ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
August 27, 2015
3:00 pm CT

Paul Kane: So good evening, good morning, good afternoon, all. Thank you very much for joining our SLE Working Group call on the 27th of August at 8 o'clock in the evening so 20000 hours UTC.

The proposal is to review, I hope in relatively quick order, the SLE document that has been circulated on the list. And what I would propose to do is just for ease is to go through the document effectively by page number and if anyone has any comments they would like on a particular page number we can then home in on it.

My hope is to come up with a document that we are all happy with, that is the working group members and ICANN IANA and so this process can well and truly get under way.

So the list of participants is as per the chat session. Is anyone just on audio please? Could you speak now? I don't hear anyone so the list of participants is as per the chat. And once again, thank you all very much for participating.

Kim Davies is unable to join us this evening. I'm delighted to say he's just - his wife has given birth to a baby in the last couple of days so he is now on paternity leave. But I would like to thank both Kim and Bernie and Adam from my staff very much for the good work they have done in the subgroup that has led to this document.

They've had 15 meetings in total I believe obviously in addition to the meetings that we as the whole group have had. And I was trying to add them up it's between 6 and 8 meetings that we have as a group have had. So thank you all very much for the good hard work that you've put in to get us this far.

So the agenda was as per the screen. Does anyone have any additional comments to the agenda? If not we'll move to accept it. So any comments on the agenda please? I don't hear any comments.

I'm just seeing Jay Daley is saying it's gone silent. Can people hear me?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I can, Paul.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Kane: Okay. Sorry, Jay just said it's come back so that's great. Thank you very much. I didn't hear any comments so we'll take the agenda as accepted. And now if we may take a review of the document that is before us, it is on the screen. I'm not sure if you have the ability to scroll through the document yourself but as mentioned - you do, I see that now - but as mentioned the intent is just to run through on page numbers just for efficiency, if that's possible.

So there's obviously the Page 1 doesn't contain much. Page 2 please. Anyone have a comment? And if anyone raises comments (unintelligible) very top there at the right hand side. This call is recorded and notes are being taken which will be made available to the community as a whole. So any comments on Page 2 please?

I don't see any. Page 3 please. I don't see any. Page 4 please which is the assumptions page. Page 5 please.

Bart Boswinkel: Paul, Elaine raised her hand during your call on Page 4.

Paul Kane: I apologize...

((Crosstalk))

Elaine Pruis: Hi Paul.

Paul Kane: Hi, Elaine. Yes, please, Page 4.

Elaine Pruis: So actually I'm super far behind but I have a - just a grammatical comment on the background paragraph, the last sentence seems to be missing like an "is" or "will be" after the comma, and providing recommendations associated with service levels. So if you reread that sentence out loud you'd probably understand what I'm -- thanks.

Paul Kane: So you're in the background section, the third paragraph of the background section...

Elaine Pruis: First paragraph. First paragraph.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Kane: First paragraph, I apologize. And where is your issue?

Elaine Pruis: So I'll read it out loud and point it out. "The Service Level Expectation Working Group, formerly CWG Design Team A, is comprised of three gTLD registry reps and three ccTLD reps and produce a report providing analysis of the existing (unintelligible) root zone management and is providing recommendations or will be providing recommendations associated with service levels in a post-transition environment." Missing a...

Paul Kane: That's not going to be a problem.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Kane: Is to be added but thank you very much, it shows you read it carefully.

Elaine Pruis: Okay.

Paul Kane: Bernie please.

Bernie Turcotte: Yeah, the document will be reread for grammatical and spelling mistakes and various things. So if we want to save time that way I think we can count on the fact that it will be gone through, is just that we were in a bit of a rush and didn't have time to do a final edit on it and wanted to get it out to you. But before it's formalized and published across the universe we'll go through it with a fine tooth comb.

Paul Kane: Thank you. Thank you, Bernie, for that. I personally find it useful that the members of the working group just raise any little issue such as this. It's a no-

brainer but I appreciate you taking time, again, just to make sure we haven't made a blunder that we haven't picked up. Jay please.

Jay Daley: Yeah, I'm actually not comfortable with the idea that there are changes made to the text after we've met and discussed it. I would prefer that we in the working group, in these meetings, then agree to final text and there wasn't then anyone going through afterwards to do a tidy-up because we all know that there are unintended consequences of such things.

Paul Kane: Thank you, Jay. At the moment I think we'll just go through. If there's any member of the working group has identified an issue, such as Elaine, for which I'm grateful, and a minor thing such as adding the word "is" let's - I'm very happy to include it at this point. If we could continue, so that was a comment on 2. We've done 3. Any comments on 4 please? Any comments on 5? Six? Seven? Oh, Jay Daley on 7 please.

Jay Daley: Thanks, Paul. So Assumption H to me is much more than an assumption, it's a definitions. And I would prefer that that was either labeled as a definition so we had another (unintelligible) definitions in the first section or that it was actually moved into the SLA bit as labeled definitions.

Paul Kane: Okay so if it were to be moved into SLE part where would you wish to move it to? I have to say I feel it is in the appropriate place in the document but maybe we could reference it in the SLE part to actually cover both parts. But where would you want to have it in the SLE document please?

Jay Daley: Right at the very front as a definition section.

Paul Kane: Oh I see, there, okay. I did note that it's only really referenced in - I'm just trying to look - it's referenced in the process performance heading. I'm not

sure if it's referenced prior to that. Could we add some language associated with the heading which says as per the definition specified in whatever Section H.

Jay Daley: Certainly. Or we could - in this - we could split the assumptions into two parts, one labeled Assumptions and one labeled Definitions and just leave it there and then also reference it.

Paul Kane: Okay so if I could open that up the idea is this is H - is to place H - move the Section H into Service Level Agreement part and have it as a definitions within that part - that section. Or we could - or in addition - either or or in addition - we could associate it with process performance reference Section H so therefore it is linked in without actually having to be reproduced. I would welcome IANA's comments, ICANN's comments as well as the working group members on making sure that the definitions associated with Category 1-5 is in the correct part of the document please.

Elaine Gerich: So this is Elise. I understand Jay's point that these are more definitions versus assumptions. I'm not exactly sure what the appropriate place in the document should be. Does anybody else on the working group have ideas there?

Paul Kane: The floor is open and we're happy to adjust it.

Jeff Neuman: This is Jeff Neuman sorry, I think Jeff Eckhaus is on the call as well. The first time I really see it was - it actually starts up right away, right, Category 1 process starts on Page 8 so it's got to be before that. I don't know, it could be a principle or after principles it could be definitions.

Paul Kane: Okay so any other comments? Because I think the point is valid. It is primarily a definition of what the various categories are. And it would be

sensible to either list it as a definition or when it is referenced in the SLE to refer back to H. Jay please.

Jay Daley: Yeah, Jeff's quite right, I actually think that Point L on page 8 is also a definition and H and L go together.

Paul Kane: Okay. So would IANA ICANN be happy for us to move H and L into the SLE part and just at the very start of the SLE where it says service definitions, we include the content of H and L? Bernie please.

Bernie Turcotte: Be glad to do whatever the working group wishes. But I think as Jeff has pointed out, we actually refer to some things fairly early on. So it might be useful to have them after the principles as definitions. But whatever, I don't think anyone is very (stringently) attached to this. Whatever seems logical for everyone.

Paul Kane: Okay. So there is a desire to have a heading called Definitions. And I think we can move H and L into a heading called Definitions. And then we can reference further in the document the definitions section by including appropriate language referring back to the service level definitions section. Bernie. Old hand? Old hand.

Okay, thank you very much. That helps with that. And we - I think everyone is happy to make that amendment. So thank you very much. So that deals with Page 7 or H particularly, I'm just going to make a note of that, L and H. I've made a note.

So may I now move to Page 8 please, which is primarily now I, J and K. Any comments on Page 8? Elise please.

Elaine Gerich: Yes, thank you Paul. So I believe it's J that's the new text that we discussed the last time as we met as a full group and Patricio had asked about having the open and transparent process. And then we've added, which surprises me a little bit, the final sentence, which says total transaction time for emergency changes should have a target of 12 hours. That seems to be somewhat out of place in this because we're really talking about operating in an open and transparent manner. And then to throw in a target service time seemed just out of place. So I was wondering how others felt about it.

Paul Kane: So would you prefer just, Elise, on this point, would you prefer to put it at the end so effectively we now have M, meaning the total transaction time for emergency changes should have a target of 12 hours. The request was that under the current NTIA contract within the current SLA you have with NTIA, there is a reference to having a target time. It is not a mandated time because one hopes one will complete it within a period of 12 hours and certainly (unintelligible).

Elaine Gerich: So I was...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Kane: ...you have completed it very quickly.

Elaine Gerich: I'm sorry, my connection must be bad. You cutout twice in your last sentence, if you could repeat it?

Paul Kane: I'm just wondering what - can I open the floor because I can see comments from Bernie and David Conrad so Bernie, please.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you, Paul. Just a note, this last part on the emergency section was not approved by Kim and he was gone by this point. It was a discussion between myself and Paul that really wanted to have a reference to the emergency section. I finagled the text a bit but this was not - this was the only thing in this document which was not agreed to. Thank you.

Paul Kane: David.

David Conrad: Yeah, just it strikes me a bit odd to have that target time specified in the assumptions section as one point that I would make. Also, the total transaction time for emergency changes would imply, at least in my reading of it, would imply incorporating time that's outside of what ICANN IANA would be able to make any assurance about, right, because it's not just us that would be dealing with the emergency change.

And then third, on Jay, I'm a little confused about why an emergency change would not be treated in a non-discriminatory manner, I mean, you know, from my point of view a change is a change. The emergency is just how it is, you know, handled, you know, in terms of timeliness. I don't see any reason why it would be discriminatory in one - in one version versus another so it might just be some confusion on my part.

Paul Kane: Okay so thank you, David. And I think there's been some conversation in the chat. Patricio has raised any specific target number should go into the process performance section. Jay Daley has agreed with Patricio. So the point that you made initially that maybe it's in the wrong place is a valid one. And I'd like to open the floor to Jeffery Eckhaus please.

Jeffery Eckhaus: Thanks. So I think like Patricio and Jay, that was part of one of my comment, I agree that this should not be in there especially if it's under the assumptions.

And the other part I know this is maybe a little bit nit-picking but I actually think J, those two sentences, should be two separate points that one point would be an open and transparent manner, while respecting customer confidentiality would be one. And then the other - and then there would be a separate assumption would be that it would - if we agree to a response or a question of fair and nondiscriminatory manner.

Because I don't see how those go under the same assumption so I would actually separate those out into two. It may be a little bit cleaner and simpler. But that's just more a little bit nit picking. My main point was about what Patricio and Jay had said, I agree with them as well that this should be - the specific time should be moved to the other section. Thanks.

Paul Kane: Okay so Adam - no, not Adam, Jay please.

Jay Daley: Yes, so to David's point, I wonder if the words "fair and nondiscriminatory" could with first come first serve. Because that's the - I think the intention there that you - there's a queue and things are, you know, the queue is a first come first serve queue, unless something is an emergency which case it can jump the queue and be dealt with quicker than otherwise.

Paul Kane: So just on that note, Jay, we did discuss this at our last call. And I'm delighted to hear that you're feeling better. And it was felt, and I think the group had some sympathy with Elise's point that on some instances first come first serve may be the best way of dealing with it. And that's why the language that was proposed was - and agreed I think by the participants of the call, the last call, fair and nondiscriminatory manner sort of addressed the concern.

So if you're amenable to that I think Jeff Eckhaus's point of splitting it into two is very valid and that would be fine. But if we can stick with fair and nondiscriminatory that would be good.

((Crosstalk))

Paul Kane: Thank you, Jay. Thanks. So Bernie please. Well I'm not very good at...

((Crosstalk))

Bernie Turcotte: So I just put it down. I think...

Paul Kane: Oh sorry. So so far we have a proposal to split so we're going to create - so Jay runs as far as customer confidently then we're going to have a new K which is basically a new K which will cover the fair and nondiscriminatory basis. And the proposal that we have with respect to the emergency changes being completed within a target time, target not mandatory, target time of 12 hours, potentially move to the process performance section.

Have I captured everything? And, Patricio followed by Elise please.

Patricio Poblete: Just wanted to say, again, what I wrote in the chat window that the mention of the emergency changes in connection with fair and nondiscriminatory is that for them to be exempt from that fair and nondiscriminatory requirement in the sense that they can jump to the head of the queue and that's okay then so people would not be entitled to claim that that unfair because as emergency changes they are allowed to be placed first in the queue.

Paul Kane: Thank you, Patricio, for reminding me. That's exactly what we said last call and I completely forgot it. That is correct. There are some instances where

changes are deemed to be an emergency or considered to be an emergency and obviously they should take priority and fortunately do take priority. So, Elise, please.

Elaine Gerich: Yes, thank you for calling on me. The last sentence, "total transaction time" that we're proposing to move somewhere else, I'm still a little concerned about having this target time of 12 hours. And I support what David said, David Conrad, the fact that a total time of 12 hours whereas it could be a nice aspirational goal, it's beyond ICANN nor the IANA department's ability to improve upon that in any way.

I mean, we could send it off in 10 minutes. We can't tell what would happen, you know, in the case we have now with NTIA, or with VeriSign as to how long it may take for them to complete that. So I'm concerned if we put that as an aspirational time when one of the principles is that we're measuring what we call IANA time, the time it takes the IANA function operator to do it, that it sets an expectation and people who haven't been involved in reading this document, that, you know, it has to be 12 hours and somehow the IANA operator can make sure it happens within 12 hours. So I'm just concerned of putting it somewhere like that.

Paul Kane: That's a very good point, Elise. And, again, I apologize that there seems to be a little typo on Bernie and I's point. This document only refers to IANA time so I think we're missing the word "IANA" so it should be total IANA transaction time for emergency changes and just I would correct the English, should be completed within a target of 12 hours. So it's a target rather than a mandatory thing. I think that's a very fair point both David and Elise. Jeff, please. Jeff Neuman.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, I was going to point something like that out. As long as you're okay with that. Because remember, this is the exception to the rule of the fair and nondiscriminatory manner. So if it takes you 10 minutes, that's great, then you can back to the fair and nondiscriminatory manner of handling requests. But I don't think we want to have it completely open ended. So I think that's why the language was inserted there. So I would support putting in total IANA transaction time and also moving that to where Jay and Patricio and others recommended it being.

Paul Kane: Perfect. Any other comments on this particular one? I think we're all in agreement we need to include IANA. We can only - this document can only address IANA. So it should be total IANA transaction time for emergency - should be completed within a target of 12 hours. I think that reads better. I understand that.

                 And is the intent still to split J into two? I believe it is. And I see the floor for Jay and followed by David Conrad please. Jay.

Jay Daley: Yes, I was just going to ask Elise if with those revisions you're more comfortable, Elise, whether the 12 hours is still (unintelligible).

Elaine Gerich: I'm more comfortable when it's called out that it's only what we can control, yes. And I guess I thought we weren't going to set any SLA targets until we've done some measurements, but I'm comfortable, I can live with that.

Paul Kane: Thank you. David please.

David Conrad: Yeah, I'm actually supportive of splitting those first two sentences into two separate bits. I might offer as a suggestion - and only a suggestion because, you know, maybe it's been beaten to death in the past that fair and

nondiscriminatory is sort of - it confused me because it would suggest that in an emergency situation IANA staff would be able to say well, you know, we like Jay better than we like Jeff so we're going to do Jay's first.

And if it's only related to treating an emergency request in order of processing to - because of, you know, the fact that it's an emergency and therefore it can jump the queue, it might be useful to actually mention that in that sort of context to try to limit the exception to the fair and nondiscriminatory bit.

Paul Kane: Okay. I think we're getting a bit in the weeds here. I think that we all have experienced IANA operating in a fair and nondiscriminatory basis whether emergency or not going think it's helpful just to keep the generic in there. So if everyone is agreeable what I'm taking from this discussion is we do split it effectively into three elements.

We have the first part as J, in addition goes to the new K and then the total IANA (unintelligible) completed within a target of 12 hours moves to the process performance section. And I think that captures everyone's concerns. Any other comments? If I don't see any we'll move on. No? Thank you very much. So any other comments please on Page 8. So we're only really talking about K I guess.

No, I don't see any comments. That's brilliant. So let's move onto Number 9 - Page 9. Page 10. Page 11. Page 12. Page 13. Page 14. Page 15. Page 16. Page 17. Page 18. Page 19. Page 20. Page 21. Page 22. Twenty-three. Twenty-four. Twenty-five and finally, Page 26 please.

And I thank you, Jeff. And just tell me which page it is in case I flipped through.

Jeff Neuman: It's 26 so last page on the next steps. I'm going to try to put some text into the chat...

Paul Kane: Yeah, fine.

Jeff Neuman: ...so just give me one second. I'm just cut and pasting there. Okay. So I think two things here, I didn't get (unintelligible) sized. Okay so the two parts I added - I would like to see added to the last paragraph, it was italic when I drafted it but I guess this only does regular text. I'd like to see after the words "New metrics" some language that has a time period in there, a time period commitment. And I put in here just for discussion purposes, "No event more than six months post transition." So I basically want to see some kind of time commitment to get this done.

And then at the end of it - no, sorry, and then the next part it says the community should reconvene to review the data collected. And then this is a piece missing which I added the words, "along with other industry comparable and applicable data." So those words, "with other industry comparable and applicable data." And then keep everything else as it is.

The point there is that it's one thing to collect all the data that you have but if the data that you have shows that you're not operating in the industry norm, that you're well below the norm, then I think we should use industry data to set the service level expectation.

So said another way, if, for whatever reason, it's unexpectedly well below industry standards there should be some commitment to move to industry standards, things like up time and others. So those are the two changes. Unfortunately I couldn't italicize it but those are my two points.

Paul Kane: Okay so if I may, and - intervene at this point, the next steps - I think the point you raise about having specific time periods highlighted is a valid one. And it is certainly something that when Bernie and I have been informing or educating the CWG have referenced.

The intent for the next steps of this document is basically that this document will be presented to - once it's ratified by the group, making adjustments for the changes we've made on this call, and no other changes, we are going to present it to the CWG or the former CWG members, because that concludes the work item that the original DTA was set.

But then IANA, as I understand it, will be preparing effectively a request to ICANN for funding to implement capturing of the times as prescribed in the document. And that will - should happen relatively quickly to come up with a plan.

And the plan needs to get, as I understand it, NTIA approval. And once NTIA approval have granted approval, effectively a test phase will be entered into where this systems runs in parallel with the new system - sorry, the existing system - to capture the time stamps. So we should, I hope, by the end of this year, be in a position to capture the time stamps in accordance with the SLE and then have a body of data from which to determine the thresholds.

So either this group or another group, I'm not sure which group, will determine the thresholds, what is reasonable. But in discussion with ICANN, and IANA, we'll come back and populate the tables so we have the thresholds, we have what is considered a breach defined based on real world statistics. So we have a tested proven SLE. So come the time of transition this SLE with its - that has been populated will come into force. So that I understand is the way forward.

The other point you make, which is at some time after the transition there is a commitment to follow industry standards. That is something that we - and effectively update this SLE. That is something that has been considered within the CWG group. It has been mentioned that the SLE should be reviewed on a periodical basis. I'm not sure how frequently the CWG group mentioned it. But I'd be very interested to hear ICANN and IANA's comments on what I've just said. Elise please. We can't hear you.

Elaine Gerich: Can you hear me now?

((Crosstalk))

Elaine Gerich: Can you hear me now?

Paul Kane: Yes, can hear you. Yes, we can.

Elaine Gerich: Thank you. So sorry, thanks, Paul. I think you walked through a lot of the process details and I guess touch points of where things have to be touched by more people than just the IANA department and ICANN. But one of my questions is is maybe it goes back to Jeff's text. He says in no event more than six months post transition.

And my question is, is that a timeframe for when all the data is supposed to be collected? Or is that the IANA department will come back with a plan because we'll have had time to scope the amount of work that needs to be done in order to implement these collection of these milestones? What exactly is the six month post transition? Because at this point there's obviously as you've said in your description of all the various things we have to go through, a development activity that has to happen and that has to be interlinked with the

other development we're doing to remove the NTIA dependencies from various things.

So what exactly is intended in the six months? Is this something where we come back and we tell you well we've scoped it and this is the plan and this is how long it'll take to finish the development and collect all the data?

Jeff Neuman: No, I think the I meant by that was that within six months post transition you should already have that data especially given the timelines that Paul discussed. If the transition is not going to happen until 2016, which we know now, right, late 2016, I mean, at least it was my hope that you would, by that point in time, have already built the measuring techniques and that after that six months or whatever the time period is - I just threw that out there as a straw man, that you would then reconvene the group with all of the data to say okay look, in the past year, or however long we've been measuring, we've operated the Website with 99.995 availability.

And we think, you know, that would be a great basis for setting the SLE at 99.995 for the future. And then this group would discuss that. So it was my intention to hopefully by that period of time that you would have the data and then the group would be convening with the assistance of that data plus industry standard data to determine what the SLE moving forward should be.

So if you came back and said, oh, gee, we're only operating at 98.5 availability but, you know, we look around the industry and every other Website is operating at 99 - every other mission critical Website that handles critical infrastructure changes like telecom databases actually operates at 99.995, perhaps we should set the SLE at 99.995 and make those changes so that we can operate at that level. So that's really the intention of the two different components that were added.

Paul Kane: Can we...

Elaine Gerich: May I follow up?

Paul Kane: ...thank you very much, Jeff. Yeah, please, Elise. Yeah.

Elaine Gerich: Well I see there are other hands so I'll just back in the queue and let others speak and then I can speak again if that was okay?

Paul Kane: Perfect. So David followed by Bernie and then Elise please. Yeah.

David Conrad: Yeah, actually it's two things. One, just for my clarification, when Jeff says, "the industry" what does that mean exactly? Which industry? Is it the registry industry, the, you know, just mention the telecom's, you know, database operational industry. So that - prefer if that could be explicit instead of sort of implied.

                    And with regards to the six months post transition as a person who has been tagged with actually implementing some of this stuff, I'm uncomfortable with that without having done the scoping exercise of the - as Elise was saying, as, you know, doing the actual plan because we are doing quite a few things as a result of the transition. And I would not want to be put into a position of having to panic develop something in order to meet a relatively arbitrary timeline.

                    I'd be much more comfortable with saying, you know, at some point in the future that fixed timeframe, I'm not going to hazard what that might be, we'd be able to present a plan that would then detail the actual collection of data,

the implementation of the collection of the data than the collection of the data and then reconvene at, you know, upon agreement of those dates.

Paul Kane: Thank you, David. Bernie, please.

Jeff Neuman: Can I respond?

Paul Kane: Yeah, go Jeff, yeah, go.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. So, David, I think it's a good point with respect to industry. So I'll throw back to you, what do you think is a good relevant industry to be compared to? You don't have to answer it on this call but perhaps you want to put that in. I mean, obviously there are comparisons. I compared it with telecom because that's kind of my background and I've helped with designing incredibly mission critical telecom databases which are relied upon to route every single phone call in North America as kind of the, you know, gold standard.

But I'm happy for you to come up with an industry. But there has to be comparables. And so whatever you think that is that could be relevant right, I mean, if you want to use domain name registries that's fine too. We have to maintain a live Whois service has to be up 100% of the time so we can use that. Otherwise - but then as far as the time period, I mean, I understand what you're saying as far as scoping and we'd be fine for you to come back and tell the group that that timeline should be.

But to go into a transition and to just tell us to feel comfortable that you'll meet some service levels at some point in the future without any kind of commitment is pretty scary from our perspective once the NTIA kind of relinquishes its contract. So I'm happy to hear your recommendations but I do

think we need some sort of timeline in there. And I'll throw it out to others in the group to see if I'm off base. Thanks.

Paul Kane: So the point is well made with respect to having prescribed timelines. I think we - Bernie and I have been discussing with the CWG appropriate - what we've been telling the CWG and others with respect to timelines. Bernie is next in the queue. Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you, Paul. A couple of just facts, I think relative to the timeline the CWG was made aware that before we could talk about timelines there would have to be scoping of the work. And I think people agreed with that and that there shouldn't be any artificial delay in generating that. But we couldn't even think about that until we got this document done.

The second thing is we're talking post transition and accepting SLEs. I will simply note that if we go through the transition the CWG has in its proposal the creation of a customer service committee, which will have representatives from the registries to handle these things. So, you know, the customer service committee will actually be the watchdog that will be monitoring the SLEs. And if we actually get to the transition they might be - sorry about that - they might be the ones approving the SLE targets because they'll be a formally constituted group responsible for this.

Paul Kane: Jay, please.

Jay Daley: Thank you, Paul. So I agree with much of what Jeff said. I think it'd be very useful if we could nail down two things. One of which is exactly when data collection will start and then exactly when data collection stop. Oh and a third thing I've just thought about which is what additional things outside of data

collection will go into a decision, namely, peer SLEs or comparative SLEs elsewhere.

So I'm, for example, I have a negotiated SLE that I negotiate in my regulator and which is formally published. Happy to contribute that. And I'm sure there are many other ccTLDs in the same position so we could look at those and understand those.

So, yeah, if we could try to nail down those - that timeline bit now I think that's our job to do rather than a CSC's job. If there has been a review that could take place later I think that's the CSC's job but I think we need to just make sure that full transition we have, you know, our plan is pretty firm.

Paul Kane: Thank you. And just before Elise comes in, if I may put on my registry hat, the intent, as I understand it, was very much along the lines that David has highlighted and indeed Bernie has highlighted. Once this document has been approved (unintelligible) effectively scope the work to ascertain precisely what is required then subsequently get NTIA approval to undertake the work.

And then start the process either in parallel with the real (unintelligible) just a copy of it start the process of making sure that all the time stamps are captured so we have a body of data - I forget the precise calendar timeline that was proposed initially - but we have a body of data by the turn of the year. And then no correction, that was wrong.

It was starting collecting the data at the turn of the year, running for two or three months, until such time as ICANN felt they had sufficient data to be able to confirm they were happy. So by March, April time we would have a body of data and then there was discussion with regards to designing the thresholds.

So at the date of transition this SLE was in place and, again, as Bernie highlighted, the CSC have made provision to periodically review the appropriateness of the CSC again based on having more information held within the IANA system. So I think that was what was being proposed. And I would welcome having additional wording to clarify the timeline if that is what members want.

The idea of just having the next steps in there was basically as a placeholder and we can have supplementary discussions without it being, as it were, fixed to this document because ICANN have just been asked by NTIA to work with VeriSign to come up with a test platform and maybe this initiative could be bolted onto that test platform as well.

But this is a moving feast and so the intent was not to commit them formally in this document but just to reference it. And I think the point of having a broad timeline is well taken. And I think the commitment to follow industry standards can be made but, again, I think that's probably something that the CSC should take up rather than this particular group bearing in mind at least some time off.

So I'm not sure if they're old hands but Elise, Jay and then Bernie please.

Elaine Gerich: Thank you, Paul. I understand everyone's desire for more predictability, put it that way, because all of us like to have a good idea of when something is going to be delivered. And I'm really on board for that. My biggest concern is that right now, and I think David's mentioned it and so did I, that right now this work needs to be scoped, a plan has to be put in place so it can be developed, there have to be sufficient resources to do this plan as well as the other plans that are coming out of the transition, the stewardship transition planning.

And so it's very difficult, and I would find it very uncomfortable to sign up for a fixed timeline to deliver something without doing all the homework that is necessary to do that. And I know that, you know, you all have SLAs, as you've mentioned, and I'm sure that when you agree to those SLAs you didn't agree to them without making sure that you could meet the timelines or that you could be within the timelines for meeting them.

So my suggestion might be is that we - if you need a committed timeline is that there's a period where this document becomes fixed, it gets adopted, at which point within a certain number of months ICANN is given a certain number of months to scope the work it would take. And then to come back to you with a formal plan of when we could complete the work.

But to just throw in a timeline and say that the work will be done and we'll evaluate the data, without having done that homework, I really feel that we're just not doing a service to the community or to ourselves.

Jeff Neuman: Can I - hey, Paul, can I get in the queue to respond to that specific point?

Paul Kane: On that specific point, but I think - if we may, let's just nip down the queue because if you wouldn't mind joining. So, Jay please.

Jay Daley: I don't mind if Jeff posits something there.

Paul Kane: All right go on, yeah. Yeah.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So, Elise...

Paul Kane: Go, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. Three - four years ago I made your exact argument to ICANN when we were doing the agreement for the new gTLDs. And ICANN required us to put into our agreements that any consensus policy that's passed or any new technical standard that's developed by the IETF we must implement, no matter what, no later than 120 days from when that becomes standard or when that policy becomes effective.

And I made the exact same arguments you did. And they're good arguments, right, that how do we know we're agreeing to something we don't know what we're agreeing to in the future. We'd have to scope it out. And ICANN staff came back and Legal said, no, 120 days.

So we're in the same pain as you guys are in. And in fact we're saying a lot longer than 120 days here. We just think that you guys that there should be some commitments and I'm willing to listen to what that fixed commitment should be, but, you know, I think if it's good for the registries to have to commit to a timeline it's good for IANA to as well.

And I understand and sympathize completely with your arguments but I got to tell you that the same arguments were shot down by ICANN when we raised them as registries for the new TLD agreements.

Elaine Gerich: Well I'd hate for us to...

((Crosstalk))

Elaine Gerich: ...that are incorrect.

Paul Kane: Okay so Jay, Bernie and then Jeff please. Jay.

Jay Daley: Yeah, so, Elise, I sympathize with your point of view. But the big issue I have is synchronization of the work that needs to be done with transition and with what we have - how long a period we have after transition where maybe things are (unintelligible) and, you know, all of a sudden I see myself in a bit of a mess there.

It is - I agree with Jeff in the broader view here that I don't get the luxury in my business of saying hang on, no, no, no I need to go and plan this before I can even agree any kind of dates for some important things. We have to up front give, you know, a target date for something and we have to just use our expertise to build into that appropriate time for us to do the assessment, the planning and the (unintelligible). And so sometimes, you know, I've put a finger in the air and I add six months onto it.

But we have to do that in order to ensure that all the other moving parts know what's going to happen and can fit in together. And in this particular case that's exactly what we need to do, we need to have some other moving parts of what's ready at transition, what the CSC is going to have to pick up from us and other things, understood. And so that's why I think we need to, you know, fix a time scale as much as we can now.

Paul Kane: I think the point is well made, Jay. And I think 120 days if that was - if that's the ICANN norm, as it were, is certainly more generous than Kim, Bernie and I were discussing. But we are very aware that NTIA have placed this additional burden on ICANN and VeriSign recently.

I don't see why the two, you know, our particular approach could not be squeezed into that work as well bearing in mind both need NTIA approval. I would very much welcome this SLE being at the date of transition. In fact it

was originally murmured by the CWG that without an SLE that could potentially delay the transition. I don't know it is at this point.

But anyway moving on to the queue, we have Jay, I'm assuming that's an old hand, Bernie, Jeff and Elise please.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you, Paul. I was going a bit in the same direction you're going. Let's not forget, let's go back to the history for just one minute here. It was the expectation when this started off that IANA was actually collecting all the data we needed, we would just look at the data, see if the targets against the data were good and if not (unintelligible) Process A is now going to have an SLA or E of this and Process B is going to have it.

Now once we got going this wasn't the case. We are where we are now because of what was there and what we wanted. And to a certain extent that - hang on a second, let me kill that - and so the reality is that I think we're trying to solve this timing issue here because it originally we wanted to deliver a complete product. All I'm saying is that the co-chairs of the CWG are very aware of the timing constraint.

As Paul has mentioned, this report has to go back and be discussed by the CWG. I mean, we could decide on anything here today, it doesn't mean it gets accepted by the CWG. B, the timing constraint, I can assure you and when this is presented to the CWG I invite you to join that conversation so you can see how serious the timing concern is for the CWG relative to this.

So my suggestion to you at this point before we get really crazy detailed on this timing thing, where there is some requirements to understand all the other moving parts, and that's done at another level, if you will, and I'm not just

talking about ICANN, the CWG and the interactions and they're there to actually get that done.

And exactly as Paul said, the CWG's view of this is that the measuring had to be started before the transition but that was an original view before we got the work done. And everyone wanted to reconsider this.

So it might be worthwhile to take a more generic approach to request that when the CWG is looking at the next phases of this project, now that we've actually got nailed down what we want to measure that they take on the responsibility of establishing the schedule because if you will, that is their responsibility and they're more locked into all the other parts and are probably better equipped to get the information and start part of that negotiation. I hope that made some sense.

Paul Kane: Thank you very much, Bernie. And Jeff please.

Jeff Neuman: Yeah, so, Bernie, you were just saying - and I think going back in history is important. But I think 10 out of 10 registries and others that agree to that CCWG principle had assumed that IANA did things like time stamp transactions when they came in because that just was something - an assumption that people - I mean, most systems have those kinds of time stamps.

And so yes we're sort of changing it but I think we're changing it because the natural assumptions we had it never occurred to us that things would have to be developed in order to do those things. So I think going back in history is important but let's not go back too much and say that we're changing things because if you went into people mind sets I think they would find assumptions back there that they didn't think had to be developed.

But what the one thing I'm worried about too I that what everyone is saying that look we have to see all the work and then we have to prioritize and we have to, you know, see where our resources should go, my fear is that that prioritization shouldn't necessarily only be done by ICANN IANA but that should be done by the community as far as the prioritizations.

And in discussions with the NTIA and with Fadi and, you know, the beginning of this year service level was the one thing that everyone thought was the highest of the highest level of importance, they were surprised that the first version of the CWG reports had nothing in there about service levels. And so I think you'll find that this is a priority of most of the groups.

And I know - I understand the CWG has to approve it but I would say, and I'm happy to be on those calls, but the CWG constituted this drafting group for the expertise that we have. And my assumption is that they will defer to our expertise and to our recommendations unless there's good reason not to. But I expect the CWG to be highly deferential.

So happy to...

((Crosstalk))

Paul Kane: So, Jeff, thank you for that. I would very much welcome wrapping this section up. I think the intent is that we have, and we will add to this document, reference to a timeline that needs to be addressed by the CWG. And we expect, as a group, that the SLE will be in place in force at the date of transition. I am aware that many CWG members felt very strongly that if the - it was not in place then transition should be effectively delayed.

That was when the transition was originally scheduled for September. Then transition was placed back into June. And IANA staff very kindly prepared what then was considered an acceptable timeframe for getting the SLE. Now more time has been given. So being candid, I don't think there is really much scope for IANA and ICANN not to have an SLE in place.

I hear the 120 days. I hear 90 days. I think we need to be careful about being prescriptive. ICANN IANA know that the job needs to be done. But I think we can in this document just reference the need for timelines but more importantly require that this SLE be in place - be populated and in place and in force at the date of transition, and leave it to the CWG members.

I'm a member of the CWG. Rest assured I will push hard. And the other thing I've taken discussion is that we do place in this document reference to a commitment post transition for the CSC to review the SLE to make it complies with the then current industry standards. So with your permission I think those - adding those two supplementary areas would help us move on.

I'm very wary of the time. And I would welcome anyone not wishing to speak to lower their hands unless they are not happy with that particular approach. Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you. Just a few things to answer Jeff's reply. The - I was not saying that ICANN IANA develop the timeline. What I did say was that it would be the CWG thing. And I think what Paul is proposing is very close to that. So I'm very supportive of that. And I think everyone understands we're trying to get something done. So that's about it for now. Thank you.

Paul Kane: Jay.

Jay Daley: My view is that the CWG only becomes involved in the timeline if we feel that an SLE cannot be ready for transition. Which then becomes their problem. However, with the time that we have left available to us before transition I, for one, could not agree that we could not have an SLE ready by then. And so I do not believe that this needs to become a CWG problem. I believe this is something that we should set out in here as a timeline that has an SLE in place by transition.

Paul Kane: So just for clarification I am proposing that we add language to the document that specifically says this working group expects the SLE to be in place and wants to ensure that IANA has scoped the work within - or expeditiously and has sought NTIA approval. And I had a discussion with ICANN staff some months ago now where we have agreed to try and move that forward.

And so I don't see that being a problem. So I think, Jay, we are on the same page. The intent is that the SLE is in place at the time of transition. What I'm trying to avoid is us on this call right now prescribing times because I think that would be inappropriate. We need to have a little longer to discuss this with ICANN. But I think Jeff's point is also valid, the community asking, brackets, requiring, IANA ICANN to have an SLE in place at the date of transition.

They already have an SLA in place with NTIA. In many instances they are capturing the times that we do know. But I think, again, we're getting too granular. We've done a good document that highlights the thresholds and with your permission I would welcome specifying in the document we expect it to be in place by the date of transition. And we do work with ICANN IANA to come up with appropriate scoping time.

I see Jeff has just said, "Please let me know when it's presented to the CWG." I will gladly circulate that to the design list when it's coming up. I hope it's coming up soon because the sooner we can get to CWG the quicker ICANN can be certain that this is the document going forward for which they can then start the scoping work.

Elise please.

Elaine Gerich: I just wanted to say that I do support not prescribing a timeline in this. And I guess I can take it offline. I was curious what exactly is meant by the full scope of having an SLE in place. That if that allows for the scoping also that's okay with me as long as we don't prescribe a timeline right now.

Paul Kane: So just so we are - I hope I'm very clear, thank you, Elise, for that. I think it's not appropriate for us to prescribe any timelines for you to do your job. What is I think a requirement of this group is that come the date of transition, whenever that is, that this SLE is in force, namely it is populated with real world data, thresholds have been set and you have something moving forward.

Otherwise, you (unintelligible) picture, the SLE you currently (unintelligible) is not applicable. We need to make sure the community has an SLE - a service level expectation agreement in place at the time of transition.

And if you - if it's not in place because you haven't populated the tables, you haven't provided it, I'm afraid (unintelligible) the transition. I don't think it will be delayed but if it were to be delayed then I feel that would be appropriate. But anyway I would welcome any further comments but so I just see Jay's comment. I agree, no SLE, no transition.

So I think certainly that was the view of the CWG. But let's not get too bogged down on that. So on this, Page 26, the intent is to basically do a high level representation of the time expected for the SLE to be in place but not a prescriptive one. And we'll add some wording to do with the commitment to industry standards. And that will conclude, I think, the next steps section.

So is everyone happy with that proposal please? If you're not happy please raise your hand. I don't see any hands being raised for which I'm grateful to all members of the group, including ICANN IANA.

The next is I would like you to raise your hands using the system if you are in agreement that this document with the amendments we have discussed this evening, is the approved document of the SLE Working Group's report on the service level expectations for IANA root zone management post transition. So would you please raise your hand and then I will basically read out your name so the scribe can capture it. Oh yes, you got ticks as well.

So the - Jay Daley has agreed. Jeffery Eckhaus has agreed.

Bart Boswinkel: Paul. Paul, before you go...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Paul. This is Bart.

Paul Kane: Yes. Hi, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: There are some hands before you go there. I saw Jay and Jeff have raised their hands first before...

Paul Kane: No, no they're raising their hands to agree. Sorry, that was - I didn't know there was a tick option. So I'm assuming...

Jeffery Eckhaus: This is Jeff Eckhaus here. I was agreeing. Sorry, I didn't realize the approve and then the raise hand so my raised hand was for approval. Sorry about the confusion.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Sorry.

Paul Kane: Sorry, that was my fault, yeah. So Jay has approved. Jeff Eckhaus has approved. Elaine has approved. I'm just going down. My screen is locked. Okay, here we go. Jeff Neuman has approved. Jeff Eckhaus has approved. Patricio has approved. And I have approved. I can do it, let me do it now. Hand up. I don't have to do the tick.

So I think that is the three members from the ccTLD community have approved. And the three gTLD members have approved. And I'm assuming ICANN and IANA are approving the document bearing in mind you've been working closely on it. So can you just confirm that as well please? Elise, I think you would be best if I can...

Elaine Gerich: Yeah, I don't know how to do the tick either so...

Paul Kane: No, exactly. You approve. That's great. And I'm - David, thank you very much for joining the call. I hope that's okay with you.

So thank you very much, everyone. It's been a hell of a slog getting there. We will update the document. We will circulate the document within the next 12 hours to make sure we've captured all of your concerns. There could be some minor typos. By all means come back to me. But by the end of this week

irrespective of which time zone the document will be formally approved and it'll be sent to the CWG, the ICG and the ICG next week. So thank you all very much, it's been many weeks of hard work. And I do appreciate your dedication to this cause. So thank you very much indeed, everyone. And at 10:17, I'm delighted to say the call is closed. Thank you.

END