

ICANN

**Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine
August 18, 2015
1:00 pm CT**

Coordinator: The recordings are started.

Paul Kane: Thank you very much. So we'll start the meeting. This is the Service Level Expectation Group taking place at 1600 hours UTC on the 17th of August, 2015. For those that are not familiar with using the Adobe room if you see at the top there there is a little hand - a little man with a hand up, just click on that and I will see that you would like the floor.

If you are on the telephone please speak now - and not in the Adobe room - please speak now so you can be recorded as attending. Thank you. So the list of attendees will - sorry, Adam, yeah, Adam, you're listed. So Adam Smith is just joining us bearing in mind he's been working on the subgroup. The list of attendees is as per those shown in the session.

So first of all thank you all very much for joining this call. To update the members of the design team, now called working group, there have been 12 meetings of the subgroup since the 21st of May. The subgroup has been comprised of Kim Davies from ICANN IANA, who is IANA staff, Bernie Turcotte, who is ICANN staff and has facilitated the meetings and very

grateful to Bernie, and Adam Smith from my company who is specialist in service level agreements but not in the workings of IANA.

And that has actually worked to the strength, I think, of the subgroup in that Adam has come with the strength associated with service levels and Kim has come with the knowledge of how IANA works. And the two parties I think have worked fairly well together. There have been over 20 revisions of the document, service level expectations documents, since March 2015.

There have been three flow chart revisions, the latest one came out - came out about three weeks ago or thereabouts. And the document currently stands, depending on your print size, but between - well my version is 17 but in some versions it comes to 20 - 24 pages.

So I'm pleased to say that I think the document is nearing completion. Kim very kindly prepared an Excel spreadsheet of issues that we would really like input from the working group on just as more wrap up to make sure that we have covered everything. And on the screen is a copy of the spreadsheet that was prepared which Adam has given his comments to. So Kim very kindly prepared the Excel spreadsheet identifying potential issues. And Adam has commented on those issues to bring everyone up to speed.

So there's a background. I've prepared a rough agenda. And I don't know - which was emailed to the whole group. I don't know if anyone wishes to make amendments to the agenda. And if you do please speak now or raise your hand now. Thanks.

Bernie Turcotte: Paul, I see Elaine has her hand.

Paul Kane: Sorry. Thank you. Elaine.

Elaine Pruis: Thanks. I was just going to ask if you could zoom in on the document, it's really difficult to read in the Adobe.

Paul Kane: Grace, could we zoom in?

Grace Abuhamad: Yes, I actually - I've unsynced the document so that you can zoom in. At the bottom of your screen there should be some controls. You can...

Elaine Pruis: Perfect.

((Crosstalk))

Grace Abuhamad: You're welcome. And that way everyone (unintelligible).

Paul Kane: Brilliant. Thank you very much, Grace. Much appreciated. So any other comments before we adopt the agenda? I don't see any. So the agenda as circulated will be the rough framework that we will attend to.

So if I may, what I would suggest we do is just go through just for efficiency we go through the Excel spreadsheet item by item. Some are very minor, in my opinion, but some may need clarification from the various parties just so that we as working group members are aware of what's happening.

I am not privy to any of the private discussions that Kim and Adam have had nor have I really been having any discussions with Adam. So I also will be learning. I did participate on the call last Friday but I have to say my connection was very bad so I wasn't really able to follow nor really add very much.

So, Kim, if you would like to just issue or comment on effectively Issue Number 1, I don't think it's a particularly contentious issue. And we'll get some input from members on that. So I see both Kim Davies and Bernie so Kim first please.

Kim Davies: Paul, in your draft agenda you suggested doing a high level review of the Word document first. I think that might be a good idea just to get a sense of how the document is structured before we tackle the Excel spreadsheet.

Paul Kane: Okay good, fine. And, Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: That was going to be my point also.

Paul Kane: Perfect. Excellent. So let's do that then. Apologies. Thank you very much for picking me upon that. I just have to find my copy. But go ahead, Kim.

Kim Davies: Thanks, Paul. So the document itself - the Word document, I'll just walk through the high level categories and just sort of give a sense of how it's intended to be structured. Firstly is this background section. This is quite simple. We haven't edited the text. It needs to be updated. It's the first issue on the Excel spreadsheet that we'll get to a moment. But obviously that will contain whatever background material is necessary to interpret the document.

The next section is principles. These principles are identical to those that were already approved by the DTA working group so it's literally a cut and paste of those seven overarching principles that guided how this document (unintelligible). I think notably the principle that measures to the attributed - so who is responsible for the time just means that IANA staff is distinguished from customer time, for example.

Another example is that SLAs should be reviewed periodically and adapted based on revised expectations of the community, that measures should be clearly defined and so on. It's all there. The next section is assumption that I think this is the first really key section of the document.

Here a lot of the base assumptions that help define the SLA are explained. So for example, it explains how the (unintelligible) process has been simplified so a number of key steps. The actual root zone process that has been identified in the flow charts that ICANN provided some months back have a lot more steps in it but for the purposes of defining the SLEs a lot of these could be simplified through some key steps which is illustrated and laid out in the flow charts.

It also explains areas for automation that sort of (unintelligible) the discussion regarding SLEs. It states the assumptions that NTIA's role will disappear. There was some conjecture early on that NTIA's role might be replaced by some other third party. But the current proposals as they stand suggest that NTIA's role in terms of the root zone management process will simply disappear. So that assumption has gone into the design of this as well. Obviously if some other party was involved that that pilot would need to be rethought.

Another assumption that's in there is that IANA is expected to operate 24/7 in the context of their systems being available. And so on and so on. I don't need to explain them all. I think another key assumption though is Assumption H which is dividing the categories of root zone changes into sort of five key categories first one being Category 1, routine updates that impact the root zone file; Category 2, routine updates that do not impact the root zone file.

The distinction between these two categories is relatively simple. The first one involves VeriSign and the second one does not. Once VeriSign is involved the timeline for processing is materially different so we want to capture that difference in terms of our reporting.

Categories 3 and 4 are for delegating and redelegating gTLDs and ccTLDs respectively. The processing efforts by IANA for a ccTLD is very different from that of a gTLD so we wanted to capture that distinction in terms of our reporting.

And then finally there's Category 5 which is essentially all other requests. And some examples are provided as to the kinds of requests that would fall into this category. And it's relatively few but they are notable. For example, if the customer has placed special instructions on file that we need to do some kind of extraordinary manual processing. Obviously we're not in a position to be able to automate that so that is a special situation.

Another situation is changes to the root servers. That's a very rare change, it happens once every few years. So it's not something that we've automated or intend to automate. But the examples of those types of changes requests are provided in the document.

Lastly let's touch on Assumption I which is sort of I believe is the core of document. This matrix is those five categories I just described, again, those high level process steps on the left hand side of the table. And shows where they're applicable. So this should help inform both reporting and also potentially where SLAs may be set later in this process.

The next area - section of the document is the service level expectation section. Firstly there's a service definition. Essentially we've boiled down to

where these SLEs apply to three services that IANA provides the service being root zone management system, this is a system we use to automate root zone management. Second is the IANA Website, this is where we publish a lot of our materials, where we publish our documentation and so on. And this is important in terms of up time.

And the third service area is that general inquiry service. This is where IANA is responsive to any ad hoc queries we may have received to change the root zone management. And that's included because there is an SLE in terms of our responsiveness to such inquiries.

In terms of the next table is reporting mechanisms which explains how are we going to publish and report on whatever we measure. And, you know, most of this we actually already do but highlighted in green in some new things that we've been asked to do, essentially a dashboard showing visual performance indicators. We currently have some form of a dashboard but it would be more timely in the new configuration.

We already have an SLE report, we already have incident reports and so on. But the structure and format of those would be adapted obviously to the new measures that are in green.

The next table is informational measurement and reporting. This sort of drills down into what are the actual measures that would be in these reports, things like measuring total time of change requests, volume of change requests, how many requests are successful, (IDA4) is time for (unintelligible), this is essentially did the IANA processing time for a ticket take. How long did the other time it take in terms of processing change requests.

Section B of that table is the different process steps that were explained earlier in terms of how long it takes to (text) checks, how long it would take for IANA to do its processing, how long for third party review if necessary and so on. And these are the - sort of the key processing steps that we've identified that should be measures.

So it's important to note that the sum of these process steps will cover 100% of IANA's processing time. There's no processing by IANA that is not covered by one of these steps.

Section C is accuracy, essentially an obligation that any incorrectly implemented request must result in an incident report. And then Section D is the availability of our services, so the up time of the root zone management systems, up time of our Website, and so on.

There's also metrics in terms of how quickly you can recover (unintelligible) of the system. And the very last section in the table is processing time for those ad hoc inquiries so if we received a question what's our mean time to respond to those kind of ad hoc inquiries.

The next table, process performance, is a matrixing of two earlier tables. So there's nothing actually theoretically new in this table. It's taking those categories, it's taking those individual measures and multiplying them out into areas that might be potential SLEs in the future.

Now this table, as it stands in the document, is out of date. This is acknowledged in the Excel spreadsheet. There's been some changes to the earlier tables. Once those earlier tables are agreed upon by this working group we can re-matrix this process performance table to make sure it's accurate.

The last table of the document - sorry, second to last is accuracy. Essentially the expectation is 100% accuracy and any deviation from that results in an incident report as we mentioned earlier. And then the final table is online service availability and inquiry processing. Now there's two tables here, and there's some discussion to be had about exactly what measures should be in here, you know, still an ongoing discussion that we can talk about against the spreadsheet.

But the resolve here at a high level is to measure availability of those systems I mentioned earlier as part to do credential recovery and so on. So that's just a high level run-through real quick, structure of the document and how it's configured. I hope that that's useful. But I suspect want to give Adam an opportunity to add anything additional I might have missed.

Paul Kane: Thank you, Kim. That was very comprehensive and much appreciated. Adam, do you have anything to add please?

Adam Smith: I just have one comment on the structure and Kim's talked about it. I won't be too long. So the way this was structured was as the process flow. So the most important part was to get the process. And understanding that IANA has multiple variations in their process, it was trying to simplify the process.

And so the whole background on this is once you establish the process which is controlled - the steps that are controlled by IANA, the table above kind of intersects between the steps and the - how you categorize the process. And that each intersection point when you go down to the process chart those will be the SLEs that will be measured subsequently in the next step.

So logically trying just to map out going from here's what the process steps, here's what the process looks like, here is the particular steps that IANA is

responsible for and then here's the next step as we take the measurement of their existing performance and then doing the statistics on it and then you develop the SLE going out in the future for the accountability.

Paul Kane: So thank you, Adam. First well let me say to both of you, and Bernie of course, well done and thank you very much for working so hard over the past few months to bring us this document. It's a very comprehensive document and I think that the discussion that is going to follow is really just trying to home in on the minutiae of making sure that the reporting is, you know, specific to our needs as it were. So thank you both very much.

If we may open the floor for any questions from the working group members on the Word document before we move on to the Excel spreadsheet, we will have an opportunity at the end of the call just to refer back to the Word document. But at this juncture any comments on the Word document, anything missed out, anything should be covered or amplified. Okay, at this juncture I don't see any hands.

So if we may move to the Excel spreadsheet please, if we can put that on the screen. And here again if, Kim, you would kindly introduce the topic and then, Adam, if you would explain any concerns that you have or anything that you would like from the working group. And then we have a discussion - effectively issue by issue but looking at the Excel spreadsheet I think there are only a couple where specific guidance is needed.

So the Excel spreadsheet is on the screen. You have control so you can zoom in, you can scroll down as you wish through the document. So, Kim, if I can invite you just to run through Issue Number 1 please?

Kim Davies: Thanks, Paul. So Issue Number 1 is relatively straightforward. So that background section is the original text from four or five months ago and has been unaltered. It needs to be updated to be an appropriate introduction to the document.

Adam and I started on it briefly and we sort of ran into political level disagreements, let's say, and we both agreed that, you know, it's probably outside of our mandate to provide that background to begin with.

So I think both of us can provide our personally-suggested text to the group if that's useful. But I suspect the group will want to edit that section and come up with a suitable background statement.

Paul Kane: Thank you. I have to say it's - as a background document, as a background page or section, I don't think it's particularly important. We as a working group are happy to take that onboard. Yes we would welcome your comments, both Kim and Adam, but that is very much something that we as the working group could draft. So that's one - is down to us, I think we'll be happy to take that on.

Item 2 then, Kim, please.

Kim Davies: Yes, so this one was simply that I've updated Assumption C to alter the wording to better match with the flow chart as it stands today. It was originally more aligned to the previous version of the flow chart. So the proposed new wording is what's in the document you've seen. It actually - added NTIA in there even though it's going away because this is talking about the current process. We acknowledge later in the assumptions that that part will actually disappear.

So from my perspective I believe the text, as it stands now, is okay. Adam has made the comment that he agreed but we should confirm with the DTA that this is appropriate.

Paul Kane: Thanks, Kim. So, Adam, I just see your comments here. Do you have any issues on Item 2? It just seems that there needs to be some synchronization between the new flow chart - process flow chart - and the wording in the document. Have I missed that?

Adam Smith: Yeah, so, you know, Paul, looking at the - my concern has more been on the process and what I've said long is, you know, anything prior to the process that's really the DTA's group. And, you know, you're going to drive the process as, you know, as to how to adjust that. So on the first three I'm in full agreement, I mean, you know, that's essentially a DTA process.

Paul Kane: Okay so just looking at Item 2 it seems that...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Kane: ...at Item 2 it seems that the document is a little out of sync with the language of the flow chart. So the flow chart is the latest, we just need to make sure the language matches up. And, Kim, are you offering to do that?

Kim Davies: Actually, Paul, what I'm saying is I think it is now matched up. My redline...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Kane: Oh it is, okay.

Kim Davies: ...should be matching them up but someone should verify that assumption.

Paul Kane: Okay good.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Kane: So, Adam, if you could check that or any member of the working group to make sure that you are happy with the revised wording. I do have a question and that was one of the items - and I tried to raise it on Friday but my - it broke down.

On - well Page 11 of my document is Technical Check 2. That has been deleted which is the IANA reviewing process. Why has - have you removed the technical check but it is still in the flow chart? I would have thought it best to keep it on because if there is a problem at Stage 5, the technical check process, where you check it just before handing it over to VeriSign, why have you removed that from the matrix document?

Kim Davies: Thanks, Paul. It's not removed insomuch as it's consolidated. The simple fact is that in this performance of the root zone process there'll be a minimum of two technical checks but there can be many more because someone who's failed a technical check will get retested. So in both of those stands there could be one or more steps of technical checks performed.

So my argument is it's more faithful to holding IANA to account to time - every time we do the technical checks from beginning to end of that test run. So the way it's represented in the table it's been reformulated to now the section called Technical Checks, and there's two measures. One is time to return results for technical checks following a submission of a request by automated submission interface.

Now this is designed to reflect the normal use case where you're going to pass them with flying colors on the first run. So your measure that you probably care about more than anything is that, you know, I submitted my perfect change request, it's going to pass. How long does it take for IANA to confirm that it passes and move on to the next step? So that's what that's measuring.

The next measure is time to return results for subsequent performance of technical checks, e.g. for those retested earlier due to earlier failed test or supplemental tech checks performed later in processing. Now this measure might happen one, two, 10, 15 times during a change request.

So the way it's formulated is let's say, you know, worst case scenario, it happens 50 times in a change request. It would get measured 50 different times and so there'll be 50 measuring points so all the 50 times we did it in the - in an individual change request. And so they would be averaged out in the context of our SLA.

Does that make sense?

Paul Kane: It does but I'm also just trying to balance off what you've just said and what Elise has written very kindly in the chat. So it's basically I'm looking at Item D, verify the change request meets policy and procedural - my text is one - policy and procedural requirements. So could it be that someone applies for a change, it passes the initial technical checks in Item 2, goes all the way through the process and then subsequently fails it at Stage 5?

Kim Davies: It is possible and that's in fact why we do it. I'm not sure that that scenario impacts like the SLAs in a material way. But perhaps just a step back - one step and explain why we do it twice. We started doing it twice because we had

very long held root zone changes, for example, a redelegation request. It might sit in processing for many months.

So we do the technical check up front on Day 1, it passes. Three months later when it goes to the implementation configurations might have changed, problems might have arisen. And so that's why we do the retest. Now there's nothing in the policy that says we need to do that. That was sort of our - a practical process decision we made to try and capture issues that might have happened in the intervening period.

Now to be blunt, we're having dialogue internally about whether to eliminate that second check particularly in cases where, you know, now with automation and fairly rapid processing and change requests, you know, most change requests will get from the first technical check to the second one in less than a day so does it even make sense at all to do that second technical check?

So that might be a modification to the future process flow in terms of further optimizing that we only do a supplemental technical check in those rare cases where processing has been - taken a long period of time. So that's why we do it.

In my mind, you know, whether we do the technical check once, twice, more than twice, as I mentioned earlier, what does the customer care about? The customer cares that how long does IANA take to do that processing and give me a result? So that's the way the technical checks are framed.

The technical checks, in terms of the original one and the supplemental ones, are performed identically. There's no core difference between the way they're done so there's no, you know, I'm not sure that there is a tangible distinction

there to be teased out between ones that are done at the beginning and the ones that are done at the end. It's the exact same set of tests, they're performed in an identical fashion.

In my mind, they're two runs of the same test. So in my mind they're two measures of the same process. But I'm happy to hear opinions on that.

Paul Kane: I have to say if, for example, you're going to drop that at a later stage, I think fine, drop the recording of the time taken. But if you're doing it I think possibly you should keep it. But anyway let's open the floor. So, Adam, please your comments.

Adam Smith: So, Paul, I guess I'm going to come to this from a process standpoint and then I actually have another - two questions. One, comment and then one question. From a process standpoint if you have, in this situation, you have two distinct other processes in between the two technical checks and as Kim has just stated there is the potential that you could have a failure on your second technical check and a pass on your first technical check.

So they should be treated as two individual processes and they should be recorded. And quite frankly, the argument with it all being automated there should be no issue in that. Now the other thing that Kim was addressing talking about that, you know, you're going through multiple checks, we're actually going to address that a little bit later down in the next couple steps or in the next couple line items in his - in the spreadsheet itself.

But where I'm coming from is there is two distinct processes because although they may follow the same - they may follow the same process in doing the same type of technical check, you've introduced two different

variables in between that. So that's - I'm looking at it from a process standpoint.

I just noticed something from the graph, and I just compared it. And if you don't mind, shouldn't there be a technical check that's done by VeriSign as well?

Kim Davies: There is but we have no insight into it. I mean, we measure the VeriSign time in a separate category but we don't - we don't drill down into the specifics of VeriSign time because frankly it's not under our control.

Paul Kane: Yeah, I think that's a valid point, Adam, in that we're only doing this SLE for IANA-related services. What happens at VeriSign or any other (unintelligible) contractor is outside of IANA's control. It's still useful to know start to end time but having granularity within a third party organization is ICANN IANA can't deliver that to us.

Can I - I see there are...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Kane: Yeah.

Adam Smith: I'm sorry, I was just going to add I understand that point. I was actually - it was more of that if there's going to be measures of the start to end time and how much time is going to be spent and if there's going to be time stamps that should be addressed in the process as well. But I just - just out of curiosity I just...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Kane: I'll make a note but let's park that for now. Let's park that and move on.
(Patricio), please and then Elise.

Patricio Poblete: Okay, I was unmuting my microphone. Can you hear me?

Paul Kane: Yes we can, thanks.

Patricio Poblete: Can you hear me? Thank you. Trying to understand what's being proposed here in Line Number 7 in the Excel file where it talks about merging technicals 1 and 2. So I understand it this it is not that all that time that could happen, as Kim was saying, a number of times during the processing of a single change, it's not being proposed that all that time should be added up into one big total but that each time that it happens it should be measured and used to compute the average time or to see if there are deviations from the accepted thresholds, right?

So perhaps merging is not the right word but we are saying - we're not going to make a distinction whether it's the first technical check or a subsequent technical check. I'm - am I understanding it correctly?

Kim Davies: I believe so.

Patricio Poblete: Okay. Now if that is so I think it makes sense to me at least, but we should understand that this breaks perhaps another assumption and one that might be implicit and that is that the total time for the whole change - total IANA time for the whole change is the sum of each - of the time spent in each individual step.

I think that's going to be except that if a technical change needs to be repeated 15 times and we measure each time but use it only to compute the average then perhaps it will not be easy to compute the total time from the individual steps because we are missing that information that this happens 15 times.

So if we want to know how this took as a whole, perhaps that should be an independent variable to be measured. Myself, I tend to feel confident with knowing and agreeing that no IANA time goes unmeasured, that there is no time that we feel we won't measure that because that leaves room for that to become larger in the future and perhaps - and create a distortion.

But if there is no IANA time that goes unaccounted for I think that would be a reasonable principle to follow. That's it.

Paul Kane: Thank you, (Patricio). Good points. Elise please.

Elise Gerich: Hi. And I was just going back to the conversation about the steps in the process. And I think (Patricio) has also spoken to that that it all should be measured. But I also wanted to say I think in the Word document it looks like, C, which is what we're discussing, is for purposes of designing the SLEs, the service level expectations. And if we go back to the overall principles one of the ones is that, you know, there should be a distinction between what's measured and collected versus what's considered a critical metric for an SLE.

So for purposes of just simplifying the description of the process, this is what the critical steps you want measured versus all the steps in the process. Does that make sense what I'm trying to say if we go back to the original principles?

Paul Kane: Yes it does. I think the point between the principles and what we're now discussing is there are certain elements that are nice to know and there are certain elements that are essential. I mean, (Patricio)'s point is if something goes around 15 times it would be good to know.

But the reality is unless we know it's been around a few times it looks as if some inefficiencies have crept in. So I think your point is well made, Elise. What is essential for delivering the service needs to be highlighted but also where - or how many times - how long it was a registry took to respond, which is my thing.

If a registry is inefficient in responding then IANA should not be taking a hit because the registry hasn't responded efficiently. So I think we should record that but that's not part of IANA's SLE although it's interesting to know.

So let's just go back because I think actually as (Patricio) has highlighted, it looks as if Number 1 and my unfortunate intervention, for Number 2, are somewhat related. So if we can conclude or deal with these two issues at the same time, I'm forming the view that it would - just as (Patricio) said, no IANA time should be unaccounted for.

And building on what Kim said, which is that technical check in Number 5 may be dropped. I would suggest until such time as it is dropped it is accounted for a separate processing step, which it appears to be, and forms part of the technical checks done. But technical checks should be completed within a specific time. So we account for it as a separate line item but I have no problem aggregating the total time doing technical checks.

Is that a suitable compromise?

Kim Davies: I'm not sure how they're - through a not in conflict with one another, Paul. Maybe I'm misunderstanding.

Paul Kane: So I'm suggesting that Item 5 is recorded as a separate entity - separate time stamp so that every process within the IANA scheme has its own time. But - and so that's helpful. But the time stamps in total for the technical checks could have an SLE associated with them so there's an obligation on IANA to perform the SLE - to perform the technical checks within a prescribed time.

I thought that might be compromise. It's better to keep it as a separate line item than to keep it as a separate line item.

Kim Davies: If I may? My counterpoint would be that particularly if the SLE is the same does the community really care that, for example, on average the first round of technical checks takes 3.8 minutes and the second round take 3.9 minutes? Is this - is this a distinction worth keeping? It's not that we can't do it, I'm trying to find the balance between complexity of instrumenting it versus what's a reasonable set of measures that won't overwhelm the community...

Paul Kane: I've got it.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Kane: Let's - Elaine any comments please? Elaine.

Elaine Pruis: Yeah thanks. So the reason that I would want to include is considering the expectation part of it. So if I'm tracking a change and I see the service level expectations this much time and then I'm looking at how this process is flowing it indicates to me that there's (unintelligible) taking longer than that.

So apart from what, k how IANA is performing the information is useful to me in knowing what I can expect for how IANA should be performing or if there's a problem surfacing or not. So that's the reason for including it.

Paul Kane: Thank you, Elaine. So if I may - if you're happy, Kim, to include 5 as a separate line item for as long as 5 exists, I appreciate it may - it may be dropped soon, I don't know, but if you're happy to do that I apologize for the - the additional line item that's going in the SLE but I think it would be helpful to have each process time stamped.

Kim Davies: Happy to...

((Crosstalk))

Kim Davies: ...we can do it.

Paul Kane: Live with it. Live with it, exactly. Oka good. So let's - so that is effective Number 2. And I apologize for raising it at this point but I didn't see it coming up at Number 7. That's 2 and 7 dealt with.

Number 3, Kim, could you just run through Number 3 because it addresses or it might address - and, Elaine, if you would like to comment, this is designed to address the point you raised on list a week or so ago.

Kim Davies: Yeah, relatively simple, a new measurement was added to the table that we (unintelligible) of change request into (unintelligible) by ICANN staff on behalf of requests sent by email. So the notion here is that when we get a change request via email basically it has one up front step in advance of the others which is that staff has to read the email, they log into (IZMS) themselves and they key it in on behalf of the customer.

So this is measuring that time. And I think it's responsive to Elaine's comment a week or two ago in terms of capturing that processing time.

Paul Kane: Thank you. And, Elaine, would you like to respond please?

Elaine Pruis: Yeah, I think that's sufficient. It addresses my concern where a change request could possibly come from outside of the portal. So I'm happy with (unintelligible).

Paul Kane: Thank you, Elaine. Thank you, also, Kim, for the language. So can we move to Item 4 please if you would like to introduce, it Kim? And I see Adam has got a question so we'll do Item 4 please.

Adam Smith: No, I don't have a question, Paul.

Paul Kane: Okay thanks, Adam.

Adam Smith: Oh never mind, never mind. Go ahead.

Paul Kane: Kim.

Kim Davies: Yes. So this issue was that I had realigned some of the tables to match with the other tables. And then also a new addition that I put in, so some cases the process and the processing step always applies, for example, the time taken to do a technical test always applies to changes that have technical components to them. So a change to the root zone file is always technical so we will always do a change request in that instance.

But, for example, a redelegation may not involve changing any of the name servers so in that case we won't have to do any technical test. So I thought it would be more explanatory to symbolize in the table which cases there were where a measure applies but also which cases a measure applies and in some instances but not all depending on the type of change request that it is. So that's one addition.

The other addition is that in the next to last version of this document we've actually left Column 5 empty. Essentially to recognize that, you know, the assumption is that there'll probably be no SLEs that apply to Category 5. However, I mean, in my view some of the steps do apply to Category 5.

For example, you know, the Category 5 change does involve technical changes, I mean, just riffing off our last discussion. If ICANN does technical checks even for one of these extraordinary change requests, I mean, that should be measured. So we would report on, you know, the average time to do a technical test for one of these kinds of changes.

Now whether there's an SLE on that is another question. But I've added matrixing to Category 5 just to - where I thought the step was applicable in the Category 5 instance. So that's really in a nutshell what Issue Number 4 was about to reflect that those changes had been made.

Paul Kane: So this is basically for the outliers, those changes that are deviating from the norm, is that correct?

Kim Davies: That's a very good way to put it. Yeah, Category 5 is outliers. And not outliers in a statistical sense but non-routine essentially non-automatable requests that we have to do from time to time.

Paul Kane: Okay so just to - for me to understand it is - those that are non-routine what you're proposing is effectively to document the reasons why they're non routine but still capture how long it takes to fulfill the IANA process but they would fall outside of the SLE, is that correct?

Kim Davies: Yeah, I think that's a fair assessment. I mean, let me give you two quick scenarios just to give you a sense of it. I mean, one non routine scenario that we put in the document is a lawsuit. So there's a lawsuit (unintelligible) from doing something, it might just sit there for a very long period of time. Obviously in that situation we have no control over that therefore SLEs should not apply.

But I was still doing the processing so the processing should be tracked and reported. The second scenario is when we change a root server. Let's say, you know, a.rootserver.net needs to be updated. That is a highly irregular change, it's not a normal business process. So in that case almost none of it would apply.

So these are the kinds of scenarios where very rare, very irregular - but we do do them so we should measure as much as possible, report on that but probably not have SLEs associated with them.

Paul Kane: I have to say, I'm fully on page. So, Adam, do you have any comments on that one please?

Adam Smith: No, I mean, you know, my original comments, I mean, through the process was that you are going to have outliers and if they are outliers they don't necessarily meet the SLE process. And it actually does relate back to the statistics because when I had done the data there were outliers that didn't make sense.

And I understand and I believe that there's sometimes those particular outliers should fall in its own category. So the way the document is currently set up is there are certain criteria that need to be met for them to be a outlier if the criteria is met that they're an outlier then they should fall in - I'll simply call them buckets, fall into its own bucket, which is Category 5.

Now one of the things that I would suggest is that if it does fall into that category and, Paul, you said it already, is that it needs to be documented and that documentation needs to be presented as why did that particular outlier fall in this bucket. And wherever IANA, you know, if there's the monthly reviews or whatever the case is then those particular requests that fall in that particular bucket just needs to be documented and presented that these ones we did not include in the SLE process.

So you're just making the whole process whole and clean and you don't have anyone that, you know, can particularly fall out of the process.

Paul Kane: I think Kim is actually proposing that as well so I think there's almost full agreement. But, Jeff, your hand is up, please.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yeah, thank you. So just a quick question, maybe a clarification because I might have missed this. So completely understand of these, you know, the non-routine change requests but are we saying that the whole end to end request is not being measured or the discrete process is within the change request that are still being measured that might be fall under a different category will be measured but maybe not the whole end to end?

Because I wouldn't want to throw out the measurement of, you know, of something that was within the larger non routine request that could normally

be measured just because it falls within this non routine measure. Hopefully that makes sense. If not, I'll clarify that further. But I think hopefully you understand the question I'm getting at.

Paul Kane: Kim, would you just like to answer please?

Kim Davies: So my assumption is measured yes. Reported, yes. But is there like a binding SLA or a breach if we don't meet a time commitment? Probably not. Because they're unpredictable, they can't be - you know, they're by definition changes that can't be accommodated by the normal workflow.

Jeff Eckhaus: Right, no I completely understand that but if something has to be done where there's a need for a special, you know, a special authorization or something else that you're still measuring once you receive that, you know, what the normal process is if it's being done versus saying hey because this falls under Category 5 where, you know, sort of putting it into its own bucket and not measuring anything within it.

Kim Davies: No, we would still measure all change requests...

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay.

Kim Davies: ...against the matrix all those steps.

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay thanks. That makes...

((Crosstalk))

Kim Davies: ...on those columns.

Jeff Eckhaus: Got it, okay no, thank you.

Paul Kane: So thank you, Jeff. So just to summarize I think with this one, as Kim said it exceptionally articulately, measured yes, reported, yes but also the reason why it was determined to be an outlier. One of Adam's things was possibly to define today the conditions where something falls into Category 5. That's probably pretty tricky. And so I would propose to leave the flexibility with the IANA to determine what they consider to be an outlier but to at least to document and report why they considered it. Because I don't know how many outliers they get.

But if that's acceptable to the group we can basically move on with those revised modus operandi for Item 4. Kim, are you happy with that or can you live with that? I won't use "happy" again.

Kim Davies: I think the only caveat I would throw out is there's probably a little bit of consideration about confidentiality aspect. Given that they're rare and if we were very explicit about why they're Category 5 in some cases it might have a negative impact on the TLD concern. But don't have a solution for you right now but I think how it gets reported in terms of the taxonomy or categorization of those circumstances need some thought.

Paul Kane: So just picking the discussion in the chat, Jeff and Elaine are basically saying they would like to know what is an outlier. So what do you think about having a definition of an outlier in advance? Is that possible? Or is it - I mean, how do you handle an outlier? Do we want to define an outlier?

Kim Davies: Well, as a starting point we actually have a definition in this very document so that would be a starting point.

((Crosstalk))

Kim Davies: Now I think Elaine made the comment via email before about she wants to know if her own request is an outlier. And I think that's something we can look into accommodating that when you log into the status of your request you can see is it a Category 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5.

And to Jeff's point, yes, the categorizations might change throughout the life of the ticket because staff will assess a change request and what might be a Category 1 or a Category 2 on analysis might become Category 3 or Category 4.

A ticket will almost never be Category 5 as submission, it only become Category 5 through a turn of events during the life of a request. There might be some situations that's not coming to mind off the top of my head where something that was originally categorized as Category 5 might revert to another category. So, yes, it might shift around. Does that help?

Paul Kane: Yeah, that's - I think everyone seems happy with that. I'm just actually reading Bernie's comment. We were scheduled for one hour. Are members of the working group happy to continue? And ICANN and IANA staff, are you happy to continue? I would say we'd be another half an hour. Any objection just raise your hand. Okay so let's continue for a further 30 minutes. So that deals with Number 4. Number 5 please. Kim, over to you. I think it's the same, just document any changes but...

((Crosstalk))

Kim Davies: Yeah I think I already covered that in the discussion.

Paul Kane: Yeah. I think it's the same. Any deviations please document. Okay so we are now going to Number 6. Kim, over to you.

Kim Davies: So I think 6 we might have already tackled when talking about Number 7 and Number 2 which is that this whole notion that the technical check might be reperformed multiple times because the whole nature of it is that a customer fails, they get notified hey you're not passing this test. They presumably go do something to fix it. They retest and they might do that in a loop multiple times before they get to the final solution.

So for that reason it shouldn't be cumulative which I think is how it was originally specified. But each individual run of the test should be its own SLA measuring point. So that's really what Number 6 was about.

Paul Kane: Yeah, and Number 6 I see Adam's comments. He's also agreeing with your suggestion. Seven we have dealt with. Number 8 please.

Kim Davies: So there was some measuring points in the document namely time for authorization contact be notified to approve change requests and time for response to be affirmed by IANA. As I mentioned in my comments it wasn't entirely clear to me what these measure or how they - how advantageous to measure them because there is effectively instantaneous decision points.

So Adam and I, I think, had a discussion about this and we didn't really come - see eye to eye. I don't know if we're just not understanding the issue in a common way or what have you. But, you know, my take is the way they were

drafted I didn't see what was there to be measured in a nutshell. So perhaps I can ask Adam to explain it a little more.

Paul Kane: Please.

Adam Smith: So I think first the Box 3 or the Process 3. And these are two measurement times within Kim's graph - Kim's flow chart. And the first one is - I mean, the first are exactly as Kim has said, the first one is - one second. I have to read it because I have to zoom in because I don't have my glasses, I apologize.

So the first one is the - is effectively the term that's come back is time for the authorization contacts to be notified to prove the (change across).

And I think what Kim is coming back and saying is yes, it's (IANA)'s time but it (occurs) just so quickly that we shouldn't measure it. The second part is essentially going back to the previous question we had, was, are there any certain circumstances you could fit into the (same) loop with sales.

And we retest it and we retest it. And if we follow the same philosophy is what we previously said and we've agreed with (IANA) that once, you know, that process has been rejected, that is actually - and you don't count the retesting in the retesting against (IANA) because the reality is that's not - you know, that's really out of the scope of the process.

And the TLD is now working with (IANA) and to help them adjust the process or to get the answer correct, because that should not be counted against (IANA) and I fully agree. My contention or the - where I'm coming back is, you know, we've set this up - (the step in) the process, it should be measured as a step in the process.

Paul Kane: So let me just try and summarize it if I've understood it correctly. And if I haven't, please correct me. Kim's point is the amount of time involved for this step is very small and (not) fully automated, and therefore, hardly worth monitoring as a separate line item. Your point is, Adam, is because it's a step in the process, it should be monitored irrespective of the time. Is that correct?

Adam Smith: That is correct.

Paul Kane: Okay, so can I just open the floor to members of the working group as to what you think.

Man: (Please).

Paul Kane: (Elaine) is writing. Anyone wish to raise their hands? Do so. Jeff, please, yes.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes, I'm just - if we're left with a (whole) that we're not measuring, doesn't that, in essence, even though the time to take a very short period of time, doesn't that leave the potential for a huge gap, and therefore, you're essentially basically saying it's unlimited?

So there're a lot of quick automated processes that could be measured that have a very, very short period of time. I still believe it should all be measured and reported on no matter how short.

Paul Kane: Thank you, Jeff, and I see (Elaine) has written in, "Measure it. The small amount of time will help the overall average," with a little smiley face, so thank you. Kim please.

Kim Davies: So just one comment to preface that which I think is important to state. There's a separate measure saying time to complete all other validation and reviews by (IANA) functions (operate at).

The assumption is anything - there is no other possibility of something slipping through the net because if it's not already captured by another measurement (point), (if) all other validations, it will accumulate there.

So there's no - I mean, the way it's written in the design is there's no notion that it can be in some kind of non-measured indeterminate state. And I think in terms of implementation, but we probably do is measure everything and then deduct time from other sections that would ultimately in this measure.

That being said, you know, as an implementer, like, yes, I can measure that step. That's not really the issue. The issue is I have to instrument that and add a bunch of complex measurements to something that's probably going to report in the milliseconds.

We have to produce that in reporting. We have to explain it to the community with these numbers mean. This is all a bunch of overhead to something we seem to agree, you know, serves no real purpose. So we're not going to be, you know, this isn't a point of contention. It's not a key measure of (IANA)'s performance, how our automated system manages to, you know, dispatch these queries.

So, you know, it's in the flowchart, I think, to sort of make the flowchart read better because if we let that (box there), it might raise the question, well, how would I contact know how to respond? But it's not there to suggest that it's a key piece of the processing pipeline. I hope that's useful.

Bernie Turcotte: I think it is useful but what happens, for whatever reason, and I understand it should be quick, but what happens if your logs fill up or some - you have an issue where it is not milliseconds? It is more than milliseconds.

Doesn't it help highlight that there could be an issue? I'm fairly (relaxed) on this one, to be candid, but just making that time available and normally it's 5 milliseconds, but it happened to be ten minutes. That's highlighting a possible systemic issue.

Kim Davies: So that's true. I would say that if it stalled for a reason like that, it's going to count against (IANA) (unintelligible) time anyway. But I think if you wanted to go down that path and use it as sort of a system administration tool, there's probably like 50 decision points in the workflow that similarly, by that logic, probably should be instrumented.

So I'm cautious about going down that line of thinking because, you know, we, as the operator, need to monitor and manage our system and track things to make sure we meet your customer SLEs and not define the SLEs as a tool to notice that our (logging) is broken or our (unintelligible).

To me, the question hinges on, is this an important time that, you know, month in and month out we want customers to review, analyze, to decide does this SLE need to be tweaked? You know, is this the basis of discussion for the ongoing dialogue between us and our customers? And my take is, it's not but I might be wrong.

Paul Kane: I'm - I don't - personally, this one I don't mind them much but I would like to really try and bring it to closure. We haven't got a consensus on it and it would like the members of the working group just to say, should it be measured as an independent item or should it be basically put together as part

of the normal (check)? So just hoping people will give guidance because this has been a bit of a sticky point I think. I don't know - okay, so Elise and Jeff, please.

Elise Gerich: I was just going to ask, since this is automated, is in this more of a binary thing than real measurement? As Kim, mentioned, there's a lot of (sys) admin stuff that happens that would identify if this never happens for a system to long.

But what I would think that everyone's really interested in is that really happens. It's a yes or no, and whether it's 5 milliseconds or 6 milliseconds, is less critical so is it really a measurement more that is binary - yes it happens or doesn't happen?

Paul Kane: Thank you, Elise. And Jeff.

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes, I think, you know, my - Kim answered my question on the chat which basically says that the all other time as part of a measurement of another SLE, so to that extent, not as concerned with the component part. So I'm - I don't have strong feelings of keeping this independent.

Paul Kane: Brilliant. So let's wrap that one up, so 18 - sorry, 8 is - it is not in (independent) measuring item. Number nine, please. But I think number nine has been agreed - can you just very briefly do number nine, Kim, and (unintelligible) so just so everyone knows.

Kim Davies: Yes, I think that was an understanding between us. I think (Alan) was asking to measure the time it takes to fix the technical check explained that was customer so that's been re-described so I think the (unintelligible) version of the document is something we both agree.

Paul Kane: Brilliant. Ten is agreed, so we'll skip that one. Eleven - could you just run through eleven please?

Kim Davies: I mean, this is just (part of) will be just alluded to before. I think a common misconception, and you know, obviously that's my bad for the weeds worded - is there some notion that this (IANA) processing, if they're not captured, they don't get reported and, therefore, you know, ICANN can sort of hide its processing in these little nooks of the process.

That's not the intention at all. I mean, the intention is that we measure sort of specific processes that we know customers specifically care about. But beyond that, there is a measure for all other (IANA) (time) and everything else beyond those things are (specifically) measured, accumulate in all that other (IANA) time bucket and, you know, that time, you know, we come to some satisfactory SLA for that as well.

So that's the way I intend it to work. I tried to do a little bit of more wordsmithing there to make that a little more clear. Maybe he needs to be clearer still, but that's the intent.

Paul Kane: Okay, thank you. Jeff, please. I see your hand. Old hand?

Jeff Eckhaus: Yes, old hand. Sorry about that. Thank you.

Paul Kane: No problem. Okay, so Adam, do you want to chip in on number eleven? I think that's a minor binary process, it's automated. It's not a big deal. Carry on.

Adam Smith: Well, no, number eleven, Paul, is if you do put the informational reporting, you know, what going to put it as - what are you going to use as informational reporting? And I think that is going to have to be a decision of the (BTA), is that you're going to be using the real-time reporting, the SLA time, the average?

So you're going to have to have one. I think I have a question. Kim keeps bringing up, we never had an SLA determined of all of the time. So I'm kind of confused as to where that's coming up. And maybe I'd like to table that and - that comment. Could we talk about the cumulative type versus the stuff time?

So maybe it is informational and you'd like to put it is informational but there was no SLA (part) to it. So - but my comment here is, this number eleven, specifically this port to the - the informational reporting, (IANA) would have an informational Web site of here's our performance.

And so it would be a management reporting chart and they would - you know, it's more for a fact transparency. So one of the comments is let's put (in a) - the times up of what the processes have been - are taking.

So this is all great. If you want to put the times up, that's great. But I think what has to be determined by the DPA is what times are going to use up there? Is it going to be real-time? Is it going to be at average time? Is it going to be the SLA time?

So that was my only point is if you're going to do that, you need to be consistent on what you use up there, and then if it can't be decided what time, that we shouldn't have that up there.

Paul Kane: Well, I always assumed it would be the real-time. In other words, how long it did take along with what is defined as a SLA, but what's your view, Kim?

Kim Davies: And not sure I understand the distinction in that we're planning on collecting the same stats for whether it's a dashboard or the reporting or the SLAs, like, these should be aligned and, you know, I think the broader question of how the real-time dashboards get populated I think is beyond this issue and applies to the whole document, frankly. There are lots of ways to do it. I think that's a separate issue but, yes, I...

((Crosstalk))

Kim Davies: ...let's wrap it up. We've only got 15 minutes remaining, so quick (unintelligible).

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, so Kim, the dashboards are only a measurement tool. Your SLAs are what - are going to be based upon what measurements are taken in statistics of your measurement. And they're going to line up between a certain variation - a certain deviation of that, so they are two different things.

Paul Kane: Okay, so Bernie is suggesting we postpone this until tomorrow. I just think we're arguing about minutia to be candid and I would rather - let's see we can get the heavy details stuff and then we can come back either online or if we need another call, let's deal with that than.

But I think there's always an assumption that the real-time be captured. We will define within the SLE the time and I think we're dancing on a pinhead. Quickly moving on to 12, please.

Kim Davies: This is really minor, those - the word API in the documents, and I think that's in the line with conventional usage. So I'll just change the terminology there. I think we're all in agreement that what was intended to be measured here is the availability of the system to (complement) the user and so the wording has been changed to reflect that.

Paul Kane: I do know - API in my world is - I would very much welcome and automated interface so I've really just happens end user to end user all the way through, but that's another debate for another time. Number 13, I think has been agreed unless anyone has any comments. Number 14, any comments on that please? Kim?

Kim Davies: Yes, so at the end of the table, at the end of the document, sorry, there are two tables on (line) - service availability inquiry purchasing. In short, the first table is mine in the second one is Adam's.

A comment is that Adam's table I don't think, you know, reflects current practice. For example, probably most notably, in terms of ad hoc request processing, you're referred to initial and forward response to urgent, high and normal priority requests.

We have noted that triaging of, you know, questions into the urgent, high for normal priority and, therefore, you know, given the mandate of this group is not to introduce new processes. I think that's not something we can measure.

So I've tried to adapt what was in Adam's table and produce the table above it which I think is a distillation of the two things that we actually can measure based on current practices. So I, for example, on those at requests, replaced them with two measurements.

One is time to send acknowledgment of inquiry and time to send initial response to inquiry. So effectively measuring ad hoc query response, that the different I mentioned that doesn't have categorization of priority and so on.

Similarly, to the other ones, I mean they're fairly aligned to what Adam has written but, for example, those measurements for request (database) measurements, but the request database is the (IVM) system. It's not a distinct we different system.

So I don't know how that would be measured. When you're looking at the status of your request, or actually logging into the IVM system itself to check the status of the request in its real-time.

So isn't there latency there? The availability measure is the same as the IVM system itself. So those are the kinds of amendments I made. So I believe that the first table is in the spirit of what the design team wanted to have measured on the map to configuration of that system.

Paul Kane: Okay, thanks, Kim. So, Adam, I think the - I mean, do you have a big concern with this in that all we're trying to do is make sure that if there are changes - or, it's a document - anything that happens is documented to ensure there is a level of transparency. Do have any (unintelligible) 14?

Adam Smith: I don't. At least is those aren't my tables. Those are the original DTA tables in the original document and those were written up by the group.

Paul Kane: Oh, okay.

Adam Smith: Yes, those were put in there, so if the DTA as a group is okay and what Kim is suggesting, that's fine, but just as - you know, out to the DTA, I pulled those tables verbatim from the original DTA document.

Paul Kane: That's fine. So Kim is very kindly updated the tables to allow the working group members to review the tables to make sure that they are as required.

Adam Smith: Right.

Paul Kane: Okay, good. We have 15 - 16 is agreed. I think so - that's good. We have 15. Any notes on 15?

Adam Smith: I do. So this - let me start this one off because this was my issue.

Paul Kane: Okay, go ahead.

Adam Smith: And yes, so the issue that comes up is - and this kind of flows nicely into the previous one about, if you're going to remove a particular - the requirement of measuring a particular step, because this falls into the same category.

So the fundamental issue is, if you just measure the steps, you can have additional (cueing) time or you could just have an issue or you have (cue) jumping.

Inadvertently or (vertently), I - you know, not saying anything that way or the other, I'm just pointing out - placing the process, where you have - the process or how you measure your process should account for your time in between the actual processes themselves because you could add time in between the steps.

And could stay in between steps but you could still meet your SLA. So I'm recommending is that you have an overall time period where (IANA) is required to get - if, you know, it meets all the requirements for categories one through four, which means it'll be automated, that (IANA) has a total time period of getting - starting the process from point A and then ending the process, where not only have to meet the testing between but you have to meet the entire process.

Now this - if you do something like this or if you put accumulative time, that takes into account, and if you want to go back and remove the measurement for step three, because then it will take that account - time - you can build that time in there.

But nowhere in the process did we have an SLE for all other steps combined. So where I'm coming back and saying is - okay, and in the charts themselves, I had started off every process - every process category saying accumulative time from the start until the end.

Paul Kane: Okay, and Kim, you have a problem with that.

Kim Davies: Yes, I mean, I think an area of disagreement is just kind of clear at this point. I mean, I don't believe it's possible based on the fact that we do have and all other processing category. It's in the table right now.

And my assumption is that, you, all the stuff that is measured discreetly, we do so but everything else was into this all other (IANA) processing bucket and there's an SLA on that.

And so my concern was that, you, (IANA)'s being held to account for all these sub-processes and then everything else, but then as an additional SLA

on top of that, which might be consistent with the sum of those, and I didn't see the benefit of having duplicate SLAs over the same period. You know, if...

((Crosstalk))

Kim Davies: Yes.

Paul Kane: So just in our four minutes remaining, and if we need to have another call tomorrow we can, but I think it would be good to hear from those people that are on the call still with respect to this one - 15, because it is - it seems to be this is a theme on which guidance is welcome. (Patricio), please.

Patricio Poblete: Well, if - the first that was - the (discussion) before, if there are steps that maybe we can (see) many times, then the total processing of time, I don't know what we could put for this afternoon SLE because it's - the time (began) sort of (unintelligible) unpredictable.

On the other hand, if there is this principle, either implicit or explicit, that all (IANA) is accounted for, then there should be no room for kind of falls between the cracks and that goes unaccounted, and therefore, there would be no need for this total (IANA) time of independent variables.

Paul Kane: Okay. So effectively, (Patricio) is saying, if every step is measured there's no need for accumulative time. Anyone else have comments, please, in the last two minutes remaining?

This seems to be quite a contentious one because it is going to place a fair workload, I think, on (IANA) just to record such times. Anyone else, please? Kim is just writing in the chat - it's worth noting that (IANA) is required to provide audit data to allow others to calculate things.

So the information is potentially there and we, as a company, have used that information particularly even as part of this process. Any other comments or is everyone exhausted?

Okay, so I don't see comments. I know you'll be happy, Kim, but could you live with the proposal or do we need to take it back to the working group to have more discussion?

Kim Davies: Well, I think, you know, what it is an SLE in the accumulative time, I think that's above my pay grade. I mean I think, conceptually I've explained why I think that it's a double counting and holding (IANA) to two different standards.

You know, but we measure it? Yes. But is a useful and would ICANN commit to having SLEs on this? I think we have to discuss it internally which we haven't done today. But I think it might be a problem.

Paul Kane: Yes. Okay, so let's say no resolution to 15. We will discuss on mailing list with you, Kim, and ICANN staff to see if we can come to closure. Finally, number 16, I think we have agreed to this but I just have it for the benefit of other members.

The intent here is to record - not part of the SLE but just to record, for informational purposes, events in that are outside of ICANN (IANA)'s control, specifically examples - specific examples such as how long it takes a registry contact to authorize a specific change. That has been agreed, hasn't it, with the (IANA), Kim?

Kim Davies: Yes, our assumption is we're going to report all the time in the request, whether it's customer time, (IANA), what have you, so that's all fully transparent. Obviously SLEs would only apply in the subset that is under (IANA)'s control.

Paul Kane: Brilliant. Okay, that's excellent. Okay, so we have 15 that has no resolution. We have eleven that has no resolution. I think they're the same issue but we'll just add them on the mailing list and seek comments from those that have not been party to this late conversation.

And I think everything else is done. So that is excellent. So with that, can I thank you all very much for your time, and I'll see you online. Thank you everyone. Call finished at 20:31 - 19:30 UTC. Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Bernie Turcotte: So Paul, Paul...

Paul Kane: Yes, hi.

Man: So we can during the call tomorrow then?

Paul Kane: Do - I don't think we need the call tomorrow unless - I mean, what does everyone think? Who wants to have a call tomorrow, raise your hand.

Bernie Turcotte: Because in many ways, if we have enough people, maybe we could put 11 and 15 to bed and then be done with it.

Paul Kane: What - tomorrow?

Bernie Turcotte: Yes.

Paul Kane: Let's do it on - keep the options open. I will write an email tonight. I'll see who can come and join the call tomorrow but it's not great for me, but I can make time for sure tomorrow.

Let's see what we can get agreed on the mailing list. I think it's the nub or where there is disagreement. I'm pleased we've had so much agreement on the other issues. But let me send out a mailing list and see if the call tomorrow is needed.

Adam Smith: All right, thank you.

Paul Kane: Thanks for (everything). Bye.

END