
ICANN79 | CF – Customer Standing Committee
Saturday, March 3, 2024 – 1:15 to 2:30 SJU

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Hello and welcome to the ccNSO Customer Standing Committee Working session. My name is Claudia Ruiz and I, along with my colleague Bart Boswinkel, are the remote participation managers for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form.

As noted, if you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphones disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar. Thank you and with that I will now hand the floor over to Brett Carr, Chair of the CSC. Thank you.

BRETT CARR:

Thank you very much. Hello everybody and welcome to the CSC PTI meeting at ICANN79. So, we have two distinct sections to today's meeting and those are a joint meeting between the CSC and the PTI and then our normal CSC monthly meeting. We've only got an hour but importantly we have got a cocktail straight afterwards, so let's try and

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.

get through this as quickly and efficiently as we can but I would like to start off with a very quick tour on the table so that everybody knows who is in the room and on Zoom of course. So, if you could quickly introduce yourself and your affiliation and then we'll crack on. We start at that far end.

FREDERICO NEVES: Frederico Neves, (NIC.br).

RICK WILHELM: Rick Wilhelm, gTLDs.

AMY CREAMER: Amy Creamer, (IANA liaison to the CSC).

KIM DAVIES: Kim Davies, (PTI Board).

MARILIA HIRANO: Marilia Hirano, (PTI).

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Claudia Ruiz, ICANN staff.

BART BOSWINKEL: Bart Boswinkel, ICANN staff, CSC support.

BRETT CARR: Brett Carr, Chair of the CSC.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Joke Braeken, ccNSO secretariat.

SEAN COPELAND: Sean Copeland, ccNSO.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Alejandra Reynoso, ccNSO Chair.

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard, Liaison from the RSAC.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Xavier Calvez, PTI Board.

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro Hotta, Liaison from RSAC to CSC.

KATUUKU GLORIA: Katuuku Gloria, GAC Liaison. Thank you.

SHAUNTE ANDERSON: Shaunte Anderson, PTI.

PETER KOCH: Peter Koch, DENIC.

GULOV MEYER: Gulov Meyer [ph], SIDN.

MOLEHE WESI: Molehe Wesi, ccNSO.

ELAINE PRUIS: Elaine Pruis, Verisign.

BRETT CARR: Thank you very much and I think importantly we've got at least one member of the CSC and a few other people on Zoom so I'll give them a minute to introduce themselves on if they want to come on mic.

DMITRY BURKOV: Brett, add me please, I am still here.

BRETT CARR: Anybody else on Zoom?

DMITRY BURKOV: Dmitry Burkov, I am still here on Zoom.

BRETT CARR:

There's two of you, Dmitry. Okay, thank you very much, let's move on. So, thank you and welcome too you all. So, the first thing on the agenda is we want to briefly discuss the work that the CSC has been doing towards looking at the current SLAs. This work came out of the last CSC effectiveness review where they recommended that the SLAs get a regular review.

We want to ensure that those SLAs remain stable but also remain useful. This was briefly discussed at a previous meeting with the PTI Board. So, hopefully this isn't used to anybody. But I think it would be prudent to check now there is still agreement on the need to change those so I want to open the floor to any questions or comments on that in itself and then I'm going to hand over to Bart who's produced the red line of the document we've been working on, which he's going to run through quickly. So, any questions or comments from the floor before I hand over to Bart? Nothing that I can see so Bart, over to you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Claudia, can you put up the red line please? This is more for the, especially for the PTI Board members. As you may know, at one point the storm will go to PTI to review potential changes and at the end of the day there is a procedure to change the process and we have to follow it and say PTI and the PTI Board play a critical role in that process but the CSC thought it would be wise to start the storm on the basis of the CSC effectiveness review ending almost one and a half year ago I believe.

Yeah, so what you see in front of you, this is the, what is not highlighted is the current text of the process for amending IANA naming service

level agreements and what they've done, the major changes are first of all in the type of the naming of the SLAs changes, they now match what is in the overview of the SLA so it's now metric definition which is a heading in the document. The real change is effectively the regular review of the full set of SLAs and that's the reason why we had to go through this process. Maybe you recall, especially the PTI Board members in, I think it was in Cancun that we met and that was the first time there was a discussion, it was in Washington, there was a discussion on the SLAs and reviewing the full SLAs. So, now the addition is the regular review of the full set of SLAs and there is also a timing included, no more than five years after the previous review.

If you recall and for the audience as well, the full set of SLAs was developed as part of the, I think of the transition in 2014, it was DTA, I believe, we did it, DTC did the charter of the CSC. And so, they've been now in place for quite some time and some of them in the monitoring activities of the CSC, they look a little bit cumbersome. At the same time, and can you scroll down now, you can see the series of questions that needs to be answered and it's a refinement of these questions when an SLA and in say the full set needs to be adjusted and there is clearly a feasibility and an impact study required before something may change and can be changed and then there is a whole process afterwards. So, this is adjusted as well as part of the process.

So, then once there is agreement to take the next step, then the SLA amendments, so the first one is exploration, I would say, and then the second step is really going into the SLA amendment procedure and what needs to happen from variance. So, there are really no major changes, observation below is a little bit an update, clarification. What

has been and still under discussion is the naming customer communication, whether or not the CSC itself explicitly needs to communicate and inform the community about the change. This is still under review by the CSC, so you will see in the final text, what is happening. Then the community consultation itself, that's a public comment period, no changes there at all. It's like individual ones and also, as you can see, there is a need to update this section because to include the full slate or the full set. And then the observation itself, that was considered an improvement of the text that was originally, that is currently in the process itself.

So, these are the proposed changes to the procedure and the CSC is very aware they need to follow, say the process to the procedure to change them is documented, so everybody is aware that needs to be followed, which will include legal analysis and decision and discussion by the PTI Board as well. But we, the CSC wanted to inform you that is forthcoming and maybe they will mention this at the upcoming joint meeting as well, so the community is aware this is happening. And maybe, Brett, you want to allude a little bit or Federico to the background why you think such a full slate is necessary in addition to what I just said. And maybe there are some questions from PTI Board members. Thanks.

BRETT CARR:

Thank you, Bart. I think you covered that very well. I don't think I've got any other comment, but I'll open the floor to any questions or comments from anybody in the room. Xavier, go ahead.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. I don't have the background as to whether there's been changes to SLAs before and how much community engagement there was in the public comment period for those changes, if there has been any. Was it extensive, not extensive? What type of comments have we had in the past?

BART BOSWINKEL: To date, there have been three changes. One was a metric change, which doesn't need a public comment. The other one was an inclusion of one, and I think a change, no, four, and the other one was a change. The public comment was very limited to zero. However, you need to go through the process, because at the end of the day, people need to be informed about this. And if you would go to, and that was the sense, if you would go to the full set of SLAs, that's a completely different story than an individual SLA. Thanks.

XAVIER CALVEZ: So, your answer about the number was what I was a little bit concerned could be the issue, and that would not tell, in my view, that we should not have the public comment, but that we need to find ways to engage more the community into that public comment, so that there can be more interest and more input into that public comment, because I think that community engagement is important.

It's these SLAs, the CSC is important, the SLAs are important, the community engagement about it is important. So, I think that in thinking about, in planning for those, that public comment, the extent to which we all together can enhance the visibility, and therefore the

participation of the communities is definitely something I would want to put that emphasis on.

BART BOSWINKEL: May I quote one of the former chairs of the CSC? Boring is good. And that's one of the issues the CSC is facing in a lot of things.

BRETT CARR: And I think to answer you, I completely agree with what you're saying about involving the community and getting lots of input from them, and the purpose of the next meeting we have on Wednesday afternoon is to kick off that process, and that's just a starting point.

XAVIER CALVEZ: And just to the point of boring is good is, I'm very happy that there would be a lot of people saying this is all fine, let's move on with it. I'm less happy with no one saying anything, because you don't know if people are agreeing with it or just don't even know it's happening. And I think it's important that people know that it's happening.

BART BOSWINKEL: Is that they have the opportunity and are informed, and I think that's the PTI and the CSC. What I can see from my end, from say supporting them, is they do try to reach out.

BRETT CARR: Yeah, unfortunately it's human nature that if people are happy, they say nothing, right?

KIM DAVIES: Firstly, I have a question, but before I do, I just wanted to acknowledge Jia-Rong Low has joined us, another PTI Board member, and also convey apologies we couldn't get the full PTI Board in attendance today. Our other two board members are not attending the meeting this week. So, with that said, my question is, is there any desire for alignment with the schedule of the IANA naming functions review? Is there any notion that the input from one or the other would feed into either process here, or are they just being treated as two entirely independent processes from one another?

BRETT CARR: Well, I think that's a good question, and it's something we haven't thought about. So, I think we probably need to think about it, and maybe we talk about it in the IFR2 meeting this week as well.

BART BOSWINKEL: If you would go back to the CSC, the second CSC review, one of the reasons why they believe the CSC would be best positioned to do this is if you would go to the first IANA naming function review, there was, and I'd say you have a former chair here as well, it's not clear whether the IANA naming functions review team should review the SLAs and this type of process. And their findings at the time were that, that is a role of the CSC because they changed the individual SLAs. And that was one

of the reasons why the CSC review team made this suggestion and that the CSC should do it. So, there is a clear point of, say, clearly, a group who's doing and reviewing the SLAs themselves.

KIM DAVIES:

Yeah, and to be clear, I'm not suggesting both groups should have the same remit or completely overlap. There're two separate processes for a reason. But that being said, the naming functions review is reviewing the contracts fitness for purpose as a whole, and clearly might result in recommendations that would ultimately influence how SLAs are specified. So, I do feel that there's naturally going to be some issues that might feed into one another. And I'm not suggesting, I've thought about this either, but it popped into my head moving to a five-year schedule as well. It's the year that the IFR is kicking off for a second time as well. So, it comes to mind that you might want to consider more about how information flows might go from one process to the other or maybe not, but it's worth a consideration.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Absolutely. And that was one of the, as I said, one of the considerations. And it's clearly, say, might be an issue for the current review, IFR or IANA function review to look into and see how they view things. I know that one of the co-chairs is in the room, so, and the liaison from the CSC as well. Rick?

RICK WILHELM:

Rick Wilhelm. Right now, wearing my IFR hat, I'm both a member of IFR2 and a member of IFR1. Not speaking for our chair who's here, but my recollection from IFR1 was that we were reviewing the compliant, is IANA doing its job with regard to the contract? Not that it was not in scope of the IANA function review to recommend changes to the contract unless it was to clarify something about the scope of what the effectiveness of is IANA doing its job?

I don't, like, just my initial thought is that the SLAs would be, from a functional standpoint, would be out of scope. But we would have to look at the terms of, at the terms of reference. But just my initial thought is kind of scrunching up my face and saying, like, I don't think that's in scope for the IFR. And I would not be interested in breaking new ground and giving the IFR more work to do, because there's enough work for the IFR to do. But that's an IFR job. So, that's, thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Anybody else? Maybe Peter, you want to chime in?

PETER KOCH:

Yeah, so Peter Koch on the record, one of the two co-chairs of the IFR 2. I think Rick pointed it out quite well. The distinction we might want to make is, I would preliminarily fully agree that it is not the IFR's job to look at the individual SLAs, but looking at the process of changes from a broader scope might be, and we need to discuss this. Luckily, later this week, the IFR team has a session, and the CSC will be the main agenda, and the current chair, as well as Rick, will be there. And I trust

we can continue that discussion from that point on. Does that make sense? Thank you.

BRETT CARR:

So, any other comments or questions before we move on? Excellent, thank you. So, next on the agenda is, this is a joint meeting with the CSC and BTIs to identify and discuss any other topics of mutual interest. In the interest of time, I'm not suggesting we discuss those topics now, but to identify them and make a note of them for future reference. So, I'll open it up to comments for anybody and see if there's anything else, any other burning issues that anybody wants to discuss.

KIM DAVIES:

It's not so much a burning issue, but I think this is probably the right forum to flag it, which is that we're coming up to the conclusion of our five-year strategic plan, which means that the PTI Board sees as one of its primary objectives this year is to develop the next five-year strategic plan in line with ICANN's schedule as well. So, to that end, the PTI Board's planning to meet in May to do a lot of that discussion around putting the bones together on that strategic plan.

And I think we will be looking in due course for inputs as to where the community more generally sees evolution of PTI and the IANA functions and certainly resourcing and planning around priority projects and the like that we can map out in the coming years. So, I just wanted to share that observation. I don't have any proposal on how to have any dialogue around that, but it's something to consider.

BRETT CARR:

Thank you. Yes, I think as a CSC, we'd be very interested in observing and inputting into that process where we can. So, keep us in the loop and you can rely on us being involved. Anything else from anybody else? Okay, I see nothing. So, I move to any other business. So, does anybody have any other business for this first part of the meeting? Thank you very much. With that, we'll close this part of the meeting and jump straight into the normal CSC monthly meeting.

We've got the agenda on the screen. So, in the interest of time, I'm going to skip over the action points as there's nothing new in there from the last time we met. So, we'll jump straight to item three on the agenda, which is the IANA report for February, which I believe is hot off the press, literally a couple of hours ago. So, I'll hand over to Amy to talk about that.

AMY CREAMER:

Yes, so for the month of February, PTI met 100% of our SLAs. And Jennifer's not with us, but that should make the CSC report fairly simple. Yeah, Jennifer's not here. I think there probably hasn't been time to do the CSC part of this report yet, right?

BART BOSWINKEL:

No, we don't have the findings, but the findings will reflect for those of you who are not familiar, the findings do reflect the PTI performance as presented. Maybe a question, are there any escalations?

AMY CREAMER: No escalations.

BART BOSWINKEL: That makes it easy. So, we can even draft it out.

BRETT CARR: So, we will, for those who are not normally in the CSC meeting, what we normally do at this point is have the CSC findings report, go through it on the screen and then vote our acceptance of it within the meeting. We can't do that today because we don't have the report. So, we'll do that on the mailing list in the next week or two and then move to do it in the normal way next meeting. Any questions or comments on that agenda item? Excellent. In that case, we'll move on to agenda item number four, which is the CSC chair and vice chair election.

So, in the first instance, I want to call for, we do have some nominations already, but I want to make an open call in this meeting for any further nominations for the post of chair and vice chair, which will become active immediately following ICANN79. For the record, I'm stepping down as chair because I'm termed out in October this year. Yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL: It is October.

BRETT CARR: So, to give a transition period from now to October, I'm stepping away as chair. So, any other nominations for chair and vice chair? Okay. Well, then this is fairly simple because we have two nominations with Fred

being nominated as chair and Rick being nominated as vice chair. So, in the first instance, what I'd like to do is for the position of chair for Fred, if people could indicate their support or non-support with the green tick or red cross in Zoom, that would be, would be useful. Dimitri, can you make your vote? Yeah. Do we get one, two?

BART BOSWINKEL: You will abstain Fred for your own.

BRETT CARR: Yeah.

FREDERICO NEVES: I'm actually not on Zoom. Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: So, we have full support for Fred as chair. So, congratulations, Fred.

FREDERICO NEVES: Thank you.

BRETT CARR: And then we'll do the same for Rick. So, if you could indicate your support or non-support in Zoom for Rick, as to be elected as vice chair, that would be appreciated.

BART BOSWINKEL: And Fred, do you support?

FREDERICO NEVES: I support Rick.

BRETT CARR: Okay. Thank you very much. So, that's Rick appointed as--

BART BOSWINKEL: Rick, you abstain?

RICK WILHELM: Yes.

BART BOSWINKEL: Fred, no, you don't have to.

BRETT CARR: Congratulations, Rick. Okay, that's good. So, where are we now? Chair and vice chair. So, that's done. Thank you very much. And, and I hope you enjoy the rules as much as I have done over the last couple of years. So, I declare both of them duly elected then to take over at the end of ICANN79. In fact, Fred gets it a bit earlier than that because he's going to do the meeting on Wednesday because I'm not here on Wednesday afternoon, unfortunately. Next on the agenda is the annual IANA presentation, which I'm going to hand over to a member of IANA staff to go through. You really are?

MARILIA HIRANO: Sure. Hey, let me share my screen.

BRETT CARR: It's pretty much she just looks surprised.

MARILIA HIRANO: Hey everyone. It's that time of year again. Time flew. Just want to point out that we changed the approach of the survey, as you've seen when you participated for this for 2023. So, the survey is still open. We're still pending a few groups to respond, to have the opportunity to have the engagement and response. So, the focus today will be on participation rates. And also, I'm going to give a refresh because the last time I spoke about this was in back in 2019 on our other survey, which is our post-ticket survey that actually measures customer satisfaction after each request.

So, the satisfaction with the engagement survey, that report is not yet complete. It will be done in May of this year. So, it's going to be a little bit of a different report as the one that I've been doing over the years. There you go. It's not going. There you go. So, I just wanted to give a little bit of a background because I know this group rotates through and quite a few of you weren't around the CSE when we first started running this survey. So, the annual survey was a contractual deliverable under NTIA. The first time we ran this survey was a customer satisfaction survey. And that SurveyMonkey was used to deliver that one.

In 2013, we commissioned a third-party vendor, and that was Echo Research, and they've been running, administering our survey ever since. At the time, participation rates averaged 10%. The highest we've ever received was 12% participation rate, but satisfaction rates consistently averaged over 90% at the time that was the survey approach on customer service satisfaction. Then post-transition 2016, the IANA naming functions contract and the numbering functions SLA continued to require a survey within their agreements.

In 2018, we launched the how did we do survey tool to measure satisfaction with service delivery, and I'll talk a little bit about that in the presentation. 2019, because of that survey launch, we changed the approach of this annual survey to be more focused on our engagement with all of you instead of being request driven. Satisfaction with our requests. Since 2016, the participation dropped. It averaged 7%. Some years, it went to nine. We've had one that was 3%, and we've made adjustments to the survey throughout the years where we discussed here with this group to try to increase the participation.

But satisfaction rates continued to be consistent over 90%, and then once we changed the approach to engagement, then the survey completely changed, and it was a one-to-five scale, and it's always been over 4.0 satisfaction once we changed that. Although we've consistently gotten high satisfaction rates from all of the groups that participated, the participation rate continued to decline even as we tried to modify and improve the survey.

That's just a little bit of background and refresher for some of you. Wanted to point out the contract, so I said it was in the contract with

NTIA. It continued to be with the IANA naming function, so that's just the contractual language here that we are required to collaborate with the CSC and ICANN to maintain and enhance the survey, which is why we're here today, consistent with the performance standards for root zone management. I just wanted to put the language here because it's been a while since this was written. So, the methodology, what stayed the same from last year? You're still using ECHO, as I said.

The focus is still on engagement since 2019. We're not using this survey to measure request satisfaction, and the respondents continue to provide input on statements on a one-to-five scale. The difference for this year is we reduced the number of questions to make it shorter. We created a general segment to reach broader community groups, so if you weren't part of the CSC or the ccNSO Council, GNSO Council, like the usual segments that we surveyed, but you were an observer in the room, you would still have the opportunity to participate, except you would get just one general question instead of the usual set of questions that this group would get.

Community leadership groups, we delivered this survey through the QR codes during our face-to-face engagement or mailing lists with the TCRs, for example, it was through the mailing list, but in our presentation, we had the QR codes, some sessions we had business cards that we had the QR codes that we distributed in the room, and we ran this survey from October of last year in the Germany, oh my God, Hamburg, in October, and we are running with our last group, the ASO-AC, this week here in Puerto Rico, and then with our operations customers, which is our ccTLD and gTLD operators, it was still sent

through unique links by the vendor as usual, and that closed in December of last year for them to participate.

So, those are the changes, and if you've seen, you would have experienced that when you took the survey. So, some of the reasons I mentioned, reduced participation over the years with the approach. We wanted to reach broader community groups. One of our strategic targeted outcomes, one of the strategic objectives in the PTI strategic plan is to reach, educate broader groups within the community on the IANA function.

So, we wanted to make sure that they were included in presentations and trainings on IANA, and in Hamburg, we ran the survey with the ALAC after we provided a presentation for them on IANA, and we also have been speaking with the fellows in NextGen, so they had the opportunity to fill out the survey the same way that this group does, except with a general link and not specific questions relating to the oversight of the function. So, another reason, small groups mean less statistically significant response rates and satisfaction, and I think this group, we've discussed this quite a few times, that some of the groups, it's a very small population, so when one person responds, and or two people respond, it's not, is it something that we can take into account and make significant changes based on one or two people in that group.

So, we were trying to really change the response and have people give us more feedback so we can trend and evaluate whether it's something that multiple groups want, or if it's segmented to just one community group. And then our face-to-face engagement returned to pre-pandemic level, so we saw an opportunity to run this survey when

everybody was in the mindset, when we had just finished speaking to that group. So, those were some of the reasons that we adopted this approach that we did this year, and I'm going to go into the participation rates here, year-on-year, as a result of the changes, as you can see, 2023, and this was as of February 27th.

Over the years with the CSC in particular here, you see 5-4 and then 5-5-4, so it stayed pretty consistent regardless of how we delivered the survey. The ccNSO, I'm very pleased that was the highest participation rate out of the groups. I don't know if I was there, and I was like giving the cards to people and like, do it now! And so, it was 12 responses. The GNSO, we had zero. With the TCRs, we only had one respond. And then for ccTLDs, which is approximately around 450 invites that were sent year-on-year, it varies a little bit each year, we got 35, so you'll see that the number reduced quite a bit. And then the gTLDs, we only had 21 responses.

And I didn't use the percentage just because of that small group, so it could be, 50% means, depending on the size of the group. So, that's why I started using the number of people who responded for this group. And then, as I said, there's a broader community outreach, so I added some examples there of the 14 who responded as other. We had, At-Large, we had fellows, we had registrars, civil society, LACRALO, and some others, and other people just put not applicable or I'm just an interested party, not really customer of IANA. So, we, you can see that we didn't achieve the result that we were trying to, which was to increase that participation. Some of it actually reduced, so, or some, we didn't get any. So, it's something that we need to look into as we

move forward with how we're going to approach this move in the coming year.

BART BOSWINKEL: Now or later on?

AMY CREAMER: Yes, we can take questions if you have it. Yes.

BART BOSWINKEL: So, Xavier, you were first.

XAVIER CALVEZ: The 21 for the GNSO, what is 21? The number of councils?

AMY CREAMER: The number of people who were the council. The council, yes. So, this is ccNSO council and GNSO council. In the GNSO, we usually include the chair of the registry stakeholder group when we were sending it in the email.

XAVIER CALVEZ: I find it concerning, well, concerning, okay, differently. We all would like that there would be higher participation of the GNSO. Have you discussed in the past to more specifically target the registry stakeholder group rather than the GNSO council? Because the registry doesn't have a business if they're not in the route, they should care.

KIM DAVIES: We've spoken at the registry stakeholder group with similar findings as we're sharing with you today in previous years, because this trend is not new this year. It's been declining over the years. So, we've implored them to respond and ask them whether there're better ways to conduct the survey, trying to get that feedback. But it's usually being met with apologies and sorry, really meant to respond, but nothing obviously has come of that.

XAVIER CALVEZ: I think we should work on the fees and have like fee incentive. No, no. Not to discount a penalty, but they don't respond to this.

RICK WILHELM: I'll offer, this is Rick Wilhelm, I'll offer wearing my registry operator hat. I've done and we do register our surveys at our registry. It's isomorphic, I would offer to kind of what you're doing here, where you've got a service operation, you serve as a bunch of customers and you want to know how you're doing. I look at these participation rates. I'm going to only look at, where you've got N equals 450 and N equals 600. The kind of the bottom two rows, these participation rates, I look at them and they resonate. So, the thing I would say is your people who don't do surveys for a living, look at these and might think they're bad. People who do surveys for a living, look at these and say, these are nominal.

These are not surprising at all. Our survey rates are not dissimilar to these percentages. We work extraordinarily hard and our people with

whom we have business relationships go out and metaphorically beat the bushes to help get the return rate up and it's hard to get it. So, I'm sitting here and as I look at these, I don't think that they're bad. And I would encourage the group as you're looking at these, not to be disappointed with IANA's performance here in terms of these numbers. These are not bad numbers. And if you do think these are bad numbers, you need to run a survey and see what you get. And you need to talk to professional research people, like you use Echo. There are other ones there. I won't give other names.

And they would tell you that what your overall number is not, they would say, that's not bad. Don't feel bad about that, which is probably what you got in the meeting. And you said, but I want more. And they'd be like, chill, it's fine, is probably a rough transcript you got. So, like, while I agree that I would like the response rate to be better, and you and Kim and I can't believe that people aren't filling out the survey, but this is welcome to human behavior 101.

So, I would just like encourage people not to be too hard on IANA about these numbers. The best thing that I can say is that the survey cannot get too short, that we have found in our work, and you've probably seen this too, someone's always lobbying to NC to get another question there, like it just cannot get too short. And there's a direct relationship between length, the longer it gets, the fewer response you get. Thank you.

BRETT CARR:

I think that when you look at all those numbers together, I completely agree with you. I think the only thing that's a red flag is that zero sticks

out like a sore thumb. And that's the thing that worried me. And maybe that's the thing you need to focus on. And I know you have, but maybe you have to find another way to focus on it to bring the GNSO or at least say one or two.

BART BOSWINKEL: Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thank you. Good, it works this time. Okay, so this is Peter, for the record, just with the registry head on at the moment. I was just wondering whether you had put the numbers in relation to the number of requests. Well, we would usually respond to the survey, but if we didn't have a request in the previous year, what would we talk about being satisfied or not? So, if you put that into relation that numbers, it might even, and continuing to what Rick said, it might even look more better, betterer, if that's a word or not. So, that's just if you do that. Thank you.

KIM DAVIES: So, not to preempt the remainder of Marilia's presentation, but this isn't our only strategy and she'll get to that in a moment. I think the one response I wanted to have here, and I agree with Rick's assessment that in terms of industry norms, it's not a bad response rate for those big groups there, but we have whole segments of important community groups that we service that we're not getting actionable intelligence from.

I think that's fundamentally the concern here. And I think we need to continue to adapt and try different strategies to get that input because, the group that oversees how we do root KSK management, that's important. The GNSO council, that's important. So, what's the right way of engaging those communities and getting that tangible feedback, I think is still an open question. Thanks.

MARILIA HIRANO:

And I'll address the Rick's comment in my next slides. But yes, I agree with you. The industry norm is, I believe, 3% response rate for the larger groups. So, this is big. And this is what our vendor, they tell us that on the operator side. When it's a larger pool, it's the smaller ones that only have, if you have 12 people or 18 people and you're not, you're only getting half then, and then there's the other complication that we have is that a lot of these groups, they overlap with this one and they rotate. So, we might get satisfaction rate from a group.

And then once it turns into the membership changes, it might be different too. So, there's that added nuance that we have in addition to these being small groups already. And when we get one or two, it's complicated to decide if we're going to address that feedback or not. But the good news is on the request side that Rick was talking about, if I didn't have a request that year, I'm not going to know how to respond, is where we go into the how do we do survey? Because that is where that focus is. The survey that we launched in 2018, it is sent after your request is resolved. So, if a TLD operator or gTLD or ccTLD operator, they submit a request to us. Once that request is processed and we resolve that ticket, they will get an email within 24 hours with a one

question, which is there. I need to take this thing out. Yes, I was satisfied or no, I was not satisfied. That's just an example that I added there.

And then once they respond, they will have a prompt to add, if they're not satisfied, they can add what was the reason. And it's attached to the request. So, they will have how you recently responded to your request to change the technical content on dot. So, the message is customized based on the request too, so that they know what they're getting the survey for. And the same requester is not going to get a survey within, I believe it was 60 days. Now my memory is failing, but each 60 days. So, that when, if you are one, the TLD operator that's consistently getting, or if you have a bunch of requests open at the same time, once it resolves you'll get one, you're not going to get multiple surveys to fill out.

And the satisfaction is there. It's on our website. 96.3 was the January number for this year. It's on the performance section of IANA.org. We have staff that is dedicated to monitoring, reviewing, and addressing the feedback. We work closely with Amy's team to make sure that every complaint or like suggestion gets addressed and responded to in a timeframe that we've established. So, for this survey that we've been running, it was in December of 2018. That's why I just put the 2019 numbers here and an average for 2019. The participation rate, the story here is much different. We actually get a lot of responses to this survey. This is for the naming function. So, 94 was the average. So, it stayed 2021, 2022, 97.5, you'll see there.

Participation rate, we were monitoring over the years to see if it would decline, people would get, like I've already filled this out multiple times, or if it would, but no, we've been pretty consistent with participation rates for this survey. And we get very useful feedback, we get a lot of, as you see, a lot of compliments, a lot of green. And for the negative, most of the times they do add what it is, like what were they not happy with, and we're able to address it. And this is just for the naming function. I didn't add protocols and numbers and questions, but you'll see a completely different story when it comes to this survey, that is request driven.

So, what's next? As I said, there's still one group to be surveyed at this meeting, the ASO-AC and with the RIRs. We're going to attempt to connect once more with the IETF community and leadership during the next IETF meeting now in Australia, because we have received, we tried in the previous IETF meeting, and we got zero from them too. So, this is not only a GNSO council problem. That way we can give them another opportunity to respond to the survey. The vendor will deliver the final report, which includes the satisfaction and with each of the themes, the one that I normally present to this group in May of 2024.

And then we will continue to discuss this internally, evaluating the approaches. And then once we have a new, because we do come to you guys and we can show you what we're proposing, because now we have these two surveys and how can we leverage what we already have while still taking into account that the contractual deliverable, and then keep having a discussion with the group to see if it would be doable and if we're all aligned, to get some feedback from you guys too, what your thoughts are on what we propose. So, those are the next steps. And I

believe that's the last slide that I have. Yes. Any questions on the remaining? Yeah.

KIM DAVIES:

Not a question from earlier, but a clarification, because I don't think we covered it, but the two surveys, one's annual and one is after each interaction, are asking different questions. So, the one after each interaction gives a simple binary question, were you satisfied, yes, or no? And when you click the green button or the red button, you are given an opportunity to add a comment. And particularly in the case of a no, like help us, tell us what went wrong so we can try and fix it for you, basically is the request to the customer.

The annual survey, initially before we did this impulse survey right after every interaction, used to be customer satisfaction driven on how we're doing our day-to-day job. But the questions now are more directed at strategic questions. Like are we doing engagement in a good way, this kind of thing. So, to Peter's comment, while I didn't interact with IANA, I didn't submit a change request this year, perhaps that's part of the messaging we need to have around the survey, but we're trying to ask all of our customer groups, and I'll use the IETF as an example, like are the forms of the way IANA staff engage with your community appropriate?

Do you want that to evolve? These are the kinds of more strategic long-term questions we're trying to get a sense from the community from that will inform things like our engagement strategy, things like that. So, it's hard to convey that when you just send a link to a survey and people just immediately throw it in the trash can. But that's the

intention, is not to do it twice, not to ask the same questions both annually and then after each request. But after the request, when it's fresh in your mind, you've just had this interaction, immediately tell us, was that a good experience or not? So, that's one facet. The other facet is, how do we get to all of our key community groups on an annual basis to work out strategically, are we going in the right direction or are we regressing, and get that feedback. Thanks.

BRETT CARR:

Thanks Kim. Excuse me, any other questions or comments from Marilia? In that case, I will, sorry Xavier.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

To just beat the horse to death on the survey and the GNSO Council, how long does it take to take the survey in your opinion? The annual one.

MARILIA HIRANO:

This one was from five to seven minutes was the time.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

So, I know I'm going to throw in an idea that is going to be laughable to some, but we could simply work with the team that supports the GNSO Council, for example. Throw in a 10-minute agenda item on the GNSO Council's meeting at any point of time during the time of the survey, and say this is the time you're going to take to take the survey. Everyone,

you can't not do it. Same thing with the ccNSO Council, and there's going to be 100% participation.

BART BOSWINKEL: They have been refusing, they will refuse.

XAVIER CALVEZ: But then they're on the spot to refuse, which is fine by the way. But if it takes five to seven minutes, this is not, and they are important. They need to understand they're important.

BRETT CARR: That's leading the horse to the water and forcing his face into it, right?

KIM DAVIES: So, that's what we did in Hamburg, and we still got that. We literally did a presentation of the right link and put out the QR code first and said, while we're here, please pull it up right now, pull out your phones right now, take a picture. But unfortunately, that was insufficient. So, maybe a monetary lure might be the next path forward.

BRETT CARR: You're not leaving the room until you can prove you've done it. Yeah, okay. Thank you very much. Let's move on to the last main agenda item of today, which is to talk about next meetings. So, we have a reception with the CSC, PTI and invitees, which takes place straight after this meeting, so in three minutes time, which is here in this room. So,

please, right outside, sorry. So, please feel free to hang around for a drink and whatever else there is here, some food, I guess. We'll be happy to host you and chat with you and et cetera.

And then following that, we have a meeting on Wednesday afternoon, late Wednesday afternoon, which is the CSC and PTI meeting with the community to introduce the SLA change process we talked about earlier in this meeting, which from the CSC's point of view, Fred's going to present because I'll unfortunately no longer be here. And then in the 20th of March now, because well, actually we said we'd do this ratification of this report on the mailing list, so we'll move the next meeting to the 17th of April.

BART BOSWINKEL: That would be --

BRETT CARR: That would be up to Fred.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah.

BRETT CARR: Well, that would be my recommendation to cancel the next meeting, do the February report online and then do the next piece on the 17th.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. And then we can finalize the storm and et cetera as well.

BRETT CARR: Yeah. So, that'll be 2am UTC. And yeah, and that's it. And so, we'll move to any other business.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. Just one thing. Brett, thank you very much for chairing this for the last couple of years.

BRETT CARR: It's been a pleasure.

BART BOSWINKEL: So, you don't a get your present yet, that's in October but this time, thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]