ICANN79 | CF – IFR2 Team Meeting and Work Session
Wednesday, March 6, 2024 – 1:15 to 2:30 SJU

BRENDA BREWER: Hello and welcome to the IFR2 membership work session at ICANN 79. My name is Brenda and I am the participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to co-chair Ashley Heineman. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Brenda. Hello, everybody, especially my co-chair, Peter. Little light on attendance. Little bit disappointed. We might have to start having talks about our attendance. Well, first of all, hello, everybody. Thank you. We'll be doing the roll call through Zoom. So if you're not on Zoom and you're in the room, please do sign in to make sure that we are accounting for you. And yes, looks like we have an apologies from Rafik.

So why don't we go ahead and get started. A couple of more -- not housekeeping, but less fun than Brett stuff before we get to Brett, go through our action items. So as you know, we've been doing a lot of briefings to get us at like a baseline of where things are with respect to the contract, what services are being performed. And today will be at least the last scheduled briefing, and it is with Brett Carr, who is the CSC chair, and he's going to talk to us about his experiences today. But if there's other briefings that we feel are necessary, we'll need to identify those. Otherwise, we're going to have to -- you know, we don't have -- well, we do have to, but I made it sound bad. Our next step is going through the contract and starting our actual review work as opposed to the briefings and informing ourselves.

So there's also the blog that we're trying to get published. I'm not sure what the status of that is, but it is drafted. I believe it's going through a clearance process at this time, but that should be getting published. It says it was scheduled for February 28th, but I don't believe it has gone out yet. Jennifer, please go ahead. Update us.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Yes. Hi, everyone. Sorry I can't join you in person, but I am here online. It actually has been published. The announcement was published on 28th of February, so I'll just drop the link in the chat. It's not the most gripping of announcements, but it's an important announcement because it lets the community know and the wider audience know that the review team did publish -- reach agreement and publish its terms of reference and work plan. So I would encourage you to share this with your networks and your groups by way of an update and as we go, we'll also keep publishing more information to keep people apprised. So I just dropped the link in the chat there. Thanks. Back to you, Ashley.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you very much. So does anybody have any questions about the action items to date, which we basically have closed out? We'll have to start a new list of action items. Okay. If not, I'll turn it over to Peter.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thank you, Ashley. This is Peter for the record. We will now go to agenda item number three, but before that, I would like the "late arrivals" to invite you to get into Zoom so we can record your name and you can also raise your hands properly. That would be great. Thank you. And with that and without further ado, I think we give the floor to Brett Carr. Brett is the chair of the Customer Standing Committee, which is subject of today's briefing, and he's also the liaison from the Customer Standing Committee, CSC, into the IFR team. Brett, it's your turn.

BRETT CARR: Thank you, Peter, for that illustrious introduction. So yes, welcome, everybody. I am Brett Carr, and I'm the chair of the CSC currently, although that is only the case for about another few hours, because at the end of this meeting, one of my colleagues is going to take over as chair. So we had an election in the CSC meeting a few days ago, and I'm glad to say that Federico Neves will take over as chair after me. I'm termed out in October this year, so I'll be your liaison until October, and then we'll have to talk about somebody else taking over that as well. But anyway, without further ado, I will crack on with the intro to the CSC. Next slide, please.

So this is the quick overview of the topics I'm going to cover today. I'll do an introduction to the CSC, talk about the SLAs and monitoring that we take care of, our complaints and performance issue remediation processes, and a little bit about how we inform and consult on our progress and the reviews that we're subject to as well. Next slide, please.

So I'm not going to read all this out, and I think most people in the room are probably aware of the IANA transition that happened -- I can never remember how many years ago, but a few years ago now. As part of that transition, the Customer Standing Committee came into being to take care of monitoring the performance of the PTI, which before the transition was obviously done by the NTIA, and as the NTIA let go of the leashes on PTI, somebody else needed to make sure that PTI continued to perform the naming function correctly and to a certain service level. So the CSC came into being to do exactly that. Next slide, please.

So this little diagram shows the CSC in context of ICANN and the post-transition IANA. As you can see, the customers are at the bottom. We represent the customers. Customers interact, obviously, directly with IANA, but the CSC represent the customers' best interest to make sure that the IANA carry out the naming function correctly and to the right service levels, and as you can see, the IANA function reviews on the same diagram there. I guess that should be updated with IFR 2 now, but I think you get the gist from the diagram. If you have any questions as we go along, I'm happy to answer them. I'll let Peter monitor the Q&A queue to see if anything pops up and nudge me if anything does come up, but otherwise, I'm happy to answer questions at the end as well. Next slide, please.

So the membership of the CSC currently and the way we're formed is currently we have four voting members. The two come from the gTLD community, and they're appointed by the registered stakeholder group, and I'll talk about specifically who these people are currently in the next slide. Two people come from the ccTLD community, and they're appointed by the ccNSO, and then there is the potential for one member to come from the non-CCTLD or gTLD community, but so far, a member has never been appointed.

We have up to seven liaisons as well. The ones marked in green there on the slide are the organizations or supporting organizations that have currently designated liaisons, and you can see that two supporting organizations, the SSAC and the address supporting organization have neglected -- no, neglected is not the right word -- decided not to appoint a liaison, and then we have one liaison directly from the PTI as well. The last thing on that slide there is it mentions alternates. This is a relatively new thing at the CSC that's been in place since October of last year. As you can see, as I mentioned earlier, there are only four voting members, and we meet once a month on a rolling time basis, so sometimes it's inconvenient for people because it's 2:00 AM in the morning, etc. I wouldn't say that we've had problems with attendance at CSC meetings in general, but there have been cases where it's been a bit difficult, and if we don't have all four members, we're not quorate and we can't vote on the report. So we discussed this problem and came up with the idea of alternates, which basically means that the supporting organizations are able to elect a third person who can take over from any one of the members who may decide that they're not able to attend any particular meeting for any circumstance. So it just makes it slightly easier to make sure we've got a full slate of members on every call. Next slide, please.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: these alternates, are they individual or are they per group, so to speak? So a voting person, does that voting person have a specific alternate for him or herself?

BRETT CARR: Yes. So there's one, well, potentially, and we'll talk about this in a second, there's potentially one designated by the ccNSO and one designated by the GNSO, one per supporting organization, basically. Yeah, per group. So the slide on the, you can see at the moment, shows the actual members that we've got in the CSC currently. So there's two members from the gTLD. Rick, who is sat here to my right, is appointed by the registered stakeholder group, as is Dmitry Berkov. Rick will correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't think the gTLDs have appointed an alternate yet. Is that in progress?

RICK WILHELM: The gTLDs tried to get an alternate, but we were unsuccessful in doing so. So at present, we don't. And since then, Dimi and I have been successful in main, is successful in maintaining quorate-ness. We've been showing up.

BRETT CARR: Okay. Thank you, Rick. And then we have got two members appointed by the ccNSO, myself, who's the current chair, Frederico Neves, who's the current vice chair, and then we have an alternate. And I'm glad to say we haven't needed the alternate yet, but it's good to have that backup in place in case we need it. And then we have liaisons appointed by their respective organizations. And I won't run through the list of names, because I think you can read them yourselves either now or afterwards, but you'll see some familiar names there. And then we've got, finally, we've got a liaison from the PTI, which is Amy Creamer. And Amy attends all of our calls and talks through the report that we review each month, which we'll talk about in a second. Next slide, please.

So what we currently do, we look at the SLAs and the performance against those SLAs. We do some stuff around complaints and performance issues and processes around that. And then we do some informing of community of the status, consultations, and take part in reviews. And we'll talk a little bit about each of these in a little bit more depth. Next slide, please.

So the SLAs, this is the core of what the CSC do. We monitor and report on the PTI compliance against the SLA metrics. These SLAs were developed during the IANA transition. And I think there's probably some people in the room who worked on the development of these SLAs a few years ago. They were based on data collection done at that time, so were deemed to be appropriate during the IANA transition. Obviously, that was quite a few years ago now, and things may have changed. And we'll talk about that as well in a minute in a future slide.

There are currently 64 metrics within seven distinct groups around technical checks, staff processing time for a gTLD creation, and similar kind of areas. If you want to view the SLAs, you can find them on the

PTI's website in a full table, which we do some explanation notes of what they all mean. But all of these SLAs are basically directly related to the naming function contract as it exists at the moment. Next slide, please.

So the screenshot you can see there is part of the monthly report that the CSC gets sent each month and for review. The PTI published this report. And I think when you get a copy of the slides, the clickable link there will take you to a list of the previous reports so you can review them yourselves. The monthly report is made available to the CSC prior to our meeting each month. We had our monthly meeting this month. We had a few days ago on Sunday, and we got the report, I think, a few days before that. So we were lucky in the fact the timing of this meeting was allowed us to review it. So the CSC will get the report in advance, and the members review it, and then come to the call to discuss it or approve its status. You'll see in a minute, I'll show you some previous results. And most of the time, this report is very similar to what you see there, i.e. 100% of the SLAs were achieved. There are some small hiccups now and again, but generally speaking, the PTI are performing at 100% of their SLAs.

On the back of the report we get from the IANA, from the PTI, we, the CSC ourselves, we produce a monthly report for the community based on the information we get from that report. And we classify our report into three different categories, either excellent, if the PTI have reached 100%, satisfactory, or needs improvement. I'm happy to say that we've only ever done excellent and satisfactory. We've never had to put a needs improvement report out. And we summarize the PTI performance as a percentage of the rating, depending on the thresholds that were met. So for example, if 63 out of 64 thresholds were met, then the figure would be 98.4%. And you'll see that 98.4% in a second in a table that I'll show you. If any SLAs were not met, we require explanation from the PTI. And we discuss with the PTI liaison on the call what the reason behind that missed SLA was. Next slide, please.

So this table you can see here is showing the percentages, as I mentioned in the previous slide, over the course of 2016 to 2023. You can see mainly there's 100% there. There's the odd drop to 98.4%. You can see between 2016 and 2020, there was a lot more drops there than there is nowadays. These were to do with some of the way that some of the SLAs had been defined in relation to technical checks, where technical checks might have failed, and the IANA had to wait for the customer to do something. And that was adding something to a timer. So in other words, the checks were not well-defined. And it caused the percentages to drop when it wasn't clearly the fault of the PTI. We'll talk about that again in a second as well. Next slide, please.

So in 2018, the CSC and the PTI did some work on what we could do around defining a process for amending the SLAs and the procedures so that in the future, if we need to amend it again, we've got a process for amendment of it. This was because we identified some areas that needed some improvement in the SLAs and some new SLAs that needed to exist. That process became effective with an amendment to the naming function contract in March 2019. Next slide, please.

So this slide is a bit of a misnomer, really, because it says "recent SLA changes." These aren't really recent. These are a good, I think, three years ago now. We haven't made many SLA changes over the course of the CSC. But we did, as I mentioned earlier, we did identify an SLA in relation to technical checks which needed to change to make it fairer to the IANA and make it less likely that an SLA would be breached because of a customer holdup rather than an IANA holdup. We also worked to define and document some new SLAs around the publication of IDN label generation rule tables, and there was some redefinition needed of a ccTLD delegation transfer process, which again could be held up and breach the SLA through no fault of the PTI. So it needed some tweaks. All of those SLA changes, as I said, were completed, I think, at least three years ago now. We should probably stop calling it new and recent because it's not anymore. Next slide, please.

So in true ICANN style, the CSC are responsible for monitoring the performance of PTI, but we also have a body who's responsible for monitoring the performance of the CSC. And so every X amount of years -- and I can't remember what X is off the top of my head, but I can find out for you later if you need it -- the CSC are subject to what's called the CSC effectiveness review, and this is where a group of individuals come together and assess how well the CSC are doing their job, basically. The second one of these happened about 18 months ago, and the things that came out of it were that there was a view that the SLAs have existed for quite a few years now, and maybe they need some regular review to make sure that they remain current and relevant. Currently there's no one really responsible for that SLA review process, and the effectiveness review indicated that this might be something that the CSC want to do.

And I personally think this is a good thing, because one of the problems we've got with the CSC is because it's quite regularly, month to month, the report from the PTI is 100 percent, it can seem a little boring. We have a kind of motto within the CSC that "Boring is good," which I think might be something that Liman coined quite a while ago. But the problem with boring is it's difficult to engage new people into the CSC to actually take part in it, and I think Rick mentioned a minute ago that it's difficult for them to get alternates because the work might be deemed as not that very interesting. So hopefully the review of the SLAs, which I think we're going to start doing that in the next few months, is something that will make things slightly more interesting. The first step of that review is we're working with the PTI to develop a framework for how we do those regular reviews of the SLAs, and to make sure that the relevant process documents take that into consideration. Next slide, please.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yeah, we have Jonathan Robinson on the line. Jonathan, do you want to ask your question?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Ashley. Hi, everyone, and hi, Brett. I just thought I would make sure that it's crystal clear here. There is no role for the IFR2 in this review, Brett. I mean, this is clearly something you talked to us about updating us on the work of the CSC, but there's no implication for us with regard to reviewing these SLAs.

BRETT CARR: No, that's correct, Jonathan. I think it's something you should be aware of, but not something we need any input from you on.

PETER KOCH: Brett, could you elaborate a bit on how they would be codified? Would these reviews be in the CSC mandate, or would they suggest an amendment to the contract without us reviewing them, of course?

BRETT CARR: As I understand it, at the moment, the plan is it's under the CSC remit, and it doesn't require a change to the contract. Where did I get to? Next slide, please. So we talked a little bit about the complaints and performance issue remediation. So if you read the CSC charter, it directly mentions that we do not get involved in individual complaints, although what we do is, if any complaints are made, and they mentioned on the PTI report that they produce each month, we do talk to the PTI about what the nature of that complaint is, because we want to identify if there's a trend of complaints. So our position is to get involved if there is systemic or persistent issues. So if there's complaints about the same thing over and over again, then we'd step in and play a role in seeing what could be done to fix that issue. And for this purpose, we have something called the RAP, or the Remedial Action Procedure. And this is invoked if the CSC determines that a performance issue exists. Now I'm glad to say that the CSC have never had to activate that procedure, and hopefully we never will.

But what we did do in a recent-- if I wind the clock back, I think, to Cancun last year, what we decided to do-- because we've never done this procedure before, so we don't really know the pitfalls that might be in there, if and when we do have to run it. So we did a tabletop exercise at the meeting in Cancun. And we did identify some areas of improvements for that. Due to time concerns, we didn't finish off the exercise, and we do plan to do that in a future meeting. But there was a few improvements that we identified that we'll make to that procedure. So it was a useful exercise. Next slide, please.

So the CSC's web page has an explanation, a link to the complaint process. The PTI also has a complaint process, which includes the customer's ability to escalate if the issue is not resolved, and all those escalations that are, again, on the PTI's monthly report to bring to our attention so we can discuss openly with the PTI. Next slide, please.

The other thing that we do regularly is inform the community in our status. And everything we do is open. So the CSC monthly meetings are open for any observers to join the PTI's monthly reports issued by the CSC, and we produce our own reports, and they're all published on our web page. We do twice annual presentations to the ICANN community to make sure that our supporting organizations know the status and, you know, hopefully become knowledgeable that the PTI are doing a good job, or if they're not, where the problems lie and what we're doing to address them. And then the next point probably needs a little bit of an update, because we do have annual meetings with the PTI board, and actually we had our meeting with the PTI board a few days ago. We have in the past had meetings with the ICANN board technical committee. We don't really do that anymore because they didn't really have much of an output. So we're believers in not doing things that don't need to be done, and so there didn't ever seem to be any real output from that input with the technical committee.

On the PTI, obviously, you'll probably all be aware, do regular surveys, and they've been -- they talked about the survey that they've got ongoing in our meeting a few days ago. So they do annual surveys and present the results of those surveys to us so that we can review them and talk about the results with them and see if there's any improvements available there as well. Next slide, please.

And that's it from my presentation. There's a few links here at the end which link to some of the things I've been talking about in the presentation. So hopefully that's useful. Ashley mentioned that the attendance was a little lacking today, so if more people want to hear this again in the future, I'm happy to go through it again. It's recorded so anybody can watch it afterwards, but, you know, I'm here to help as part of the liaison, and I think happy to do what's needed. And any more questions?

PETER KOCH: Thank you, Brett. I can just echo that. Any questions? Ashley has a question.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I have a question. I'm not 100 percent sure of its appropriateness, but it seems an obvious one. As the CSC, do you take note of issues or areas that would be outside the scope of what your group does but might be of interest to, say, our group?

BRETT CARR: I think we would do, but I don't think anything's ever come up that we needed to do that for.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: That's good news, I guess. It makes our jobs easier.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thank you, Ashley. Thank you, Brett. Maybe -- Rick has a question. Go ahead.

RICK WILHELM: So let me comment on that, and let me kind of riff off of it. So CSC's job is to make sure that PTI is doing the job of their thing. Like if PTI were having problems, there would be residue of it in the documents that we produce, right? Because they produce reports for us. We have meetings. That would be evident in the contrail, the telemetry, right, the detritus, if you will, of our work stream, right? And so that would be evident to the IFR2. When the IFR2 was looking at the ability of how is PTI doing with complying with its contract, which is what the job of IFR2 is doing. So in answer to your question, like, you know, what are you doing that's of interest to us? Like, well, that's kind of our job. Like we're working with them on a day-to-day basis to kind of do -- and this group's job is to sort of take the long view of that. And so while Brett's answer was accurate, it was like accurate in a, you know, abbreviated sort of way. Like it's accurate because you can see what job they're doing by the way that the canary is alive and well in its cage, right? Because you can see what the record is of the way that they've been producing along. That's a more voluminous answer. Like Brett answered it with sort of his typical short, very brief Brett sort of answer. But that's a more wordy -- not that I'm an attorney -- you know, wordy and attorney-grade answer.

BRETT CARR: I think Rick put it very eloquently. And what I would say is the bits of the UK that I'm from are very famous for using a small amount of words to describe the same thing.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I appreciate both approaches. To clarify perhaps a little bit what I was getting at, because perhaps I was using too few words with too many words, is out of everyone who interacts with this particular function, you guys are probably closest outside of, you know, the folks actually asking for changes. So it's possible that you guys would see things or experience things that wouldn't necessarily be part of what you do as the CSC mandate, but might be something worthy of a review team. So I was just curious like from that perspective.

BRETT CARR: Yeah. I think you're right, actually. We would. And, you know, I would say my role as liaison to the IFR2 would be where I would deem it appropriate to bring those things up. But I'm glad to say there is nothing that I'm aware of to bring up.

ALAN BARRETT: Following up on what Ashley just said, I wonder if it might be appropriate for the IFR2 to formally ask the CSC if they have seen anything bad that they want to alert us to.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I think I know what the answer is going to be. But if that's -- I mean, this is where I look to you, Peter. If that's the sort of documentation that we need as part of a review, then perhaps a formality is necessary.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thanks, Ashley. This is Peter for the record. And I would like to elaborate on that because I think that's an important point. And thank you, Rick, for reminding us of our mission. And I think nobody wants to step on each other's toes. And there is a line between IANA function review and the CSC. But there's a reason that we are asked to cooperate very closely and have a liaison and so on and so forth.

When you, Rick, mentioned the telemetry, of course, you can only see what you measure or what spectrum the antennas -- and I'm not driving this further -- are aligned to. I vaguely remember that in the past there was a situation where the SLAs were perfectly met and there was no reason for formal complaint. But it could occur that things took longer than, say, the intuitive expectation was. And while that's a situation that I maybe, Ashley, had in mind, that definitely I have in mind, that you couldn't see by the way your glasses are aligned, but that might occur from interaction. And if I may add another question, Brett, you had on your slides, you had these 100%, 100%, 100%, which is perfect performance, and you had some with 98 or something. And you also mentioned, and that's repeated for the benefit of the other listeners, you explicitly mentioned the CSC's mandate does not include going into individual cases. How far do you go into these 1.6 missing percent? And how do you deal with that in the CSC? Thank you.

BRETT CARR: What I would say is we don't go into individual complaint cases. That's what I was getting at from individual things. But if there is any SLA miss, we go into those with the PTI to make sure that there is either a reasonable explanation or we've seen this and we're going to do this next month to change it.

PETER KOCH: Okay. Thank you. And I think in the light of the suggestion, at some point, the chairs might want to make this formal liaison request. But I think it takes some time for the committee to actually phrase the question in the right way to be conveyed to the CSC. And then, again, the CSC has the non-boring job, hopefully, of providing the response. And even if that is a literal no at the end, picking on your brevity here. Thank you. Any other discussion points, questions? We don't see remote hands. Anybody from remote? Any questions? Does any non-team member have a question? Hiro, go ahead.

HIRO HOTTA: This is Hiro Hotta, alternate liaison to CSC from RSSAC. I'm not a member of this IFR2 team. But I want to comment on the low attendance of this meeting. So on the ICANN schedule page, this is called IFR2 something. And many participants of the ICANN doesn't understand what IFR2 is. So maybe if the IANA is shown on the page, more may come. That's my comment.

PETER KOCH: Thank you. That's an excellent suggestion, I think. And we try to find out what we can do for next time. Thank you. Brett.

BRETT CARR: Yeah. One thing I would say is I've mentioned to -- and I'm not going to name any names, but people [inaudible] Wednesday, I've got the IFR2 meeting. And some people don't know what that is. So you would think that most people at ICANN would know what that is. But not everybody does. So I wonder, is there some outreach needed maybe to publicize IFR2 in some way to make it more visible? And that might mean you get more attendees.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: To pick up on what was said earlier, boring is good. I don't want to make things unnecessarily interesting either. So that being said, I am sympathetic to what Hiro says. And if there was at least an articulation of what the acronym meant, how about that? I think there's probably sensitivities about whether we call it IANA or PTI or just domain name function review. But again, participation is good. The right participation is best. And let's not make it -- I think sexy is bad because this is so not sexy. This is rightfully boring. But I also see what you're saying, Hiro, as well.

PETER KOCH: Okay. Thank you, Ashley. With that, I would say last call. Any other comments, questions online or in the room? Going once. Going twice. Okay. Sami?

SAMI MOHAMED ALI: Hi. I am Sami from .BH from ccNSO for the record. Just a comment on that. I think if we can put a little bit of like IANA review function or domain, whatever you want to call it, a little bit of mission or like what we are doing in this will be useful in terms of simplifying it for the audience because as our colleague said, I also mentioned to a few people that we will have this IFR2 meeting but nobody really seems interested to figuring it out. Thank you.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thank you for that additional suggestion. There will be a point where we have to do explicit outreach when we ask for comments. And I think we can take that into consideration at that point, the latest. I think there is no more questions or comments. Thank you, Brett. Thanks for being here. There is one more.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Well, we can still thank Brett because I think this is going off of his presentation a bit. So thank you and then we can carry on with my other points. Thank you, Brett. No. I was just going to add one to this which I -- it's a little bit separate from what Brett was presenting. But, yeah, I think as a solution at least for the next meeting, if folks agree, is spell out the acronym but in the session details there is an explanation of what this group is doing. So if people know what it is, they look into it, it's there. So I think that's a good compromised approach.

PETER KOCH: Okay. I think then we can move ahead to agenda item number four. Call rotation and meeting cadence. We had the spreadsheet out there which is an attendance record from starting from the Hamburg initial meeting going through our calls up until and including the latest February call. And what we see here is that the attendance at the 01:00 UTC calls is noticeably lower than during the daytime UTC calls, 11:00 and 18:00, and what the chairs and staff discussed and the chairs decided, you've seen that in your inboxes actually, not so much for the team members, that we decided to skip the -- not skip but to no longer have 1:00 UTC calls but instead move to only 11:00 and 18:00 but keep the cadence of a biweekly call for this, at least for the upcoming weeks. And we can review that by the Kigali meeting at the latest. We can increase the attendance but it's also obvious that we are now starting into a more active phase because we've now finished all the briefings. Which doesn't mean that anybody who has questions could not get back and ask. And as Ashley said before, if the need arise for another briefing or an in-depth explanation for any one of these neighboring committees or anything else, we will be able to schedule that as well but what we will start next is going into the contract and then start the actual reviewing work, having in mind everything we throughout the briefings. Does anybody have any concern about that way forward? The timing, I mean, we moved that. We didn't receive any feedback, I think, after sending out the invitations. So we assume that was an accepted and hopefully helpful move forward to increase participation. Okay. So that is recorded. And yeah, 60 minutes calls biweekly, that's what we said. Okay. Good.

What else do we have? Any remarks on agenda item four? That brings us to agenda item number five which is probably going to be short. I think I already mentioned the rough outline. So we have the contract in front of us as in the next agendas for the next meetings. We're going to dissect the work and the suggestion from the chairs as we already communicated earlier on looking at the experience from the previous review team. We'll try to parallelize the work to assign or let team members pick particular parts of the contract to review individually and in depth and then report back. We'll try how that works for the initial parts of the contracts and we'll also see to distribute the work maybe not equally but so that we can make the best uses of the team members' resources without having anyone bored or overwhelmed. So that is asking for your planning and your contribution and kind of a realistic estimate of what time and effort you can actually spend. And it also probably depends on the previous experiences, or where the contract is a bit more technical maybe what technical background the individual team member has or doesn't have. Anything to add to that, Ashley?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Not really, unless there's anyone amongst our membership who has other ideas of how to move forward with our work. This is our initial thinking based on Peter's experience with the previous review and figured that that was the best way to start it out, just parsing up the contract.

PETER KOCH: I see one hand from Jonathan. Jonathan, please go ahead.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yeah, I'm not sure how it will go but I'd like to say thanks for the suggestion. I think it's a very good way to get us engaged and make the members make a contribution. So I'm enthusiastic to give it a try and so I appreciate the idea and I'm supportive. Thanks.

PETER KOCH: Thank you, Jonathan. Anybody else? So then for the next meeting we will prepare the proposed slices of the contract. It is very much straightforward. If you have looked at the contract, which everyone by now has done, we can more or less go through it section by section and then distribute the work, give everybody some time to in-depth review this. And there might be questions arising where additional information is needed either from IANA/PTI, maybe from the CSC or other parties. And the earlier we identify these needs, the better we can reach out and ask for that additional information when it comes to – we've heard the meeting of the SLAs but there might be other things that you need to know to actually assess the relevance and the fulfilling the contract by IANA/PTI. Okay. Everybody happy with that? Anything? Yeah.

MARILIA HIRANO: I have a question on the process. As you said, you're going to divide up the work and you might need more information from IANA or the CSC. Those requests or questions that you would have, would they be given to us ahead of time so we can prepare and send it to whoever is reviewing that particular section or do you prefer to have that as a discussion during the meetings?

PETER KOCH: Yeah, without assuming too much of what nature the questions are, it can be tiny bits that you could respond to on the spot. There might be questions where somebody would ask for a bit more data and we wouldn't assume that you can produce that during a meeting. So the idea is, of course, that we do have cycles and then maybe table a certain item until that data has been produced. And there is a limit to put on the research, understandably, but previous experience I think didn't force PTI to do months' worth of review. So not on the spot, but some things might be easy for you, not necessarily for the review team member and others, again, where you have to produce data, of course, that would be ahead notice. Sure. Anybody else? I think we arrive at any other business, Ashley, do we? Any other business? Any announcements? Nothing? Okay.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Are there any other briefings that folks would like to arrange or any other information that would make you feel more comfortable as we start into the actual review process? We ask this at the end of every meeting, so don't feel like you have to have something now, but I just want to make sure people have the opportunity.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, and also if it's only a small question, don't be shy. You can ask the chairs or any other team member, hopefully, for an exchange on whatever the relation between the different committees and teams is and should the need arise. Again, I would echo what Ashley said. We've learned that everybody is helpful to ensure that we can do our work, and we could always go back to that offer. And with that, I think we can close the meeting and stop the recording. Thank you for being here, and thanks to the online participants for watching and intervening. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]