
ICANN78 | AGM – Customer Standing Comm & PTI Board
Sunday, October 22, 2023 – 4:30 to 5:30 HAM

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Hello and welcome to the Customer Standing Committee and PTI board session. My name is Claudia Ruiz. I am the participation manager for this session. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the I can expect it standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form, as noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. If you would like to ask your questions or make your comments verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly and at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when done speaking this session includes automated real time transcription. Please note this transcription is not official or authoritative to view the real time transcription, click the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, full first name and last name or surname. You will be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. With that, I will now hand the floor over to Brett Carr, chair of the CSC. Thank you.

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.

BRETT CARR:

Thank you. Excuse me. Thank you very much and welcome everybody, to the Customer Standing Committee meeting 75 which I keep getting confused by the fact we're in meeting ICANN 78. So we're going to do the meeting in two separate sections today. We're going to do the normal monthly business of the CSC and then we'll move on to a longer section where we're going to talk about the framework work towards potentially changing the SLAs in the future.

So we'll do a very quick run through the action items first. Two is to schedule a tabletop exercise for the next community forum. This is a follow on exercise from Cancun where we did a tabletop exercise. This is the next part of that and it's to be scheduled for the ICANN 81 meeting.

Action item three is the CSC to develop former communication templates. This again is an output from the tabletop exercise we did in Cancun. And we've pencil in the start date of July 2024 to be completed by ICANN 81.

Action item [174] is staff to circulate CSC findings for September 2023, which is one of the things we're here to discuss now, which is completed. Action item [0274,] include technical test procedures in review of SLAs. That will be part of our review of the SLAs, which we'll talk about in the second part of the meeting. Action item 0374, onboarding of the new membership and alternates, which we did last week. I think it was. Yeah, that's completed. New procedures published online is also completed. Staff to circulate documentation to prepare discussion of framework for SLAs. That was completed last week. So hopefully those people in the room who want to discuss it have read

those preparatory notes. And then lastly, is to invite Kim to provide a high level overview of the SLAs, which again, we'll do in the second part of the meeting.

So that's a run through of the action items. Any questions or comments on any of those action items before I move on? No. Okay. Thank you very much. So we'll move on to agenda item number three, which is the PTI report to the CSS for September 2023. And I will hand over to Amy, who's on my left.

AMY CREAMER:

Thank you. This is Amy Creamer for the record. Actually, it's not necessary to pull it up, but for the month of September, we hit 100% of our SLAs. And if there are no questions, I will pass it off to my colleague with I can. Jennifer Bryce.

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Thanks, Amy. It's Jennifer Bryce, ICANN Org. as Amy said, performance is 100% of the SLAs. I circulated the draft report via email, I believe, on the 6th of October. There it is on the screen. Any questions or comments? Happy to take them. Otherwise, Brett, back to you. Thanks.

BRETT CARR:

So no questions or comments in the room. I'd like to obviously congratulate the PTI, 100% again. Always good to see that number each month. So I propose that we approve both of these reports for this month and ask if anybody doesn't agree with that approval. Thank you very much. So that is passed and we'll move on.

BART BOSWINKEL: And we'll record as an action item to staff to circulate, as the usual one.

BRETT CARR: Yeah. Thank you. So number four is completion of the CSC membership selection process and onboarding, which I'd like to welcome the new members and alternates in the CSC. The onboarding has been done for those already. Welcome to them. And I think it's really good to have those alternates on board. That gives a lot of flexibility going forward to allow—For those who don't know, very quickly, we put in the alternates in place because there is a requirement for a minimum amount of people in the CSC, which is quite a small amount. There's a minimum. There's a requirement for them to always be present at meetings each month. And sometimes that has been a challenge, especially sometimes due to the geographical spread of the group. So putting the alternates in place was to help assist with that. And well, it is brand new, so we don't know how effective it will be, but hopefully it should be effective going forward. Any questions or comments?

And then I'll move on to any other business, which I don't have any. Does anybody else have any other business? In that case, we'll class the first part of the CSC meeting as being adjourned. We overrun by one minute. I think we started one minute late. So exactly to time.

So we'll move on to the second part of the meeting. This is where we're going to talk about the potential looking at reviewing SLAs and the framework for doing that. So this is a joint meeting of the CSC and the PTI around the development of that framework for a general review of

the SLAs. To kick things off, I think it would be useful to do a quick tour around the table to get an idea of who's in the room. So we can start at that end and work this way around. That includes the people in the back as well, obviously, but be fairly quick.

MARILIA HIRANO: Marilia Hirano, director of strategic programs for IANA.

SALINA HARRINGTON: Salina Harrington, operations manager, IANA.

HARRY CHAN: Harry Chan from Nominet.

GORDON DICK: Gordon Dick from Nominet.

KIM DAVIES: Kim Davies, PTI president and PTI board member. And before I pass the mic, I just wanted to note that the PTI board, at least one member is on their way. Another member should be calling in. So hopefully they'll be trickling in very soon. But the goal is to have some other board members here very shortly. Thank you.

AMY CREAMER: Hi, Amy Creamer, director of operations with PTI.

BRETT CARR: Brett Carr, chair of the CSC.

YAZID AKANHO: Yazid Akanho, office of the CTO.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Jennifer Bryce, project manager for the office of the CTO. ICANN Org.

BART BOSWINKEL: Bart Boswinkel, CSC support.

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro Hotta, JPRS M-root operator, alternate liaison from RSSAC to CSC.

YURI TAKAMATSU: Yuri Takamatsu from M-root operator.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Joke Braeken, ccNSO staff support.

BARRACK OTIENO: Barrack Otieno, AFTLD.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Abdelmonem, CSC observer, ccNSO.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible]

RICK WILHELM: Rick Wilhelm, registry stakeholder rep on the CSC.

OLGA CAVALLI: Olga Cavalli, ccNSO council member.

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard, Army research lab, RSSAC liaison to the CSC.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Xavier Calvez, PTI board member and ICANN CFO.

FREDERICO NEVES: Frederico Neves, ccNSO representative and vice chair of CSC.

ELAINE PRUIS: Elaine Pruis, former CSC member and vice chair.

LARS-JOHAN Liman: Lars-Johan Liman, root server operator, RSSAC and former chair of CSC.

ERUM WELLING: Erum Welling, DISA, G root observer.

PETER KOCH: Peter Koch, Denic.

RUBENS KUHL: Rubens Kuhl, NIC.br.

MARCELO: Marcelo [inaudible], NIC.br.

RAJIV PRASAD: Rajiv Prasad, Google LLC, observer.

JOSEPH HAYES: Joseph Hayes, DISA.

MAARTEN SIMON: Maarten Simon, SIDN, and I'm walking towards the other side of the room.

LAENA RAHIM: Laena Rahim, ICANN org.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Daniel Migault, IETF liaison.

SEAN COPELAND: Sean Copeland, ccNSO.

IRINA DANELIA: Irina Danelia, ccNSO council.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible]

MILTON MUELLER: Milton Mueller, I guess I'm a liaison for the GNSO.

DMITRY BURKOV: Dmitry Burkov, CSC member.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: And Claudia Ruiz, staff support for CSC.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you, Claudia. Back to you.

BRETT CARR: Thank you, everybody, and thank you for doing that so quickly. I had a feeling that was going to take too long, but you all did a sterling job. Thank you. So now I'm going to hand over to the PTI and to Kim in particular to provide an overview of the SLAs as they are currently defined so we've got a kind of good starting point for the discussion that we're going to have. Kim, over to you. Thanks.

KIM DAVIES: Thanks, Brett, and thanks for the invitation to present. My brief, as I understand it, was a request that I just give some context on the SLAs, how they came to be, what they are, to inform the future work of the CSC as it looks at the suitability of the current SLAs for the current environment. Next slide, please.

So just incidentally on my way here, I saw this in the departure lounge of my gate, and it just seemed kind of appropriate. Thankfully, we're not measuring hygiene tests with IANA, but kind of indicative of what we're trying to accomplish here with the naming functions of IANA. Thankfully, also, our scores are a little higher. Next slide, please.

So just by way of introduction, just to set the scene, we currently have 63 different types of measurements we perform for the naming functions. They're all measures of essentially transactional processing capabilities. Most of them are time-bound, how quickly things are done, measuring to be conformant with a certain target time frame. But there are other measurements as well, particularly in relation to accuracy, making sure that when we actually conclude our processing, the end result is what was expected from the process. We publish them in primarily two different manners. One is in a real-time dashboard. Real-time means with a latency of a few minutes, but generally speaking in real-time. That's available at sla-dashboard.icann.org.

And secondarily, we crystallize those values in a monthly report that we submit to the CSC. We deliver that to the CSC by the 15th of each subsequent month. The data is identical. It's literally pulling from the same data source. The only difference I would note with the monthly reports, we also provide a narrative on any missed SLAs. So whenever we don't meet a particular threshold for the given month, Amy and her team will look into the circumstances around that and enter in a narrative into the reporting function. So you can see that spelled out as to the key contributor to us missing that particular SLA. Next slide, please.

So for those that are not familiar with the context of the creation of the SLAs in the beginning, it was a product of the IANA stewardship transition. Prior to the stewardship transition under the contract with the US government for performance of the IANA functions, there was a different set of SLAs, quite different in fact. There was very little commonality between what we measured prior to 2016 and what we've been measuring since. During the transition process, a number of design teams were convened, and one of the design teams, in fact, design team 8, was tasked with creating what were called service level expectations or SLAs. The design team was relatively small. I think there was like three representatives of the CCs and three representatives of the gTLDs with a few others as well, meeting in a very expedited fashion, as were all the other design teams for the stewardship transition.

But the actual SLAs themselves were really defined by three people. One of those, and I'll take the blame as myself, also Bernie Turcotte as a facilitator, and one ccTLD representative. I recall in my nightmares spending countless hours just poring over the minor details of our business processes and talking out how things work and then how it could be measured. That collaboration is what resulted in essentially what we have today.

One, I think, most critical design factor that went into it, not driven by me, to be clear, but driven by the objectives of the design team was the design team wanted to make sure that 100% of the time that IANA could possibly take in processing root zone change requests was captured. At the time it was expressed that there was a concern that if that was not done, it would provide an opportunity for IANA to hide performance problems in the non-measured parts. Without passing judgment on

that particular design goal, that was certainly very much the basis upon which the ones we have today. That explains why we measure some things that arguably are very minor processes, and we'll go through the specifics in a moment.

Subsequently, in dialogue with the CSC, and I can't remember what time frame this was, others in the room might remember, but there was a recognition a couple of years later that one part of the service delivery for the naming functions, namely how we process IDN tables, was not captured at all in terms of metrics, so that was added subsequently at a later time. Then there's been some other tweaks to the measurements. I think one particular category, the measurement was completely unrealistic, so it was loosened up, for example. Next slide, please.

For this part, and please indulge us for a moment, I'm going to ask us to switch to this web page. So rather than transcribe this all into slides, I thought it would just be easier to scroll down the page. Before I do, I'll just switch over to the dashboard to give you a sense of this is the real-time dashboard I just mentioned. Everything I'm going to go through here you can find by scrolling through, clicking on the category, and seeing all the current values that are pertinent to our performance.

So this is the formal table of the SLAs that we adhere to. Originally, it was integral to the naming functions contract. Another adjustment that was made subsequently was to extract it from the contract as a separate document in order for the document to be maintained without necessitating changing the underlying contract. And each category really speaks to an element of the processing that, as a cohesive whole, should capture the scope of the item functions.

The first column, which I'll get to in a moment, sorts out different types of root zone change processes into five categories. The reason for this is that, generally speaking, when we do root zone management, we have routine change requests, the day-to-day administration, relatively uncontroversial changes, and those are generally conducted very quickly. And then we have much more complicated requests, ccTLD transfers being notable as probably the most complicated requests we do. We distinguish those different types because the timeliness expectations are very different. The community, I think, recognizes and expects that when we do a ccTLD transfer, that's a business process that will typically take months. There's a lot of collaboration and engagement involved. We're doing essentially a due diligence process on legal documents and submissions and things like that, a very different kind of operational exercise to day-to-day updating NS records in the root zone, things like that. So we have process category, and I'll scroll down. The first one being routine updates impacting the root zone files. So these are the sort of standard day-to-day updates to NS records, DS records, glue records, and the like. If I scroll down further, category two is changes that are not impacting the root zone files. So these changes are changes to the admin contact, tech contacts, and sort of the other non-technical aspects of the records that we keep that also have a relatively quick turnaround time but do not involve actually editing the root zone. So, for example, Verisign as a root zone maintainer is not engaged in these kinds of requests.

The third category is when we create or transfer a gTLD. Here there is some due diligence done by IANA, but it is relatively minor compared to category four, which what I mentioned before, creating or transferring

a ccTLD. This is definitely the most elaborate business process that we have in terms of end-to-end processing time.

And then lastly, we have sort of a catch-all for everything else. We have a few other kinds of change requests that the design team felt were sufficiently unique or bespoke that it wasn't worth categorizing individually. Just a couple of examples for that. One is deleting a TLD, a very rare event, has its own business process. And another kind of root zone change would be a root server update. So if a root server operator wants to update the IP address of their root server, that would be such a change. And this happens very rarely. I think in the last decade maybe once or twice. There was a flurry of activity about ten years ago as every root server operator added IPv6, but beyond that it's an extremely rare event.

Going back to the top, I'm going to go through each individual measure relatively quickly. So the first measure, time for ticket confirmation to be sent to requester following receipt of a change request via the automated submission interface. Essentially this is acknowledgement that we received the request. When this was written, it came from a ticketing system, and the notion was that we should acknowledge and provide a ticket number back relatively quickly. Our operational circumstances evolve now in that because people are logging into a web portal and submitting, it's like literally when you click submit, it pops up in your face that it's lodged, and here's your ticket number, so it's effectively immediate today. The threshold here is that we would do that confirmation within 60 seconds, 95% of the time.

The next category, time for lodgment of change request on behalf of the requester when it's sent by email. So this is relatively rare these days, but we do have the opportunity for certain kinds of requests to receive it by email, particularly people that don't have a login to our system. And then it's our duty as staff to take the email and then enter it on their behalf into the system. And so here the threshold is three days, 95% of the time. I think three days was informed by the fact that we don't operate on weekends, and generally we would expect to take maximum one business day, but because we don't measure in business days, three days was deemed to be appropriate.

As part of any change to the root zone, we do technical checks. So the next category is how long it takes to do the technical checks on a submission. The first category is the very first time we test, which is up front at the start of a request, and the technical checks were asked to complete within 50 minutes, 95% of the time.

When there is a condition where the TLD doesn't pass the tests, our practice is to repeat the tests periodically. Obviously, if the issue is remediated, that allows it to move forward, but if it's not remediated, to continue to provide guidance to the customer that this issue is still existing. On those, the SLA is each time we do those tests to complete them within 10 minutes, 95% of the time.

The next phase is asking for contact confirmation. This is perhaps not the right terminology in the modern age, but those that are required to authorize any given change, when it's time for them in the business process to authorize it, they should be asked to provide their authorization, typically via email. So this is how long it takes for us to

basically send an email to the contact saying, "This request needs approval. Please log in and approve it." And the SLA there is within 60 seconds, 95% of the time.

The next one is time for the response to be affirmed by the contractor. This is when the customer logs in and clicks the approve button, how long it takes for the system to recognize they clicked the approve button and trigger the next step of the business process. Here, the SLA is 60 seconds, 95% of the time.

The next category is essentially a catch-all for what I would summarize as the manual processing of a change request. For every change request, there's some elements of human review, and these are all captured by this measure. Some elements of the human review, I mean, they vary depending on the change request, but every change request is reviewed manually. For straightforward change requests, this review is very simple. One common element for every change request is we do have to monitor all changes for compliance with any relevant regulations where we operate, which includes things like sanctions and things like that, so that's part of that review. In total, we're expected to complete that review within five days, 90% of the time.

Supplemental technical checks, I don't know why this box is blank, but our business process is that once technical checks are passed and we go through all the processing, at the very end, just before we implement in the root zone, we actually do the technical checks one last time. The reason for this is that sometimes the business process is slower, particularly with those ccTLD transfers, but there can possibly be months intervening between when we originally reviewed and tested

the TLD to when we actually want to implement, and we just do it one last time to make sure nothing has fallen out of compliance, and that's what we refer to as the supplemental technical check. There, within 10 minutes, 95% of the time.

Implementation. So once a request is deemed to be ready for implementation, the SLA is that they be implemented within 72 hours, 99% of the time. And then once that is completed, once we're satisfied the request is actually implemented, we have 60 seconds to notify the customer that your request is now complete, and that is 95% of the time. All these measures, the percentages are in the aggregate across any given calendar month that we're measuring.

With that, I'm going to skip through the next because it's the same categories, but now for Category 2. The one thing I want to highlight is as we go down, some of the categories actually do not apply because they're not applicable for that business case or because the design team deems that it's just not appropriate to measure or hold IANA to any particular standard. That other category, Category 5, is a good example of that. Those kinds of requests are so unique individually that there is no specific SLA for performance, but there is a reporting obligation, so we will report our performance, and then the CSC can review that on a monthly basis. Indeed, anyone in the community can review it on a monthly basis, and if there is a concern about our timeliness, then that can be a discussion as opposed to a material failure against the SLAs.

I'm going to scroll down past all these and bring you to the IDN tables, also known as the label generation rule sets. Validation and reviews, so

this is a very different business process to the root zone, to be clear. This is where gTLDs are obligated and ccTLDs voluntarily submit their IDN-related business practices to us in a particularly formatted file called a label generation rule set. When we receive these requests, one of our experts reviews the request, analyzes it, and either decides it's ready to post or provide feedback to the customer that it needs correction. So the time that we would provide that advice back to the customer here is within five days, 90% of the time. Then subsequent to any approvals that are required or authentication, when we're ready to then implement, i.e., publish it in our repository, we then have seven days to do that publication within 90% of the time. If you're wondering why these time periods seem to be a little less aggressive, it's because there's no operational dependency on this being done rapidly in the same way that a root zone change obviously has a material impact on operations when it's performed.

Then we have measurements for accuracy. Our expectation is quite simple, that we never make an error in the root zone. So the SLA is that we implement proof changes 100% of the time with accuracy. Any deviation from this threshold is a reportable event. Similarly for the root zone database, and the root zone database includes the WHOIS and our website representation of the details of a TLD.

Lastly, we have availability metrics for different parts of the system. First is the availability of the root zone management system. This is the portal the TLD managers log into. There the availability is greater than 99%. Website availability, the same. Directory service availability, this is our WHOIS database. Then we have some other measures that are just more meta measures, I guess you could say. When someone does a

password reset request that we have to send the email that they do password recovery with within 60 seconds. When they log in and actually type in their new password and hit submit, that new password needs to propagate within five minutes within our system. The real-time dashboard that I mentioned before needs to have accurate data within 30 minutes. The accuracy of the dashboard has to be 100%. Dashboard availability has to be better than 99%. Production of our SLA reports, the monthly report we provide to the CSC needs to be provided monthly. SLA report availability less than 10 days after the month's end. SLA report publication monthly.

Then the last two pertain to just general questions or inquiries that are sent to IANA that relate to the naming functions. If we just get a question out of the blue like what's your procedure about this or whatever, again, issuing them with a ticket number should happen within 60 seconds. Then the actual substantive response to their query should happen within five days, 90% of the time.

All right, that is a whirlwind tour of the SLAs. If we could just jump back to the slide deck to wrap it up. So these are just my thoughts off the cuff based on what I understand the CSC is reviewing. Some of those measures I just walked through are of little utility. I mentioned that we measure things like how quickly it takes us to send an email. This is a completely automated process. So we're measuring internal processes within a system. I mentioned why it's structured that way. It was a conscious choice of the design team originally. But they are essentially beyond IANA's meaningful control in some ways. They are ranked at the same level of importance as everything else. There's no sort of distinction as I walk through that list which ones are the true key

measures of IANA performance under our control versus things that are highly systematized and probably of lesser value. So bear that in mind as you consider the SLAs.

And then lastly, I think whenever we contemplate changes to the SLAs, this is probably a factor in the discussion. You know, changing them is not free. It is a complex process whenever we want to change these measures. Obviously, there's the community consultation piece that we have to not only come to agreement here, but we have to put it for public comment proceeding, things like that. But more importantly for us as a team within IANA is that every one of these measures is instrumented. We have that real-time dashboard. We have to build software to do these measurements, and that takes time, engineering effort, testing and so forth. So that is work. It's work we have to prioritize. It's work that we have to substitute for something else the community might want. So I think, you know, I know there is a desire to have a perfect set of measurements, but do bear in mind that there is an inherent cost in changing the system we have in place right now. With that, that's all I had to report on for this. Thank you very much.

BRETT CARR:

Thanks, Kim. For what it's worth, I think I agree with you that change for change's sake is not something we want to do. But I do think we need to have a look. You know, it's been quite a while since those things were put in place, and it's worth considering a look but not making changes where there's no real need to make a change.

But anyway, I want to give a little bit of background as to why we're here. The work that we're talking about here is based on output from

the most recent CSC effectiveness review committee, which said that it might be wise for us to review the SLAs as they were developed back in the mists of time now. It doesn't feel like that long ago, but it is, to ensure that they're up to date with anything that might have changed since that original work. And I think that's useful work for the CSC to do. I think the expansion of the CSC into more members has made this – we've got more people who can look at it. I think it gives – sometimes the CSC can be a place where we're getting a report from IANA every week, every month, that says 100%, so we're just going, "Yep, yep, yep." So it gives the CSC something to get their teeth into, so I think that's a good thing. But I think we do need to balance that with let's not make change for change's sake.

So the first stage of this is to develop some kind of framework, and we'll review and update those SLAs should they need updating. And in developing that framework, we need to take views from the PTI, the PTI board, and the CSC into account, which is why we're here. We've only got 20 minutes left in this meeting, but we will continue these discussions online and in future meetings as well. This is just a starting point.

So to start working towards that framework, ICANN staff circulated the document a little while ago with some thoughts in it, and in particular some questions. So hopefully the members of the CSC that are here and online have had a chance to have a look at that document, because now is the time when I find out you haven't done your homework. So I'd like to spend a few minutes discussing each of those questions. I'll read them out and try and give some context, and then open it up to the floor for comments.

I haven't got time in this meeting to read out this entire document, so hopefully some of you have read it enough to be able to comment on some of these questions. But first of all, in the document it was detailed the current procedures around determining if SLAs need changing and their limitations, and there were several categories listed there. And the first question that was posed in the document is, should those categories be expanded, and should they include a new category, for example, change of multiple related SLAs? So I'll open that up to the floor for questions and comments mainly, or views.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Let me explain the background of this document. This is a summary paraphrasing of the current procedure to change SLAs. What I've done is included the introduction, which is really referring back to the findings or the CSC findings around a review team report and why they suggested this. This was the result of a conversation with the PTI, PTI board, and the CSC. That's why they picked it up, this whole idea of SLA change. That's one.

Secondly, if you look at the procedure itself, I would say there are two categories or two steps. One is, as you can see, the current procedure to determine if an SLA needs to be changed. So that's the, I would say, the conversation between, if you go down this path, between PTI and the CSC to look at a change. In the past, and I think that the examples that you refer to is one of the-- was the IDN table, the other one was technical check, and the other one was a change of the ccTLD transfer or delegation SLA. These were the three changes, and they were the

result of a conversation between the CSC and PTI to really understand whether the change was needed, etc.

When this procedure was developed, you can see it's really focused on the change of one SLA, one specific SLA out of the whole list. Now, the question, what you see in front of you is more, is there a need to introduce something like a new category or multiple just to allow the CSC and PTI to go through a whole-- yeah, I would say almost a set of a subset of all the SLAs. So that's the background. This is not about taking any decision on changing it. It's more they did pre-work whether to understand and whether there is really a change needed. So that's the first step. Can you scroll down, please, Claudia? Go to the next page.

So then you have the current procedure to change the SLAs. So that's really after the CSC and PTI have agreed upon, yeah, a change might be useful, then there is a whole assessment set like the ones that Kim introduced in his final slide, what's the cost, what's the impact of such a change, how long does it come up with an implementation plan. So that's all described in the process, which you can, if you go down the path of expanding the current procedure, which may apply to the full set as well. So to ensure that you don't go lightly down the path of changes, and this worked in the past. And then there are a few questions there as well, but this is just to steer up the discussion to provide a little bit of background, Brett, to the questions that have been raised. So maybe with this background, we can go back up to the first question so you understand the different categories.

Maybe one additional point before I forget. One of the comments that was in the CSC review report, also, again, reiterated by Kim in his

presentation, was about the consultation. This categorization of the changes is also reflected in the need to almost, first of all, inform community of changes. So only a small change, there is a need to inform. All the other changes, like introducing a new one or deleting one, all inform a public consultation of the community. So it's a very relatively heavy-handed procedure to ensure that the direct customers and others are informed about these changes. So that's embedded in this process as well.

But the initial part is whether there needs to be a change or determine whether there needs to be a change. That's between the CSC and PTI. But, again, the CSC also has a consulting or consultation role and PTI as well. So that's the safeguards you have already in this initial phase. So that's a bit of the background of the procedures and the questions. And now we can go back up to the first question. Thanks, Brett.

BRETT CARR:

Thanks, Bart. As always, Bart acts as my memory. So if we can go back up to the question on the share. So the question that we want to discuss initially is going back to what we were talking about a minute ago, is those categories that are listed, the new SLA, remove SLA, change SLA, should those be expanded to include a new category, i.e., a change of multiple related SLAs? So I'll open up to the floor and see if anybody's got any views on that.

MILTON MUELLER:

One of the things that struck me about the very useful presentation by Kim was that let's suppose the item is meaningful and important, but

you're in that 5% or 10%. And so it looks like they're meeting the requests, but from your point of view, maybe there was some very damaging missing of the thresholds or bad performance from the standpoint of one particular registry or TLD operator. Do you have a complaint process, or would that be possibly a new SLA item in which somebody who was in that 5% or felt wrong could simply file a complaint and say this is what happened, and the new SLA item might be a minimum number of complaints or no complaints or something like that? Is that something that's possible, or is that already part of the procedure where you can complain?

BRETT CARR:

I mean, there is a complaints procedure to IANA, right, to the PTI?

KIM DAVIES:

Yeah, I think that's a very good point. Currently, we do have a complaint process. If you go to [IANA.org/escalation](https://iana.org/escalation), you'll find it. Part of Amy's role in the CSC in each monthly meeting is to report in the aggregate complaints we have received. I'm very gratified to report that I think in almost every month that the answer is zero, so it's not a process that is regularly invoked by any means.

I would also note that, to your point about possibly hiding values within those percentages, I think generally speaking we have the converse problem. We have so few data points in any given month for certain types of requests that all it takes is one miss, and we automatically miss the SLA. I think that was true last month that we had one request take 17 minutes instead of 10, and that was our only miss in recent months.

I think it was explained in the CSC, and the CSC understood the context and was okay with the performance. But nonetheless, that was a ding on our record in terms of our performance.

Lastly, I'll just note that the dashboard does provide minimums, maximums, as well as the averages. If you want to drill down into the data a little bit and identify maximums, I think that's another way you could possibly identify what are the tallest ten poles in the reporting. Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Milson, one of the reasons why you always see this in the findings report is this is one of the areas where the CSC may use complaints to understand whether there is a systemic issue or performance issue. And there is a procedure, so the remedial action procedure, which fortunately never, ever had to be invoked, but this is a very heavy-handed one where if there is a recurring missing of SLAs or there is issues around complaints where this procedure would kick in. So in that sense, that bit is covered off. It's not [round.] I hope that addresses your point. Thanks.

BRETT CARR:

Thanks, Bart.

FREDERICO NEVES:

I would like to add something. As Kim said, sometimes we have so few data points that make us missing, I mean, PTI missing one of the SLAs. But besides of that, we are normally here only measuring or we should

only be measuring the PTI performance. So if I'm not completely wrong, a few months ago, we missed a few SLAs, but because the measurements were taking in account time of the requestor, so there was in the past some times that we have been measuring and not completely correctly. So perhaps is not a situation for reviewing the SLAs, but at least a few process of how we measure a few of them.

BRETT CARR:

I completely agree with you, for what it's worth. I will say though we're going slightly off topic from what the question is. I think that's definitely should talk about. I think there are things probably in SLAs that no longer need to be measured. But yes, Rick.

RICK WILHELM:

So to the question that you were asking, I think that while I am, like Fred, anxious to get into revising the SLAs, I unfortunately agree that we need to take a preamble step and revise the process for revising SLAs to open it up, because as it sits right now, a strict reading of what we have there would actually probably restrict us to do the kind of revision that we would probably want to end up doing—Sorry, I would probably want to end up doing. So I think we should look at expanding the way that this is allowing us to do it, because right now it seems to only allow very singular, my term, not staff's term, line edits, but we should look at allowing it to do more category level things, because otherwise, if we do these things, PTI is going to end up with sort of a piecemeal, I believe, would end up with a piecemeal revision and sort of like a Swiss cheese sort of a set of SLAs that would need another restructuring. So I think that it would behoove the CSC and the PTI to go look at this process for

doing it, add in more category flexibility, such that when we do the revision, it comes out at a more coherent set to address the concerns that Fred was talking about. Thank you.

BRETT CARR:

Thanks, Rick. Yeah, I agree. I think we need to look forward and assume we're going to make a certain amount of changes to make it easier for ourselves by planning that in advance. So I would say the answer to this question is yes, add a category to change of multiple related SLAs at the same time. But again, I'm going to open it up to the floor and see if anybody else got any views or online.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you. Lars-Johan Liman, member of the CSC from the outset and also part of the group that created the current procedure. So if you want to take that path to change the procedures for changing these metrics, step carefully, I would say, because there was careful deliberation in creating them as they look now. When it comes to these SLAs, it's I think, and this may have changed since I haven't been part of this group for a while and with other people, other groups weighing in here. It's actually down to the ccNSO and the registered stakeholder group to set the SLAs, not to this group. And what we did change in the procedures was to make it possible to do minor changes without the heavyweight consultation. But if you want to do major overhaul, you probably might want to tread carefully.

BRETT CARR: It was my assumption that any changes would need to be signed off by both of those stakeholder groups anyway.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe the categories is if you look at the change item target threshold only, that is just the information. The other ones need real public consultation. So very broad and then they need to be informed and at the end of the day, they need to sign off on the changes as well, as Brett said, there's both the ccNSO and GNSO councils. So that won't change. So this is really building on that mechanism. This is just expanding and not diminishing the role of anybody in that process.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Then I misinterpreted and heard other vibrations. So thank you for clarifying that.

BRETT CARR: Thanks, Liman. So I think it feels like there is two voices in the room that say that adding a category for change of multiple related SLAs is something we should look to do. I hear no dissenting voices. So I'm going to take that as a positive for that question. I know that in true CSC style, we've managed to get to time by going through one question. So I think we'll probably need to defer the other question and have a discussion on the mailing list. I would say, I would encourage you all, the CSC mailing list is traditionally very, very quiet apart from me, Bart and Fred. So let's put this onto the mailing list, but actually try and discuss it. So we've got some meat to discuss next time we're on the next CSC phone call and when we're together in, where is it, San Juan

in February. But with that, I'd like to thank you for your thoughts and your input and Kim for his presentation. And I'll open it up to the floor for any final questions or comments.

KIM DAVIES:

Brett, can I have two minutes? So I think it was on the schedule that annually we have a meeting between the CSC and the PTI board, and this meeting was intended to be that. But I know we had other business to discuss and some of our board was late in arriving as well. So firstly, apologies for the late arrival. Secondly, if we want to schedule an engagement on a telephonic call at a later date to have that discussion, because I think it's very valuable that the PTI board hears from the CSC about the last 12 months and where the next 12 months should go. So happy to coordinate that at a later time. Also noting that our board is actually having some turnover later this week, so we'll have at least one new board member after this week. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Sorry, Brett. If you look at it, say the PTI and the CSC both have an important role in this change process. So if that could be a topic of that exchange as well, that's why we wanted to use -- or that was the reason to propose this meeting, because both are very important and both need to agree to the change. So that's probably a topic as well.

BRETT CARR:

Yeah, I think that's a good point. Thanks, Kim. So can I leave it to staff to try and organize that meeting between the CSC and the PTI sometime in the next, I guess, month or six weeks or something like

that, if that's possible? It would be great to meet any new PTI board members as well. And let's do our normal update but also discuss where we go with this as well. Thank you. Any thoughts with any other comments? Then I call this meeting closed, and thank you all for your input and attendance.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]