RECORDED VOICE:        This meeting is now being recorded.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        This would be useful to not make this a one off, make sure to continue to develop it into a process, or a couple of standard [inaudible] users later on.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        So the question now is [inaudible]…?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        No, the data.  [Inaudible] So if the [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        Yeah.  Data scrubbing will be embedded in the generation, I mean, not a one off.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        Okay.,..

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        Reduction version in order to generate data, the dashboard…

RECORDED VOICE:        This meeting is now being recorded.

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    If the scrub data is part of the system.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    If I could elaborate just a little.  Sorry, as we identify then, [inaudible] identified, [inaudible] a lot of information in the apparent systems now. When we started implementing the measuring for [inaudible], we took sort of the opposite approach.  [Inaudible] long-term budget stuff, because you know, they might be more isolated down the road, might want to tweak them.

Like if we can avoid it, if we just log a lot of information, then maybe it's already capturing a lot of information we might need when we [inaudible], so you have to go through [inaudible].  So I took the approach of [inaudible]…  As David identified, that does include [inaudible]…

So we're purely scrubbing it from a confidentiality perspective to hide anything, and to the critical point that dashboards, all of that, will be produced from the scrub data.  The theory is we'll probably scrub data, we'll publish that dashboard, and anyone, any third party should be able to take that scrub data and count the same results, I believe.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Would this scrubbing eliminate any need for the customers of IANA to authorize the use of their transaction data for these purposes?

| UNKNOWN SPEAKER: | I mean, [inaudible] that's [inaudible]… |
| | |

Maybe there is some areas we might [have a conversation on?]. Our assumption is, [inaudible] that are [inaudible] to the point where [inaudible]… NCF, ACTC and so on. So we don't identify what the PLT is. We don't [inaudible]…

| UNKNOWN SPEAKER: | So that is what we do not have today, which is just [CROSSTALK]… So let's be clear. |

| UNKNOWN SPEAKER: | …the development that is ongoing. What we have right now is the generation of the actual log event with the full data in the, needs to be scrubbed before we actually release it. But there is no time constraints on that, right? When we get the scrubbing code done, then we just apply it to the data that we've been collecting since March 2$^{nd}$, I guess. |

| UNKNOWN SPEAKER: | Right. Okay so, when will we be able to get a definitive answer to this question? |

| UNKNOWN SPEAKER: | I'm sorry [inaudible]… |

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Sorry.  Can we be certain that we will not need any formal permission requirement in order for the release of scrubbed data?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     So I guess what we'll first need to do is actually see, yes, some dummy output of the scrubber, and [inaudible] just to see…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Yeah, I mean, [inaudible]… permission…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Right.  Yeah.  As we ask permission, we have to put an UI element into the webpage, and it would be annoying.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Yeah.  We'd appreciate your feedback on this activity.  If you think we're actually divulging too much, let's have that discussion and we can [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Okay.  The thing is scrubbing removes evidently could be a problem, but there are other ways of knowing.  So a short time ago, if TLD was doing a lot of emergency changes, so we'll probably know it was Turkey, even [inaudible] doesn't say so.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Yeah, I'm not convinced even the TLD will necessarily…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    I agree.  I mean, there is definitely the ability [inaudible] WSIS change. [CROSSTALK] …point being more transparent about each change.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    But the real concern that we have, you know, as Marc can probably attest [inaudible], is that the existing data structures include like incomplete email messages.  And there is clearly information that can be contained within request, and within an email that is highly confidential.  So that's the raw data that we have no ability to even consider releasing.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    [Inaudible]… data actually scrub, we have that permission to do that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    We have not explored that with them.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    They are aware of the SLEs [CROSSTALK] implemented, we will have to, once we're prepared to share the information, have to notify them…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    …to get approval.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:          And I'm sure they'll want to see it before.  They always like to see the data before we get approval.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:          Yeah.  I think…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:          It's not like you can get preapproval.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:          I think you should reconsider scrubbing out the TLD, but I think [inaudible] reverse engineer it, and too many people will and it will make it look like you're hiding something unnecessarily.  I think whatever we decide we want to do, split it with the community, there is significant [inaudible], and we should address that by whatever mechanism, and if it does ultimately mean an opt in or an opt out, make [inaudible]… development we should consider.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:          I think we should do everything to avoid an opt in mechanism or an opt out.  This should be a core transparency principle that this is, that we're guiding this, and that we've published because of that.  And any TLD that doesn't like it shouldn't be a TLD basically.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:          Yes, you're no longer a TLD.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     I think the principles that you all wrote in the design team, did not go down to the level of TLDs.  My understanding was the principles, knows these by heart so he'll tell me if I've got it wrong, or that you just wanted to know time stamps basically for how much the IANA functions operator spends, and then how much time might rest with a TLD operator, not a specific TLD operator.

And then how much time it might take the root zone maintainer.  And so by putting in explicit TLD operators, that it wasn't…  The principle didn't make it sound like you wanted to identify individual organizations…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     I certainly hadn't thought it through until now.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     So let me tell you.  I think that if we are going to show the TLD, I'm going to have a problem because there is nothing in my contracts with the TLDs that say I can show these kind of data.  And if they are having problems, their competition could use that and say they're not stable and stuff.

And now I'm getting into this problem of allowing people to snoop on others.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     But could we look at the other way around?   Is there anything your contract has stopped you sharing that data?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     No, but I don't want to invite…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     I think this is…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     What if we analyze the data and just assign a number of TLDs, one, two, three, four, so they [CROSSTALK]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     …the challenge with that is that, [inaudible] is something that changes [inaudible] or changes the [inaudible].  So you can roughly correlate the time stamps in the logging to when it actually appears live, and someone could work back from that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     I think it would be trivial to do.

[CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     …it's not like we're offering it.  [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     I'm not sure I understand what's wrong with the proposal.  The proposal would be ICANN is fully transparent.  They say, well, we're going to do this, release the, we will release the time stamps, chip out the TLD, we recognize that…  You just think it makes people look foolish?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Yeah.  It makes it look like, it takes control away to someone else, who is going to do that work of producing that, and makes it look like we're hiding something without actually having thought through the triviality of it.  And I said, I don't think the legal point is whether we're allowed to do it, the legal point is if we can't do it, it's, well, we'll look at the other way around.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     No, but you have to put yourself in the truth of the TLD operator. Right?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     No, I do understand that, but I think that is something that is relatively newly introduced from the commercial implications of some new gTLDs, not all of them.  I don't think it's a long standing principle that we've had about management of the root, and I'm cautious that we change what have been long standing principles based on a relatively probably small number of TLDs, who may be quite litigious about it.

So that's the point I'm making.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        So I think it's considering there is, I think, at least we think, that the presumption of confidentiality to request the process and the details, which is why [inaudible], didn't talk about that particular TLD, just expressed in generality.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        I think the details, I think I understand that, yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        Right.   But [inaudible], details and then what's in the eye of the beholder.  I think these logs, the fact that you [inaudible] checked 50 times before you succeeded, might reflect badly…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        But then that's good.  [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        …to be aware…  [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        Yeah, give them six months' notice…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        …okay, the SLEs are to measure ICANN's performance.  Not to measure whether the TLD is having a problem, changing certain things or

[inaudible], because that's a different issue.  If we're looking to measure now performance of TLDs, that's a different issue.  Let's not go there, please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     No.  In the SLEs, there is clearly a statement about publishing all of this data, and at no point did we imagine it would be [inaudible] to take out the TLD within that.   Okay?   That's something [inaudible] that we haven't expected to be there in the way that that's written.

It's meant to be an open database of what happens to those TLDs, obviously with some of the details removed about [inaudible] between different contacts and those sort of things.  But the expectation was that that would be public.

You know, that's not clearly stated because it was never imagined that it would go the other [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Change from a current environment.  I mean…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     The whole thing is a total change from the current environment, absolutely.  Completely agree.  The new SLA is a total change to the current environment.  I take a significant improvement for the current environment, but it is a total change, yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:   But reading this, the design team email list, there has never been anything about reporting on TLDs.  It's all about reporting ICANN's performance, and making sure that you're not conflating ICANN's performance with delays that might come from TLD operator or from VeriSign.

So it's, I don't know if these were side discussions, but they certainly were not documented in the discussions an email.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:   [Inaudible] because it was a simple, straightforward assumption.  I mean…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:   Well, your assumption, but not everyone else's.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:   …publishing that…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:   I mean, to that point, I [inaudible]…  Clearly never explicitly talked about [CROSSTALK]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:   …and if we want to make that assumption concrete, then I think we actually have to go back to the registry communities [inaudible] and say look, you know, in the future, we're going to, we're thinking about

doing this.  What do you think?  And see what the community thinks.  I don't think, I think it would be really bad for us in the development of service levels for the IANA process to make this sort of change.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    That's a step forward, if you're willing to do that, that's very useful. [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    …explicitly set that up as an assumption nor a principle.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Right.  And to be fair, it's not us that would be, this was to be a community decision.  Yeah, if the CCs and the Gs want to get together and say we want to change things via the CSE, or something like that, you know, there are actually are there, there are now very elaborate mechanisms which will be able to do this in the future.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Just a thought on this.  As I'm sort of going back and forth between anonymous and disclosure.  Is it possible to keep it anonymous, but have it under some sort of light weight document disclosure policy? Like if somebody ask, then just have some reasoning that would be disclosed what it, what the standard would be anonymous?  Is that something that [CROSSTALK]…?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     I think what he's saying is that once we release these things, people would be able to reverse engineer it.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     I completely understand.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     My problem is, yeah it's fine.  It could be easily understood who is having problems and it's not, but let's not go and flaunt it and say, and put it on us that.   ICANN is throwing these guys under the bus, and…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     No, I agree.  I suppose what I'm saying is that it would be the standard, the standard would be anonymous, and we wouldn't release it.  But if there was, if somebody came and said here is a specific [inaudible] document disclosure policy, say here is what I want to know, and then, you know, they could go through that process to have it disclosed, on that individual basis, not for everything.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     I think that our document disclosure policies are very clear.  If you sign a non-disclosure [inaudible] can get you some [inaudible].   So I… [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     …and then that would be a compromise, because at the end of the day, Jay, you're right.  Anybody, you could figure it out, but if you're looking

at it as something bigger and you needed confirmation, then you could go to ICANN and say, here is the reason why I need to know, this is what I'm working on, and then they can make that…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Actually I don't think you would generally be able to…  Certain scenarios, yes, you would be able to figure out.  But in the case of, you know, technical check failing 50 times.  That's not something you'll be able to figure out [CROSSTALK], and that's potentially embarrassing for the registry.  That could impact their business.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     And not the registry, it's the backend provider.  And the backend provider is getting business based on the technical stuff.  Then we are like hurting their business.  [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     But then say, but yeah, I'm a new TLD operator and I'm doing due diligence on a customer and say, I'd like to know have they had massive problems?  And that would be part of a like a standard due diligence.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     If all SLEs measure ICANN's performance, or to measure TLD performance.  And if the goal is to measure ICANN's performance, then we should focus on that and then potentially later discuss the [CROSSTALK]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     …want to focus on ICANN's IANA performance, and not get into situations in which, you know, the [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     We're only going to be able to not figure out if two or more go live at the same time.  So somebody fails checks…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     …the technical…  Internally don't see [inaudible]….

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Good.  Well that's right.  Okay?  That's fine.  So that's not an issue that effects [inaudible] then does it?

So if we don't see the number of times it goes through a technical checks, I'm not talking about that, but I'm not sure anonymization hides that even further.  Do you see what I mean?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     No, but the anonymization would hide the entity that's doing the technical check.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Right, yes.  So if you anonymize and tie that entity, then at the endpoint of which it goes live, when they finally pass the checks, if that's the only place that takes place in the zone at that time, we know who they are.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     But you don't know [inaudible]…  [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     I think we need to blame this on [inaudible]…  [CROSSTALK] I think what I'm hearing, effectively I think TLDs need to, eyes wide open whatever gets decided.  ICANN, I think they'll strongly, if this should all be new disclosures, they need to be kind of [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     This is that the Gs and the [inaudible] should initiate and make sure that their own communities are supportive of this?  And then come forward with this proposal?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Maybe sort of somehow [inaudible] the SLEs, I wonder if we could just get the SLEs for the purpose they're intended, and then…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     My concern was an identity, and it doesn't have the name of the specific TLD or the operator backend.  It should be the ability to track IANA's or ICANN's performance of the change request happens here, when did it get fulfilled?  It's not so much who is that?  Or how long [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:   That's what we're doing,   anonymization, is there any single thread that you can track one case [inaudible]?  That's what I'm asking.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:   Yes.  There would be some kind of [inaudible]…  I think the key pace that transforms it from anonymous to identifiable, is content.  So one option we might want to consider is by having [inaudible]…

I mean, there is also the way that, I don't want to solve that problem [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:   There is a specific reason identified in the SLE report as to why it might be useful to not anonymize, and that is that there have been concerns raised, which I personally don't share, that new gTLDs are prioritized over old ccTLDs or [inaudible] ccTLDs, shall we say.   And if you anonymize, you cannot evidentially prove that that is not the case.  Now I think it is useful, to the IANA ICANN to be able to prove that you are not differentiating between different classes of TLDs.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:   Given that this is anonymized, we would say, this is a ccTLD and this is a gTLD.  We actually, because you are asking for the SLEs to be separate between ccs and Gs.  We are going to give you that information, these are ccs, these are Gs.  But we're not going to tell you which TLD it is. That's all.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Yeah.   But if there is any question as to whether there is a differentiation taking place, you're not able to prove that.   You are between that one incidence of gTLDs, all gTLDs.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    You can aggregate and trend the data.   You can, just as we do today. We aggregate and trend delegations and re-delegations, and then say what the average processing time is, so that we do that on a high level today, just not to their…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    I think, to Jay's point, gTLDs are faster process because [inaudible] usually very few hiccups, where ccTLDs with often nearly [inaudible] don't have a lot of experience, and they take a little time to handhold through the process.   So you just look at the aggregate data, you are going to say that gTLDs are a lot faster, and must draw inferences from that.

I think, I've heard the argument and I agree, the more transparency we give, the more we can relay concerns about stuff that we don't do, but at a cost.   A cost of…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Yeah, but let's remember that our actions, the way I understand SLEs are working is, we're measuring the time we take to do an action, and then there is a measurement for the time the TLD takes an action…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Which is excluded from the…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Which is excluded.  These time are the [inaudible] extracted out and the averages should be okay.  And we can back end and provide that proof, if challenged.  But I think, to get back to what Jonathan said, we should try to focus on the goal which is to get the SLEs that we've put in place to decide on how much data to collect before we start reviewing it to look at SLEs, so that we can move forward.

And if there is going to be enhancements, I'll call them enhancements, to reporting that can be done after the communities agree on what those enhancements should be, above and beyond what's already been disclosed.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     As I told you yesterday, I'm catching up with what's been going on, because after we finished our report, and I basically wasn't involved with anything that happened until a few weeks ago, when we starting getting, again, news about this process, and we learned about Mark's study.

So I'd really like to understand where we are and where we are going. And it seems to me, from what I hear, is that now we are in the process of collecting the data that will allow us to compute the SLEs that we defined, as different from what could be computed from the data that's used, you had before, right?

And Max's study refers to that, not to what has been collected now. Right?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:      Correct.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:      And that's, this process will, when we have an update and understand this thing whether we need [inaudible] months or six, will allow us to, or the community, to decide what the perfect levels are?  Right?  The thresholds, and this process will then be an ongoing process because that same data will allow the community to determine when there has been a breech, or will perform this within the proper [inaudible].  Am I right in that understand?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:      Yeah.  And I think David has put up a, thanks to Kim.  David has put it up…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:      Can I just say first?  [CROSSTALK]  Yeah.  Thank you to Mark for that report.  I think, personally, that that was a better report than we could have written if we've been given the data.  So that was excellent.  And so I have no concerns at all about the way that was taken forward and that was dealt with.  That was very nicely done piece of work.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Thank you for that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Transfer the comments to [inaudible]?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Actually, do you want to speak to this?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Yeah sure.  This is really just a [inaudible] landscape that you're talking about, which is what we've done and what we're doing.  There is really sort of six steps we show on this diagram.  We've split it into two slides. The first one was what you folks have done, which is, you know, [inaudible] aspects has done.

We then took various identified what as [inaudible] was capturing. We've gone through a software development [inaudible], that software deployment happen on 2$^{nd}$ of March.  As the 2$^{nd}$ of March now we're logging that [inaudible]…  And I mentioned we're sort of [inaudible] collecting data.  We tried to [inaudible] if necessary, we figured that's probably a good thing to do if we teak the SIs in the future.

Sixth step, which I'll go back to our development team after this meeting, and we'll kick off in earnest, is taking that role of not only anonymizing it, but actually developing sort of the dashboard component to it too, which is generating graphs, generating the ability to drill down into the data and [inaudible] web interface, and that will be the public representation of the data on our website post-transition.

So. The notion is as we develop that and we have like our first preliminary dashboard, we'll share it with you as a draft and we'll continue to share data as we get more and more confident. After we have this period of data question, which is I guess the exact period that we, as the topic of discussion here, but is the…

My assumption is what we have confidence in the data. We want to go through and check the data and get our records, make sure everything lines up. And you know, be confident that the data that is coming to the dashboard is truly accurate. Once we've satisfied that, you know, we then need to [inaudible] what the actual thresholds are, percentage this time, whatever the case may be.

And then we can take that agreement between the community and ICANN, back into the dashboard and basically do sort of the color highlighting of the thresholds. So it is actively tells you, you know, we're within the threshold, seeing the threshold, so on and so on. But those five steps kind of bring us to transition, and then the assumption is, through a regular process, we are of course evolving, communicating with the CFC, [inaudible] periodic review, whatever the case may be that these don't become static.

These don't become locked in on… We're happy to adapt these measurements, adapt these thresholds based on further discussions in the future, in the months and years to come. That's kind of how we envision this working.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     There is actually a blog posted this morning, that actually goes into, discusses this to some extent.  And we proposed within that blog that the initial period be three months, as I think we discussed on a call earlier.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     How do the SLAs compare immediate at all prior to the transition?  How do they compare at the various stages of evolution?  Because one of the concerns might be that this is, you're going to see no improvement, or…  How do the SLAs compare that PTI will be held to compare to what [inaudible] entity is?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     So right now, our SLAs are kind of [inaudible]…  So for ccTLDs delegation [inaudible], 120 days is the expectation to complete a ccTLD delegation or re-delegation.  And we're supposed to do that 50% of the time, I think.  And that was the result of the public comment period, and we have made some aggressive suggestions in our public comment where we said 90 days and we would do it 80%.  And the comments came back like, you're smoking something.

You better really reduce it and make 120 days and only 50%.  And so we've been tracking against that, and we hit it every time, quite easily.  Then with the gTLDs, it's a different metric.  And that metric is 20 days, it's 20 days and we have to hit it 80% of the time.

And again, we've hit the metric and we put in the publication, which TTLDs missed or didn't miss it.  And that's just end to end time.  So there

is no breakdown of what was the time spent by the IANA function staff. There is no breakdown of what time was spent by NTIA, no breakdown of what time is spent by VeriSign, and no breakdown of how much time the requestor spent after they have initially submitted it.

So it's a very high level and just end to end times, and that's the SLA we report on now and have been, I think it's two years now. So they're all published on the IANA dot org slash performance website. So this will have the ability, as you requested, to show how much time ICANN spends on the IANA function piece, how much time the requestor spends in the iterations where something is unclear?

How much time from when it takes to where we submit it to VeriSign to show up in the root zone? And so that could be the next layer of SLA, but you may want to show more data. You could say how much time does it take in technical checks. And I think once we see the raw data, and it gets, the SLE data gets shown, then this group, or I don't know if it's a broader group, will look at that and decide, okay, what's important for us to know?

Do we need to know each and every one of these metrics? Or do we want to have some aggregate of those times?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:      I'm going to get right to the point. I mean, for me, it feels sensible where we're going, and I quite look the proposal of intricate improvement beyond the concern, I think, from the design team. And I don't want to put words in you guys' mouth. The concern is, is this a [inaudible] to push it further down the track?

That's, you know, are we going to have a meaningful SLA in place at the time of the transition?  Because that's what I don't want [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     And I understand that…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Can we go back to the slide?   Because I think that's the [inaudible]…
[CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     The question is, if I understand what you're saying with three months of data collection, you can guarantee that we'll have something meaningful at the time, but with six months, you can't make that guarantee.  Is that the case?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Six months we won't hit the transition date.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Right, so six months you won't make it, okay?  So with three months…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     The math…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        No, I don't need to.  Okay?  So that's the point that you're making is that, if it's down to three months, you can guarantee they'll make it and hit it there.  Yeah?  Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        And therefore we will have meaningful SLAs in place [CROSSTALK]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        [Inaudible] we think we will have something meaningful to measure, so that we can accept the SLA.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        Exactly.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        If after six months, or nine months, or a year, we have more meaningful data, then the committee can review the data and say, you know what? These SLAs were set to high, because the data is [inaudible] much better, we can adjust it.  That's all.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        This is a deliberate intention is that we are not trying to tie the SLA to increase the performance of the IANA at the time of go live, okay?  By nature, it will look very different because we're taking out this process in this detail, and taking out the process in time that's held with the TLD currently, which is part of the, you know, IANA metric, which is just ridiculous, that part there.

So that's taken out.  So they all look very different for these reasons. But basing it on true data means that it's a reasonably fair way of doing that, and the mechanism is then [inaudible] and said for the CFC to do something about that, either up or down, because the three months may be unrepresentatively you know tight, compared to six months or something like that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     To that point, for me, I mean, what keeps me up at night is not the kinds of requests the people in the room are doing.  We do a lot of gTLD delegations, we do a lot of name server changes in ccTLDs.  But if you look at the complexity of all of the measures, there are some things we'll do like one a year of.  And part of the thinking of having a large amount of data is that we don't really want to upset SLAs based on one or zero events.

That's kind of a unique situation we're in because we have some really oddball stuff we do from time to time that we are going to measure.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Yeah.  I wonder if it will make sense that anything that we don't have sufficient data, and we'll have to identify what that threshold would be, will be just to fall back on the existing SLAs the community seems to be happy with, you know, since IANA's operation.  [CROSSTALK]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Why don't need that, the committee to decide?  Once we have the data….

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:      Yeah, yeah.  I was just suggesting it in the proposal.  And I'm not saying that we will do that.  It's just an idea.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:      So do you have a list of all possible requests and actions that you'll be checking [inaudible] the data against the [inaudible]?  Or how are you going to deal with a zero event?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:      Well, I mean, we'll be accessing against the [inaudible] team's report, which has that four page table, and we're trying to produce measures that [inaudible].  And you know, we should know the population size of each of those events, and [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:      After three months, we'll have obviously have a population size, each of the cells in the table.  It's just some of them may not be sufficient to get specifically those samples, and in that case, what do we do?  And that's why I was suggesting maybe the falling back on sort of the high level SLAs.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:      Do you know if the design team's table covers every single action on the [inaudible]?  Did we miss anything?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Probably covers more than everything.  Rather than less.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Good.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     But also too, so as regards ccTLD del re-del, you're not going to have enough data in 90 data to develop, right?  So…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Maybe too…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Yeah.  I think that goes without saying, but there is a general sense that that's a meaningful period given the time constraint we're in.  But also two, is to not recognize that the moment that the CFC is constituted, they'll have the data, and they could immediately start a process of reviewing those in terms of SLE.  Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     And David, to your point.  Myself, I would be cautious about just reverting too easily to the high level SLEs.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Absolutely.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Certainly us as a registry, we'd rather have the new ones, but maybe we should flag those who are, have really weak data, and maybe escalate those in terms of reconsideration. Some way, some exception procedure for those where the data…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     We have a mechanism within there, which is the threshold. We have to meet that. So we've put a specific time on it, but the threshold is largely, it's a probability thing. So if actually this physical number is very low, we can dial down the number that need to meet that, to then get to a point where we get, [inaudible] then dial up the threshold later, without actually having to change over time, possibly.

And you know, the other thing that we've got is we've got the report that has some very useful information about some things in there, and that can then guide and, I think, fill some of the holes as well. So.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     So it sounds like we're coming together. In three months it's going to be okay?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Well, I'm disappointed it didn't start in January, and then we'd have the six months. But I don't need, we don't need to get into the reasons about that, because I think, that will be just time wasting, I suspect. So yes, I personally can see a way forward with this, certainly.

**EN**

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Just as an expectation setting. I want to be clear. We start a session on March 2nd. In testing, we have looked for data. We haven't looked at the real data, [inaudible] and cross verified it and so on. We'll start doing that next week. I think there is a reasonable chance that we might need to tweak and do another deployment in bills, so end of that first three month [inaudible]…

It might take us a few weeks to get there.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     So it doesn't start 2nd of March?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     I don't know. I mean, if I develop as a great movement [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     What's the drop dead date for [inaudible]?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     That's a question to the group. What's the latest date [CROSSTALK]…?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     …three months back from August 15…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     So you're not going to be able to do three [inaudible] everything [CROSSTALK]….

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Three months and then add a month for actually doing the [inaudible], so say four months.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    I think [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    So expectation is by April 1st, we should have discovered if there were any gotchas, able to… Yeah, April Fool's Day.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Sort of [inaudible] my notes. It would be nice if there was some firm responsibility taken within ICANN about the amount of time you need after the data collection to implement things, so that we know from you, what that drop date is, and then if there is a problem and it's not met, then we [inaudible] call you into account for that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Some of this is going in parallel, even though [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    I think that's right, it is that we need to know the time it's going to take the committee to say yes, we have the raw data, these are the SLAs that [inaudible] from the… We put them in the contract and we get all of

that done.  So there is work there, there is work to generate the data, you know, to run the, whatever the…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        Describer and the aggregate…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        Yeah.  And then there is a collection data.  We need to know these three elements so that we can give it a deadline that says, if we don't [inaudible], we are already missing our chance.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        So if you go from April 1$^{st}$ to July 1$^{st}$, that's three months of data collection.  That means, can you get everything else done from July 1$^{st}$ to August 1$^{st}$?  You?  You personally.  [LAUGHTER]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        Ultimately, I mean, the point being that once you've collected the data and got the [inaudible] is at, we're just signing that off.  You haven't done something crazy, we're adjusting it.  That's it.  So there is a relatively short process, you know, a couple of days or something like that.  And it's one of the things that we just [inaudible], but we should also…

But probably at that point, it goes to CWG.  [Inaudible] exactly recommend that it's happy with it, formal time off by CWG, back to you, and so yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        And so it needs to have some idea of the time, that the two week period that, four week period and [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        So the TT….

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        [Inaudible] has to be available like the beginning of July to take their step.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        No, but actually if we can plan it ahead [CROSSTALK]…  That the DT meeting, and the CWG meeting.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        You mean we could set those up now?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        Yes.  In principle, we could.  But it feels like, you know, something like three weeks, just to be safe.  That kind of, but which is fine.  It's well within the window of what [inaudible]… and planned the dates.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        So we should start socializing that July 1st to say 21st sort of time period, so that everyone at least has it on their mental calendar.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     So just a [inaudible] question from my point.  When the SLEs are given, is there already a formula for getting the SLAs out?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     These…  We just need figures that come out of data collection that fill in some boxes, and that's it.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Okay.  [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     …average [inaudible] standard deviation, all that stuff.  But the actual selection of what the actual values are, how does that happen?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Yeah, we're going to be given…  [Inaudible].  We'll give you a medium for, you know, processing a request.  You don't want to set a SLA on a meeting.  [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     …goes back to my earlier question.  So we'll have a [inaudible] SLA in place at the time of the transition.  [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:         Earlier on in this process, we discussed thresholds from the 95th percentile, those sort of things.  And I thought there had been pushback on that, that you wanted to set those percentiles based on that data.  So I thought you would be giving us…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:         We can do that if you like.  [LAUGHTER]  I'm serious.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:         So am I.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:         You would do that [inaudible] data, and then we would sanity check that.  [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:         [Inaudible] we think are reasonable….

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:         I agree because we went through them.  We said, oh, we're not going to hold them to five nines, but what's our relevant number?  We said 95%.  [CROSSTALK]  Yeah, and those are in the report, exactly, yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:         So when we select a table, you would like them…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:       Proposed SLA…  [CROSSTALK]


UNKNOWN SPEAKER:       …sanity check and then give us [CROSSTALK] or just do we need to change it and why?  Yeah.


UNKNOWN SPEAKER:       Okay.  So second week of July, you can start having your meetings.


UNKNOWN SPEAKER:       Yeah.


UNKNOWN SPEAKER:       [Inaudible] been raised, but there was a survey, four or five years ago, where they collected that sort of information on what was the expectation from the TLD.


UNKNOWN SPEAKER:       Correct.


UNKNOWN SPEAKER:       That is something that would be very useful in an exercise, but I don't think that [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     No, we're really trying not to change what the current data collection is. So we're trying to base it on, you know, what they think is reasonable based on the data, not based on people's expectations.    The expectations come in later to the SFC to adjust those things.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     So the question I have is, we're reporting monthly on SLE performance. Okay?  So if you have a particular area of measurement that has very minimal activity.  And 95% of two….

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Exactly.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     It becomes…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     That's deliberately addressed that the measurement period can be over a year, but it's still reported monthly.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        [Inaudible]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        It's also noted in, yeah, okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        And that's precisely the kinds of issues where I would hesitant to throwing out percentages earlier in the process until we had to [inaudible], because those kinds of issues will emerge when we see relative number instead of [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        Well you can state the percentages in terms of [inaudible].  95% over six months, or over [CROSSTALK] and you can show the, you can still report the progress, there is that….

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        But the percentage thresholds are all annual.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        Okay.  That answers my question.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        Okay.  And we have Mark's data, which actually, very nicely, shows us the outliers.  Recently [inaudible]…

**EN**

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    You should speak up Mark.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Be careful about [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    But what he does is very clearly identify the outliers, and allow the outliers to be removed.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Before you make too much conclusions, please call me.  [LAUGHTER]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    He stands behind the report.  [LAUGHTER]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    So I'm hearing that we are creating a baseline, then we'll adjust that later on.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Forgive me for asking this, I know you're all trustworthy but, how do we know you're not going to go as slow as you possibly can in the three months for that baseline?  [LAUGHTER]  [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    We continue reporting what we have been reporting now for a number of years.   At least until transition if not further.   So if suddenly [inaudible] requests takes longer in the next three months, our existing reporting mechanisms should [inaudible]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Right.  We report…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    [Inaudible]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    We have another monthly report which is there, which shows the number of root zone requests we receive, and then the average processing time for each of those root zone categories and requests.  I trend it personally for our own benefit, and anyone who wanted to could also see whether it spikes or not.  And…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    So we'll take your current, the next three months data collection and look at what's happened previously according to previous reporting.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Well, I think that the metrics are not comparable in the sense, but accept end to end.  Because what we report now, is say the average

processing time, I think is typically around nine to 10 days for gTLD delegations. But that doesn't include, it's an average, any times that the, that includes the time the customer takes. So it should be that all of our average time should be lower, because we're taking out any iterations that we have with the customer.

We're not reporting on the VeriSign time. So the IANA actually performance should be less than the average time because today, our average time has includes all of those things.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Especially, I mean, we do report on [inaudible] we just have a [inaudible] SLAs on that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Right.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     [Inaudible] report metric.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     So that's understanding our bit of it then. So Jonathan and Lisa, it then goes to you. Do you see any hiccups, problems there that means you need a particularly long to deal with that? Or is that really…? You're just taking, you know, the recommendation from us?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     We should build ourselves a bit of slack here just to be safe, if we can. But I mean, realistically, and if it has been done logically and especially if we explain to the group what's going to happen and so on, it should be just a matter of going, putting through the group through due process rather than anything else.  That's my sense.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     I agree and anyway, your email list is open, right?  So they can follow the work, and I can…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     I can explain the way it's going to work and get concerns up front. Done?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Everybody happy?  [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     An important remark.  In the interest of keeping our acronyms right, what used to be design team A, the DTA was remain the SLE working group.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     And so who is going to [inaudible], because Paul is someone who is potentially, you know, out of the process, and that's one thing we have to do is make sure Paul is brought along.  And is anyone willing to bring him up to speed and make sure that…?  Has anyone taking any notes from this session?  [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     It's been recorded, okay.  So we can report to the recording… [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     …recording, we'll have a transcript and the recording, but we started a little bit late.  The recording may not be as [CROSSTALK]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     [Inaudible] back in Brussels [CROSSTALK]…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     But also too, I haven't heard anything today that is different from what you were relying on in the last call we had, in terms of the 90 days.  So there was no…  And Paul was, wasn't he on that call Jonathan?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     He was.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     So basically it is more or less, there was a meeting of the group to confirm the process that was proposed in the last call, and you know, there was obviously some details, and you know, I'm warmed by what I've heard.  So I think, yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Just so I know that Paul is pretty passionate about this subject. [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     ….like a lot more data than three months.  There is no choice about…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     But I think he's accepted that.  And I recall from this past CWG meeting, that he accepts that we are where we are as far as that's concerned.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     We would love more data too.  [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     …an artificial barrier that has been put in front of us…

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     Yeah, yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:          Again that has been put in place for continuous improvement anyway.



UNKNOWN SPEAKER:          Yeah, exactly.


**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**