ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
August 18, 2015
1:00 pm CT

Woman: Hi. Who's just joined?

Paul Kane: Sorry. It's Paul Kane again. I don't know if you what you caught of my call, my comment.

Woman: No. That's fine Paul. We - you dropped off but we're glad to have you back on the line.

Paul Kane: Okay good.

Bernie Turcotte: We only got the first minute of it. So you might as well start over because we've had most of the people join in since then.

Paul Kane: Okay good excellent. I do apologize. I'm not sitting at my desk and if I drop off Bernie please feel free to carry on but I just thought there were a couple of issues that we just wanted to clarify.

And I'm not sure how best to deal with it. The specific issue is really as Patricio highlighted -- and I appreciate Patricio has been commenting on email -- but we want to know that every registry that submits a request will be processed in the order in which it was received.

So we don't - there's no opportunity for discriminatory practice. And I'm not sure if it's something that needs to be done with respect to having a time in other words all of the requests will be completed within a certain time period or what because I don't really see how that works?

So and the idea is to brainstorm and discuss with ICANN, IANA staff and also registry operators to see what they would like to see to ensure that certain registries don't get fair treatment or unfair treatment so treated differently that's the issue.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay Paul...

Paul Kane: Yes.

Bernie Turcotte: ...are you in the Adobe room?

Paul Kane: No. I am not in the Adobe room. I'm on a cell phone.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. This is what I thought. So if it's okay with you I'll manage the speaking queue for you.

Paul Kane: Please thank you yes.

Bernie Turcotte: All right so we've got Patricio with his hand appeared Patricio.

Patricio Poblete: Can you hear me?

Bernie Turcotte: Very faintly, if you could speak up Patricio?

Patricio Poblete: Can you hear me Bernie? My line was muted.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes I can hear you but faintly.

Patricio Poblete: Oh good. Okay my point was a bit different from what Paul was just saying. I was not concerned about the queue jumping or things of that sort but rather that all of the time that's spent on the IANA side would be accounted for.

                      And I think Kim understood it perfectly. And I agreed with what (Keith)'s proposing to add to the report.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you Patricio. Did you have something else?

Patricio Poblete: No only that.

Bernie Turcotte: All right thank you. I'll insert myself in the queue then to talk about Paul's point, Kim from the example that you gave in the email and could you talk about the possibilities that Paul is talking about?

Kim Davies: I can try. I feel the issue that Paul's raising was touched upon in an email conversation some weeks back. I'm struggling to remember if it was on the list, or privately or what have you.

                      But I guess, you know, I don't believe we have any kind of practices where there's like queue jumping let's say where we prioritize some TLD over another.

But my response at that time was that I'm not sure that it matters in the sense that as long as though the requests are meeting the SLA, you know, how they individually treat it while still adhering to the SLA my initial take is that's what's important right?

That being said I, you know, understand the desire for a mutual treatment and that's certainly what we try to uphold. I'm really not sure how to instrument that in an SLA fashion.

I mean there's separate from the service levels there's obviously escalation procedures and appeals mechanisms all in other parts of the proposal.

But in terms of like, you know, a measuring session I mean you can't make sure that everything comes out the same order that it comes in to test that because every request is processed at a different rate depending on, you know, the type of request, the qualifications, the responsiveness of the customer and so on.

So I can't see a natural way of measuring it in an SLE context that, you know, we process on a first come first serve basis beyond, you know, what we already do having SLAs on what you expect the performances for all customers and having an escalation (unintelligible) identified.

Bernie Turcotte: All right thank you for that Kim. Also before I go to Elise I guess from where I was going with this question was from the - both the example that you gave in the emails of the detailed times you were measuring and the reply you've given to Patricio if there was anything that was overtly obvious for delaying a transaction given what we're proposing for measurements it would pop out in one way or another or am I wrong on that?

Kim Davies: In my view an obvious abuse of that nature would be identifiable. That being said I mean (unintelligible) purchasing on an individual ticket might take a lot longer for a particular request that might be not be obvious to an outside observer why that is.

So, you know, I would think an individual TLD manager would understand why their request is delayed but due to the notion of confidentiality we wouldn't necessarily expose the detailed reasoning to the outside world. I mean that's the only caveat I would put on that.

Bernie Turcotte: All right thank you Kim. Elise? Elise if you're speaking we're not hearing you. Elise we're still not hearing you.

Grace Abuhamad: Elise this is Grace. You may need to connect your microphone. You need to connect the audio or we can dial out to you.

Bernie Turcotte: All right since we're having some trouble with Elise for the moment I'll go to Jeff and then we'll come back to Elise if we can get audio. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks Bernie. I was just going to say what I put in the chat is maybe if we could just put not as an SLE but as an assumption and, you know, add another assumption that will say just what Kim said that we treat requests in a nondiscriminatory fashion and that generally requests are treated on a first come first serve basis. I think again I think that might give people comfort and we wouldn't necessarily need an SLE on it.

Bernie Turcotte: All right thank you Jeff. I see a green tick from (Ellaine) if people like that you can in the little icon that has the hand - man with the hand raised or the

person with the hand raised there's a little arrow to the right. And you can click Agree if you think that's a good idea.

I'm seeing a few green ticks. Yes and I realize Patricio your point was not about queue jumping it was about measuring all the times.

And I was trying to do a link between the two that if we're at measuring all the IANA time it would be difficult to hide if there was preferential treatment to a particular registry operator.

Thank you much. You can untick yourselves. Elise, can we hear you know? I'm not hearing you Elise so we're going to carry on here a bit. Kim did you have a response for Jeff's proposal?

Kim Davies: I mean I think its fine. I mean yes it seems fine to me.

Paul Kane: That's good for me. I have to say that's good.

Bernie Turcotte: All right. So we've got several okays. I'll put the question around would anyone be objecting to resolving the issue brought up by Paul of queue jumping by including this as another principle, so anyone strongly objecting to this?

It doesn't look like it...

Elise Gerich: Hi. This is Elise now can you hear me?

Bernie Turcotte: ...okay so that looks very interesting. Elise you're there. All right I'm just going to finish up this little block here and I'll hand it over to you if that's okay?

Elise Gerich: Yes. So unfortunately you're taking a call or can you still hear me?

Bernie Turcotte: Yes I can. Okay and basically...

Elise Gerich: So I missed what we're voting on.

Bernie Turcotte: There's no vote going on. We're just trying to get a sense of the room. It seems to be fairly strong. What we were discussing is going back to Paul's queue jumping point.

And Jeff Neuman made a suggestion which is in the chat that in the assumption section we include something that says basically that unless there is special circumstances that IANA does first come first serve. Did I get that essentially right Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Two things, yes its absent extraordinary circumstances that IANA will operate in a nondiscriminatory transparent manner. And the second one is to handle requests on a first come first serve basis.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. To which Kim replied he didn't see a big issue with that. So you're - after that we got several okay so we've got several green ticks. And Paul Kane answered he thought this was good.

I asked if there were any violent objections to dealing with this problem this way, there was none. And we are up to you so over to you Elise.

Elise Gerich: Okay. So that wasn't why I raised my hand but I'd like to speak on that. I do have concern about that and making it a principle which I think is the proposal.

And it's primarily because it kind of makes it sound like is done somewhat sequentially and it's not just one person who's doing a queue. And the queues get distributed between different people within the IANA department.

And so yes indeed everything is handled fairly and neutrally as it states in the IANA and the ICANN principles.

So it would be very difficult I could think people would say at some point in time well, you know, I sent this in on Monday but my friend who sent it in on Tuesday already has there's finished so you must've done this first.

We can always go back and demonstrate that it's because they had different issues or they were being handled in a queue where there were more requests ahead of them of the same type or whatever.

And so it seems to me that this would be a very difficult thing to ever demonstrate consistently even though the fairness is being applied because it's not one person taking, you know, number one on the stack and finishing it, taking number two on the stack and finishing it, this is distributed across a department where people are working on these as they are need, you know, come in. Did I make my point?

Bernie Turcotte: I believe so. And we've got Jeff Neuman who's got his hand up. So let's go to Jeff and see what he's got on this. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks Elise. And I completely understand your point. We're not trying to say that it has to be resolved in a first come first serve basis but that you'll basically start responding to issues on a first come first serve basis. It doesn't mean resolved.

And I'm happy if you want to suggest wording that would make that more clear but I would be very reluctant to drop the concept simply because you're afraid that people will interpret it as resolution as opposed to response. So if there's wording suggestions that would be great because I completely understand your point.

Elise Gerich: Okay. Well I'll think of the wording. You're suggesting this in principles correct?

Jeff Neuman: I would put it more in the assumptions but I'm not wedded to it having to be in one section over the other.

Elise Gerich: Yes. The only reason I asked that question is because going back to Patricio's original point to which, you know, Kim had added some text in the assumption area and Patricio has said that met his concerns.

The principles as their stated in the SLE document come directly from the CWG document. And so I guess it seems like we have more flexibility if we're adding it somewhere else in the document.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. And then the assumptions would be fine right?

Elise Gerich: Yes.

Bernie Turcotte: All right so...

Elise Gerich: Yes I agree.

Bernie Turcotte: ...thank you for that. Elise what I'm hearing and seeing here well yes I guess I can say I'm seeing it given I'm watching the Adobe room is that I think there's a requirement to include somewhere something very clear that requests will be processed fairly and no one will be discriminated against.

I think there's some understanding from Jeff who suggested the initial wording about your concerns. But overall from your point of view Elise do you think it would be reasonable to include some text that would give some comfort to those people who are looking for that kind of assurance?

Elise Gerich: Yes. I think that's fair and reasonable. I don't disagree with that. And I'm typing in some potential tweak to Jeff's proposal as he suggested I might.

Bernie Turcotte: Excellent. All right so I think as far as I'm concerned we've gotten this to the point where we'll wait for Elise to give us some words and we can have a look at those. And that would sort of close off that one. Paul what would you like to go to next?

Paul Kane: The main issue that had been brought to my attention so I'd like to open the floor to any other outstanding matter with any member of the working group or IANA would like to bring to our attention for closure.

But I think that closes off all of the outstanding issues that I'm aware of. So the floor is open to anyone.

Jeff Neuman: Bernie this is a new hand sorry. Can I...

Bernie Turcotte: Okay Jeff up to...

Jeff Neuman: Yes. Okay so I just I can't remember what we said about this but there's a couple sections in the service levels that are left kind of blank.

What is the process to fill those in? For example availability of the RDMS and Web site availability what's the process going forward to fill those in?

Bernie Turcotte: All right I think you're talking about the next step. Paul do you want to do that one or do you want me to do that one given your connection? I'm kind of perfectly comfortable with either way.

Paul Kane: If you would like to do it Bernie because we've discussed it so certainly if you do it my connection is bad.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay no problem. The objective here Jeff as far as I understand it and I've discussed with various people is that we settle on what we want to measure. And that's the objective of nailing this down in a document that we're all happy with.

Once that's done that goes to the CWG and we say these are the measures we want. The next thing that's got to happen is that we would like this - these changes to be done prior to the transition.

To do that probably have to go to the NTIA to get approval to change the system. And we're hoping that wouldn't be a big deal if we do in fact have to go there.

If we do have to go there and we get that approval work out the details for getting those changes put into the current system so we can start gathering data.

I believe that when we had been discussing some of this early on and I'm not IANA to this but in the initial discussions once the system was completed, tested and could be put into production IANA would like to gather about three months' worth of data on the various items that we've decided upon.

And then bring in people and say okay where -- ouch that hurt -- where are we going to set the bar for these SLEs? That's my understanding of the process. Is that essentially correct Paul?

Paul Kane: That is correct for the SLE document. But I think the point Jeff was making was at what point, you know, what assurances can we get from ICANN that the Web sites going to be up and the root zone management system will be running.

We're happy to run that in parallel with implementation plan but we need a specific mandate to do that. And I'm not sure if that's CWG or if that's just coming from IANA?

Bernie Turcotte: And I think those are some of the things we have to get to. Kim your hand has been up for a while.

Jeff Neuman: All right Bernie can I just do a quick follow-up? This is Jeff again on this.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes Jeff sorry. I'll put you on hold Kim, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Sorry Kim. Can we write a quick section on next steps so that when we submit this document to the CWG that they know that we thought about the next steps and what we expect of them and of IANA to help guide them because I also want to send this document around to the rest of the registries.

And it would be great if there was some explanation of how we view or what we view the next steps are. Thanks.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes. I think that would be a requirement also so yes very much so. We just have to figure out who wants to write what parts. ICANN staff are here to help bring this home if you're comfortable with that if you guys want to do it yourself that's fine also.

And Kim has certainly been contributing a lot to these documents to turn them into something that's useful for everyone. So absolutely I agree with you on that.

Is that okay Jeff? I'm not hearing anything Jeff so I'll assume that my response was okay. Please jump in if it's not.

Jeff Neuman: Yes it's okay. Yes thank you.

Bernie Turcotte: And everyone will get to read it before it goes out to the CWG. All right I had someone who was trying to cut in. Was that Elise?

Elise Gerich: I was just going to say I thought that the principles covered that the next steps and the fact that, you know, basically what the SLE document is doing is coming up with the definition of measurements., And the next step is to, you know, then determine what SLE should come after their measurements. But maybe I...

Bernie Turcotte: Yes. And I think what were...

Elise Gerich: ...seven principles.

Bernie Turcotte: I think what Jeff was talking about was trying to map this out a bit more so there's clarity for everyone. It doesn't go against the principles but possibly another level of detail.

Elise Gerich: Got it.

Bernie Turcotte: All right Kim has been very patient. Is there anything else before I try to go back to Kim? Going once, going twice all right Kim I think we're up to you.

Kim Davies: Thanks Bernie. I just wanted to resuscitate the issues discussed and from yesterday's call and the other change that I made to the working draft.

So namely there was some discussion on the list about we need to agree how the dashboard would be presented and configured.

I've provided my thoughts on that on the mailing list yesterday. I wasn't sure if anyone had any thoughts on that.

And then secondly in the draft I also cut and pasted some old text into the background section, its two paragraphs just to institute the document.

And again I just wanted to see if anyone had any thoughts or, you know, is (unintelligible) ready yet there - please do so at some point and provide thoughts back later on.

Paul Kane: So if I may with respect to the background section I'm very happy to take that on board and work with Kim to make sure that any reader is aware of the work that the Service Level Expectation group has been doing.

And like all the documents it will be circulated to all members before it goes to the CWG. But I haven't unfortunately had the chance today to read your latest submission Kim and for that I apologize.

But certainly you and I can thrash out a background because it's just very straightforward and just straight fact. So I'd like - I'd really read yours but certainly I'm happy to take that on board and work with you on it.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you Paul. Kim I see your hand is still up. You got more stuff?

Kim Davies: No old hand.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen I think we're about there. There may be some final cleaning off and polishing to get done to get this into a document.

But my sense of the room at this point is we've gotten to where we need to get so we can hand this in and get going and say this phase is done.

Now this is just my feeling. I'll be glad to take opposing views at this point or concerns as there are any please raise your hand or speak up?

Paul Kane: I would like to echo Bernie's view that I think the documents is as close to completion as can be but it needs obviously just tidying up and concluding.

But I think or certainly I am very grateful to ICANN and IANA staff for the work they've put into trying to facilitate this document.

And certainly within I would like to think the next three, four, five days we will have a document ready for circulation to the working group members for

formal adoption before going to the CWG for their consideration as well. So I like Bernie feel we're very close to having this concluded.

Bernie Turcotte: All right then. So what I will propose if it's okay Paul is that the ICANN side take this on, and we'll work with yourself.

And if we have any questions obviously we'll bring them up on the list. But we'll try and get a next version done which matches all of the input we've gotten over the last couple of days and beat this into a general report yourself and Paul, Kim, yourself Paul, Kim. And Kim will work on the background section just to make sure everyone is comfortable with that.

And I agree with Paul. We need to get this wrapped up. There's a lot of pressure from a lot of sides. So we'll be circulating a note about a call early to mid-next week. And we will have had distributed the document at least 24 hours ahead so you can read and consider it -- and oh bad echo sorry -- and I think that's where we are at unless there are any closing issues from anyone.

Paul Kane: What I would welcome Bernie and thank you for your kind offer of ICANN staff because (Adam) has been so closely involved in the drafting of the document to date if I may suggest that (Adam) is involved with the ICANN staff in just trying to bring the document to closure.

I don't want to feel that his very valuable comments and contribution over the last however many months he knows it much better than I.

So certainly please work with (Adam) as well in the drafting of the final document because we're very close with the current document we have.

There shouldn't be any major changes to the current document although as we've highlighted certain issues following yesterday's call need to be reintroduced and obviously the background needs to be addressed. And Jeff's point today needs to be collaborated.

So I think we're good. Look forward to a call next week. Again apologies I'm not at my computer but thank you very much everyone for the time you've put - spent on this particular project. Much appreciated. Thank you.

Bernie Turcotte: All right thank you everyone. I think this closes this call. I will echo Paul's thanks for the time and the good spirit of working here.

We'll get the document to you as soon as possible. We will also be getting to you some sort of poll to try and schedule a call next week. Thank you and goodbye.

Man: Bye.

END