once confirmed, notification is sent by NTIA to IANA. And for changes that impact the root zone file, to the root zone maintainer authorizing the change request for implementation. Seven, prior to implementation, the root zone maintainer repeats automated technical compliance checks on the request, and once verified, implements the change within the root zone file.

This file is typically published twice daily. Eight, on publication of updates to the root zone file, root zone maintainer notifies IANA, who verifies the changes match the requested changes, and notifies the registry. All right? C, the processing roll currently undertaken by the NTIA will no longer exist in a post transition environment. And those steps will no longer be undertaken. This means that IANA will have responsibility for triggering implementation at the conclusion of processing, and communicating directly with the maintainer of the root zone.

D, IANA's online system operates 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, except for maintenance periods, as befit a service that has customers around the globe. That would complete that sub-section. Monitoring past performance. Bracket. We accept past performance as no indication of future performance. But, instead of "is does," I believe it should be, "It does capture the status quo." Minor grammatical edit there. The SLE group conducted historical analysis of IANA performance based on two sources. Data publishes in IANA performance reports, and transaction logs provided by CCTLD registries interacting with the IANA root management function.

The data sources were for the periods September 2013 to January 2015, which provided approximately 565 total data points. Only 27 transactions took longer than nine days, and 13 took longer than 12 days. It should also be

highlighted that some much of the delay is as a result of the registry not responding to IANA to authorize a change request. So, the delay is not necessarily within IANA's control. Four transactions took longer than one year, which is not necessarily a problem if the stability of the DNS is assured. A summary of this research is presented, and we will eventually insert the correct URL. The ongoing work of DTA...

Paul Kane: Jay has a comment. Jay, go ahead.

Jay Daley: Yes, sorry. Sorry, just one thing. The use of the word "registry" there is confusing. The "requester" or something, because IANA is also a registry.

Paul Kane: And (Kim Davis) agrees with that comment. So yes, that will be amended. Okay carry on, (Bernie).

Bernie Turcotte: All right. Almost there, folks. The ongoing work of DTA to define the final SLE to be included with the proposals submitted to the NTIA will be running parallel with eh ICG process to review naming community proposal. The objective is to ensure that the naming proposal is not delayed by work to define the SLEs. And so, to optimize use of the Time prior to the final submission of a proposal to the NTIA. Review of the ongoing work can be viewed here. URL to be entered.

Escalations. The design team endorses the concept of an IANA standing committee specifically to monitor SLEs, but also to contribute to an escalation path for any future breach of service expectations. The role and remit of the CSC is outside of this DT's remit. So, the escalation path described in this document is rudimentary, and designed to support registry operations. We hand over to our CWG colleagues to better describe the recommended escalation path. I believe that's it, sir. Over to you.

Paul Kane: Thank you very much, (Bernie). So, any other comments on that last section, please? Okay, so let's just go back, if we may, to Jay's point about the registry. Within the chat, there have been a number of comments. So, Patricio said possible call it "the requester." (Kim Davis)' says, "It depends on the contents in terms of change request submission. Use requester in terms of who is expected to approve the change request. I would try and emit the text. And it can vary who is to approve." So...

Bernie Turcotte: Sounds good to me.

Paul Kane: Okay. So, the proposal is to emit that text, so that we don't need to specify who is doing the approving. So, thank you for that. So, just going back to the very start, there was a request to clarify the fact that the SLEs that are currently in place between NTIA and ICANN are no longer fit for purpose. And we'll certainly bring that in. I think that's a relatively simple thing to do, but something we will do.

The other one, the relevance point, may I suggest we revert to the original wording of relevance, but actually insert - so, I would propose the following wording, "There should be a distinction between metrics that should be collected to support general analysis, versus those metrics which are the customer critical metrics, that are considered important to set specific thresholds for judging breaches, in IANA's ability to provide an appropriate level of service." I've inserted the word "customer," so it now reads, "customer critical metrics." Does that work for three? (Bernie), your hand is up.

Bernie Turcotte: Just for a general point after, when you're done.

Paul Kane: Okay. So, just on three, that being the most significant I think that is being proposed, is my proposal to introduce the word “customer” critical metrics acceptable. Any objections? I don’t see any objections, so we will amend the wording of the statement to reflect that. The other one, Patricio’s point about including raw data to continue to be available. We should include something about that. Jay’s point about the word “initial,” putting that in.

And also at Number 7, “other when collected.” So, I’ve made a note of those points. And we will certainly review the comments that Bart has collected. So, in essence, I hope the statement does meet with member’s approval, subject to those corrections. And I would like, if I may, to invite all members to vocally, individually, indicate their preference. Either support or not the statement being made. So if I may, Elaine, can I invite you for your comment, please?

Elaine Pruis: Yes, thanks. I support it, with the edits we discussed.

Paul Kane: Thank you. Jeff ?

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes. I support it also with the edits as well. Thank you very much.

Paul Kane: Patricio.

Patricio Poblete: Yes, I support it as well.

Paul Kane: Thank you. Jay.

Jay Daley: Yes, I support it as well. Thank you for the work that’s gone into this.

Paul Kane: Thank you. Jeff Newman has already indicated his support. And I support the document with the edits included. So, thank you all very, very much for

supporting that document. And it will go forward tomorrow to the CWG for inclusion in the proposal. So, thank you. And thank you, (Bernie), for your patience on that. And Bart and I will work through the document, to make sure we capture the various points.

The final thing on the agenda now, with the upcoming meeting in Buenos Aires, I believe there will be significant interest in our work. And I would like to ask for volunteers to present to their respective organizations and respective communities. And there may be some collective meetings relating to the work of the CWG. And I would like to invite people to present at those.

Unfortunately, I am not going to be in Buenos Aires. So, the floor is open to anyone willing to present to groups, please. Okay.

Jay Daley: Hi, Paul. Yes, it's Jay. I'm happy to present to anybody. That's fine. I actually very much - either Patricio and I could do the CC community. I'm happy with that. I'm happy to do the DNA here. And I'm happy to speak to (Kurt) to get him to do that. But, I think it's best if there were a multiple of us doing it. But, if others can't make it, I'm happy to do it.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes, it's Jeff Eckhaus here. I said, I think, in my email I will be at the meeting. And I will probably not be able to lift, but I'll definitely be there to support. I could definitely speak, and speak about the GTLD registries. And just I'll have to check my schedule, but I should be able to participate as well.

Paul Kane: Thank you very much, Jeff. Patricio.

Patricio Poblete: As I said before, I can present to my colleague in TLD in their meeting before, [unintelligible]. And I will be at the ccNSO meeting, and I can present or support their presentation for our colleagues of CC Tech Day and so on.

Jay Daley: Can I suggest, then, that I do...

Patricio Poblete: It would be a set up for a slide that we can just write.

Paul Kane: Jay, go ahead.

Jay Daley: I was going to suggest then that Patricio, that you do the ccNSO, and I will do the CC Tech Day on Monday.

Patricio Poblete: Okay. But, will you be at the ccNSO meeting anyway?

Jay Daley: Yes, I will be there.

Patricio Poblete: Okay.

Paul Kane: Well, so maybe you can do something together. I don't know. So in terms of the slides, we will try and put something together so there's a standard slide deck available. And possible, if we all as a group, try and put a presentation together, that would be welcomed. Elaine is not going to be in Buenos Aires, unfortunately. (Bernie), I see your hand is up.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you, sir. I just wanted to bring back a point that we covered early on in the document, which, you know, came back in the end of the document under "monitoring performance." Does the ongoing work of work of DTA to define the final SLE be included in the proposal, blah blah blah. And there is, in parallel with the ICG process. Just a note, this is a recommendation from this group to the CGW, but it's the CWG's decides, as noted, when we started the document. I just wanted everyone to be clear on that.

Paul Kane: That is very clear. And as I mentioned at the start of the meeting, it is up to the CWG to endorse the approach that we take. Or not, as the case may be. So, thank you for raising that point, (Bernie). Okay, so thank you all very much. So Jeff for offering to do the GTLDs. Jay and Patricio, likewise. I think Jeff Newman has offered, as well, to do some presenting if called upon.

So, that's really good. And we'll try and get some collective slides together showing the research we have done, showing the direction we are traveling. And I believe Kim is going to be in Buenos Aires as well. So, that will be good. So, any other business for this call? No. Please raise your hand. Please comment. I don't see any - sorry, (Bernie). Yes?

Bernie Turcotte: Paul, if at all possible, it would be great if we can finish the edits for the end of this day, so that they could be distributed as fast as possible.

Paul Kane: Okay, fine. It's going to be a late night. Yes, okay. So, we'll work on that immediately after this call. So, any other comments, please, for this call? I don't see any. So, can I thank you again for your support of the statement. We'll be going to the CWG tomorrow. And will be included in the proposal, subject obviously to those edits we have discussed, being included.

Thank you all very much for participating, and I'll be writing to you with the next call. Good luck in Buenos Aires and thank you very much. A great call. Much appreciate it. Thanks, bye-bye. The call ended at 22:00 hours British Time, 21:00 hours UTC. Thank you.

END