HYDERABAD – Customer Standing Committee
Tuesday, November 08, 2016 – 08:30 to 10:30 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

BYRON HOLLAND: For the benefit of others in the room, we have had one call on October 6th, which was primarily an introductory phone call and administrative phone call to some degree. As such, in the first face-to-face, we put forward the agenda that you see in front of us. I would like to keep the meeting relatively casual and provide the opportunity for all of the liaisons and all of the members to provide input and feedback as we get started. I think this meeting, in particular, I look at as the forming meeting before the norming and storming, as this committee really gets going.

I think the primary objective of this meeting is to make sure that all the liaisons and all the members are up to speed and have a common level of understanding and knowledge around some of the key elements of the CSC and the work that's been done to date by PTI, which is considerable, as well as a c0mmon understanding of the SLEs, which clearly spell out much of what we need to be measuring and monitoring as the CSC and provide the basis upon which we will be building reports and providing reporting, both to direct customers and to the broader community.

I'd also like to take the opportunity of this meeting to start thinking about the more medium and longer term work items and get an understanding of what we believe are the urgent items versus the important items and start to break those apart in terms of a chronology that we can work on over the coming year.

With that, we'll dive right into the meeting agenda proper. First, I'd like to welcome all of the non-liaison and non-members. I was not sure on what kind of audience we'd have, but it's practically a standing-room-only crowd. Welcome.

Anyway, let's move on to the Agenda Item, essentially, #3 here, which is an overview of the SLE. As I mentioned, the SLE is very detailed and provides us a very strong basis upon which to do the work of the CSC and measure and monitor the performance of IANA.

To make sure that we're all up to speed and have a common level of understanding and knowledge, two of the members of this committee, Elaine and Jay, are going to provide us an overview of what is contained within the SLE – not at a detailed-detailed granular level, but more at an overview level.

With that, I will pass it over to Elaine and Jay.

JAY DALEY:	Thank you. This is to talk you through the SLA in terms of its structure – or, the SLE. I'd like to get away from this phrase "SLE" to "SLA" because I think that the more ICANN uses completely unique phrases, the less it is accessible to anybody in the real world.

So, I know it says SLE and all the documentation says SLE, but I'm going to try to use SLA wherever possible and just normalize this a bit.

We're going to talk you through this structure and some of the background as to how we got to this point of it.

At the front, we have a set of principles, and I'll be talking about those. We have some assumptions. Those are not going to be gone through, but they're relatively straightforward, just background to how this was developed. Then the services are defined, which we will talk through. Then there are the reporting mechanisms for PTI to follow, which are set out quite clearly.

This actually breaks down into three logical parts. We have the Background of Principles and Assumptions. We then have the three definition parts of Services, Reporting, and Fields. We then have the five parts at the bottom about what reporting is required.

In those five parts, we have the Informational Measurements Reporting, which is things that are useful to know but there are no targets associated with them. Then there are the four elements of Process Performance, Accuracy, Online Services Availability, and Enquiry Processing that all have targets associated with them. For those, that's where the field definitions are necessary to understand those.

We're not going to show you the details of the targets. We're just going to show one slide with some of them as an example as to how they work.

The principles. One of the very first principles here is the foundation of the SLA and a change from the NTIA SLA. That SLA solely measured end-to-end performance for a particular operation and did not take into account that, while PTI does some elements of the work, there are other elements that need to sit with the requester. The requester can take some months to do it, and that's entirely outside the control of PTI.

So, this first principle is that all of the measures must be attributable to the person that is responsible for doing them so that PTI is fairly measured on what they do, not unfairly measured because they are waiting for somebody else to do something. So, that's the foundation there.

The second thing, though, is that we do need to look at overall times of processes in that because we need to understand how long things sit around and what that means for us if things sit around for ages.

For example, if a particular request is made by a, say, French speaking African country – or French and African-language speaking African country – and we see a trend that those requests take much longer than requests that come from English-speaking countries, then that may indicate that there's a language barrier there or something. That needs to be looked at and assessed in some way from the overall times.

Now, that's purely an example. I'm not suggesting there is any barrier there.

The next thing is relevance. We don't want to measure everything. There is no point in measuring everything. Anything that is measured should be relevant for a specific purpose.

We need clear definitions of things, and in particular, we [need] definitions of thresholds. I will explain this later again a bit more, but when you set an SLA and set a target in an SLA, you are looking at two things, one of which is the fixed point on a particular scale at which you need something delivered beneath or above.

The second thing you're looking at is the spread around that point that you're willing to accept because there are certain things, such as an automated process, where you can be confident that the spread will be quite narrow, and so a high percentage of thing should be achievable within a particular band.

There are other things that are much more complex, such as the re-delegation of a ccTLD, for example, where the spread could be enormous across that because there are so many local complexities to take into account. That needs to be addressed. So that comes into the way that the thresholds are defined.

Then, of course, the principles are that there should be a review process and regular reporting.

Do you want to add anything, Elaine, at all? No? Okay.

BYRON HOLLAND: Jay, I'm just going to jump in here for a second. As I said right at the outset, I want to make sure that we all have a common understanding and shared knowledge, so if there's anything that is unclear or you want to make a comment or question, please feel free to do so at any point in the early going here because it is absolutely critical that we all understand the essence of what is it that we're doing, which is, in particular, around the SLAs.

And just as a reminder, we've already had our first call, but as a reminder, all the liaisons and all the members get to participate and question and join the conversation in an equal way. Any of the liaisons, please jump in if you don't understand of have a question or comment.

ELISE GERICH: This is Elise Gerich. It's just a comment, mostly for the people who aren't on the CSC, because, Jay, I think we're now calling it SLAs, which is great because that's the goal of where we wanted to get.

But I think what you're defining now upfront was the service level expectations because it went through two phases. There was to define what we thought the expectations for services should be, like what we might measure. Then once we got that, we collected some data, and then we set the service level agreement because we didn't start with an agreement knowing that something would be three days or two hours or whatever.

So, the expectations were the definitions of what we'll measure, and the agreement was the metrics that we're going to be held against?

JAY DALEY: No.

ELISE GERICH: No? Did I have that wrong? That's what I thought… So, I just wanted to… Since we're using language, I just wanted to use it consistently.

JAY DALEY: Okay. The SLA, the bit with the actual numbers in, has to contain all of this around it as a wrapper around it. So, the SLA is the version of this that has got full numbers in – well, at least the one I'm showing has [where we do it] – and is then signed as an agreement, which is what then makes it as an SLA.

Now, it started as an SLE, which is rather unique language, as a request or a set of expectations. But otherwise, there is nothing in this that would not be in the SLA.

BYRON HOLLAND: Lise?

LISE FUHR: I just wanted to explain why it's also been called SLE. That was because there's a number of ccTLDs doesn't have any agreement with IANA, and that was you called it "expectations" instead of "agreement."

JAY DALEY: I understand that. I think, though, that, for PTI to deliver this, they have to sign this with somebody to say, "This is what we are committed to."

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Jay. Carry on.

JAY DALEY: Okay. Thank you.

We have defined five categories of service with this. Category 1 are routine updates impacting the root zone, such as changing NS records or changing DS records. These require a third party – Verisign, of course – to implement, publish, and distribute changes.

Category 2 are routine updates not impacting the root zone; basically things updating the root WHOIS, the database of designated managers and those sort of things –well, all contacts within that and the administrative side of those things.

Category 3 is creating or transferring of gTLDs, which of course requires significant processing and is therefore a different type from an ordinary rooting change request.

Category 4 is creating or transferring a ccTLD (the nightmare one, I believe). That is therefore an even more significant one

and cannot be bundled with a gTLD, whereas the rules are clearer with gTLDs.

Then we have Category 5, which is, as written there, things that may have special handling requirements, so it is generally impossible to automate them. Or they are conducted so infrequently that it is problematic to attempt any form of clear definition or target about those.

These are just some examples here: requests handled outside the online service platform, such as through postal mail (I didn't realize there was such a thing); customers putting special handling instructions on file; unique legal or regulatory encumbrances that must be satisfied; removing a TLD from service, which as we know can take several years in some cases; and changes that relate to the operation of the root zone itself.

Should I just carry on? All right.

These are the reporting mechanisms that are defined. These are the reporting mechanisms that PTI is required to deliver. Some of these already existed. Some of these came new through the SLE development process. I'm not going to distinguish which ones are which.

The metrics or data points on the right are slightly summarized compared to the detail in the SLE, but it's roughly the same.

EN

So, we have the five public ones. The first one is a real-time dashboard, which, as you can see, has a number of different metrics it shows on there.

The second one is the monthly SLE report, which is the point in time data extracted and then kept, which is then the main purpose of the CSC to look at.

Then we have incident reports, which are ad hoc reports based around incidents. We may have none of those.

Then we have accuracy, which is a separate calculated metric, probably [a daily] part of the SLE report. But that was kept out separately for some reason that eludes me.

Then we have the request database. This is not entirely clear around the request database as to how much detail it will have in it and how much will be anonymous around that. That's stills something that's not clear. Basically, it's intended to show every request made after the request has been actioned, the time stamps of those key steps, and the final status of them. So, it's not meant to be, as I understand, a live tracker role from it, It's a historical record of requests.

Separately, for requesting TLDs, there is a live tracker intended to be which shows the status of their requests, the time stamps,

and what actions are required and who is required to do those next steps.

I'll move on. Informational measurement and reporting. This is an area which there are, as I said, no targets, no thresholds set about those. But these are important to understand the overall performance of PTI and for determining if there are any particular issues within anywhere.

So, overall request processing volumes and timelines. And then accuracy. And then the online services availability and processing.

Now, this gets a bit self-referential after a while because one of the metrics in here is the availability of the dashboard that reports on the metrics. But apart from adding that on, these are all systems that existed previously. So, it's straightforward.

Okay. I'm on the penultimate slide now. The next slide I'm going to show you is some of the actual targets from the SLA, but this is the slide that explains those. Briefly, just to note, the way that the figures were achieved was through a two-part process.

One part was an independent review of historical requests. The second part was through adjustments to the IANA systems to record new data and an analysis of that new data. And, actually, there was a third bit, which was a finger-in-the-air take-a-bit-of-

a-guess because some things simply didn't have enough volume for us to make better things with that.

These things were quite genuinely negotiated, I think, and that is the essence of an SLA: it is a negotiation. It is not an imposition on an organization. I think that's important to note.

In the next slide I'm going to show you, you'll see these. The first field is the process that we're requested to perform. The second is the metric, which is what we're measuring. The third is the target, and then the type of target, which explains whether something must not exceed that target or everything must exceed that target.

The next one is the breach. This is the important one that people may not be familiar with. This is a percentage of requests that must comply with the target. This is how you manage the spread within an SLA.

There are four examples, as we said earlier, of the re-delegation of the ccTLD, which can take, in some cases, several months, and in other cases, several decades, I suspect. So, we need a reasonable measure of spread so that there is some degree of tightness around that, but not too much so that the outliers can still stand as outliers without causing a breach of the SLA. So, effectively, that's about tolerance for outliers – that breach there.

Finally, there's the period over which the SLA compliance is measured.

This is a screenshot just from the very first bit of the performance targets. This is to give you an indication of just how detailed the SLA goes in. This is quite normal, for any of you that do business-type SLAs that go into this level.

Category 1: rooting out data impacting the root zone file, which I've already discussed. NS, DS, and Glue records. The first metric is the time for the ticket confirmation to be sent to the requester. That threshold is below 60 seconds. That's a maximum, so it should not be more than 60 seconds. 95% of the time, it needs to be below 60 seconds as measured over a month.

The next one is the time for the lodgement of the change request into the root zone management system by ICANN staff on behalf of a request sent by e-mail because it is clear that there will be multiple mechanisms for people to put these requests in. That's less than or equal to three days. Again, that's 95% of the time over a month.

Then we see the technical checks that need to be performed. The time to return results for technical checks following the submission of the request is less than or equal to 50 minutes. That, again, is a maximum with a 95% compliance.

Finally, the time to return results for subsequent performance of technical checks. That's less than or equal to three minutes.

So, if the figures look counterintuitive to you, that's because they're probably genuine from genuine data, rather than something that you might necessarily want to set as a target.

It's important to note that, when you start with an SLA like this, that's very normal. Over a period of time, there could be a particular push to tighten in a specific area, which is normally a strategic decision made. That then leads to a change in those targets.

Okay. Do you want to add anything?

ELAINE PRUIS: Yeah, I guess so. Just to note, as Jay said, these SLEs are based on real data that was collected over several months. So, the three days for a request for e-mail was a discussion around how long does it take to actually have staff open an e-mail, review it, and then start the process, and do we need to consider holidays and weekends.

Also, as Jay said, we'll look at tightening these things up as time goes by and processes change.

EN

JAY DALEY: So, that's it from us. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you very much. Any questions or comments from CSC members or liaisons?

Okay. Thank you very much. Just by way of a reminder, as we discussed on the call, we are recording the meeting. As you may have seen on the website, it is available. So, for that, please, let's state our names every time we speak. Depending on how we record this, there's certainly the potential that we'll be providing transcripts and will want our names there. Anyways, that's something we'll come to later in the agenda, which is forward work planning. But for now, please just state your name.

So, no questions on that? Thank you very much, Jay and Elaine.

We'll move on to Agenda Item #2 then, which is a beta of the current dashboard. Some of us have seen it, but again, I want to make sure that we bring everybody up to a common standard of knowledge. It has been evolving. It is a beta, but it's quite robust thus far.

With that, I'll turn it over to Elise to walk us through what the beta dashboard looks like.

ICANN|57
HYDERABAD
3-9 November 2016

ELISE GERICH: Thank you, Byron. The beta dashboard is a beta because the document was written, the service level expectations were defined, and then the SLAs were applied. We had to write the tool, obviously, to implement that. We think we got it pretty much right, but every now and then we discover things that could be improved. So, this is the beta for a while until we are all confident that it's reflecting the information properly.

What you're seeing on the screen right now is the overview. There's three categories there. The top one, which is all green, is Service Availability. The next bar below that is Request Volume. This is an aggregate. It's just an overview. It doesn't dive deep yet.

If you can scroll up, Ria, so that you can see the bottom bar – it's request duration. To the far right, there's a big tall spike. You may wonder what that might be. Jay mentioned multiple times that sometimes ccTLD delegations or transfers seem to take longer than some things. So, that's one reason we have a spike over there.

If we could, Ria, then go to "Open Overview," you'll see there's sub-categories under the overview. Go down to "Request Volume," please.

The dashboard loads about every 15 minutes. It goes out and collects real data. So, when you're just opening a page, it may take a few minutes, like that one just did.

This is an overview of several months of the request volumes. Ria, if you can scroll your cursor across some of the bars in the graph, please.

You'll see that if you hover your cursor over a bar, it'll give you the information on that bar so that you don't have to go down to the table below and try to map it to the bars. They're color-coded. I can't read it so well from here, but if you go online, you can read it.

Ria, if you can scroll the screen upwards so we can see what the lower part of this is.

Then you get the numerical information instead of just the pictorial information for the volume.

One of the things that Jay mentioned was that there was interest in making sure that we measure the time that the IANA functions operator spends on a ticket, as well as the time a third party might spend on the ticket, as well as the root zone maintainer and the customers themselves when we have to have iterations with them.

Ria, if you could go back up to the list on the left and click on "Time Per Actor."

Again, this wasn't necessarily preloaded, so it may take a couple minutes. What you'll see, again, is that there's a potential to have four bar graphs. It'll come up any time now. And you'll see the time spent by each of the actors. Sometimes there's never a third party involved, so there won't be any bar graph there.

Oh, darn. I hate live demos when they take a little bit of time. No, it's not your problem, Ria. It's clearly –

ELAINE PRIUS: Can I ask while it's loading. Will we see an aggregate of tasks for each of those actors, or is it individual?

ELISE GERICH: No. The data is anonymized.

So here we have the bar graph for Time per Actor. I believe the purple is for the IANA functions operator, PTI. The red is for the root zone maintainer, Verisign. The blank one was for if there were any third-party activities. The blue one is the customer themselves.

As you can see, typically it's PTI and the customer that have the bulk of the processing time. The root zone maintainer is fairly flat in their performance of their activity.

One other area I'd like to show – I think it's primarily because Jay highlighted it – is about the fact that we do receive requests and tickets by e-mail.

If you click on "Submission," please, and then on the "Manual Lodging Time." One of the reasons I want to show this category – the other, under "Overview" is primarily volumes and numbers. They don't apply the SLA.

In this bar graph, it shows that we've received manual requests and this is how long it took us to get them into the system. There are a couple of spikes there which, of course, were worrisome so I looked at them.

If you'll scroll down, please. Keep scrolling.

You'll see that now it applies the number of days for lodging that ticket against the SLA. So, there's some things that are red there. Not a happy camper, are we?

However, I have investigated this. With the one that says "gTLD Creation and Transfer," I couldn't understand why that could possibly be twelve days. This is why this is still in beta. It was a mis-categorization of a ticket as a gTLD instead of a ccTLD.

So, the beta version is helping us to be more accurate in our processing of tickets because we can now dive down and check and see why it was mis-categorized and make that correction internally.

If you look at the routine non-technical, I was concerned that one took 17 days. There's one that's just slightly over the SLA at three days. There were four tickets that drove the one in September that gives us that average of 17 days. One of them was one that went over a weekend and a holiday day. So, it came in on Friday and then Monday was a national holiday in the U.S., so the ticket had four days where it sat in the queue, the e-mail, before it was created as a ticket.

One of the things we discussed in the negotiation, as Elaine mentioned, was that it was a negotiation about how many days it should take to lodge an e-mail ticket. I think this was something that didn't rise in the conversation when the metrics and the time stamps were being collected and the methodology was being defined: the system counts calendar days, not business work days.

So, what you're seeing are calendar days, so if something does come in on a Friday and then there's a holiday on a Monday, it will often take more than three days.

The other three tickets that came in manually, of the four that caused that to be out of scope, so to speak, for the SLA, were ones where we had a lot of iterations with the customer. They sent a manual request that was not fully populated with the information necessary to proceed.

I don't know if you want to see anything else, Byron, but I thought I'd highlight first the overview, which was just overall volume. And ten each of the subsequent categories have the graph as well as a table that highlights whether the SLA was met or not met for that month.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Any questions for Elise?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Hi. A question. When you have tickets with long durations, is the time reported under the month when the ticket is finished and closed? Because that doesn't map the ticket numbers for submitted tickets when it crosses a month boundary. I don't have an opinion. I just want to know what I am looking at.

ELISE GERICH: The methodology is to report on when it's closed because that's when the SLA is completed. But the volume – we show how many tickets were in process for ticketing volume.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. Any –

ELISE GERICH: And I do need to apologize to Lise and Jonathan. We were chatting. They asked me how many tickets we get per month, and I said 30. I was obviously having a brain freeze. So, I do apologize. I don't know what I was thinking.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. Any other questions for Elise at this juncture. No? Okay.

Well then, moving right along to the next agenda item, which is around the monthly performance reporting format. As everybody on the committee will likely call, Elise had actually asked us what form that monthly reporting could or should or might look like and whether the dashboard itself would suffice. I think having some discussion about that right now would be

helpful, both for Elise but also for us to initiate that very conversation.

To that end, I'd like to ask Kal to kick us off on that discussion.

KAL FEHER: Thanks, Byron. I've had a good look around the dashboard, actually, as a customer as well as in preparing for this meeting. Some questions were running around through my head because, to answer the question of what format you would have it in, you have to ask yourself who consumes the data, what they want to see, what they want to use it for, how often they want it, and so on.

I don't think I have those answers as of yet. I'm looking for some feedback from the other CSC members to see whether we've identified consumers and expectations. Obviously, we are one of those consumers, so I take that as a given.

I also found it interesting from Jay's presentation that he listed a couple of additional reporting categories. I don't know how they were perceived or whether we intended to have some structured format around those or whether the dashboard was going to fulfill those requirements. I think you listed, Jay, the dashboard, the SLA report, incident reports, accuracy, metrics – we kept

separate – and the request database. I'll leave out the status tracker for now because it's private.

Were we expecting separated data for those? Yeah. Okay. I see Jay nodding.

Why is it green? Oh.

JAY DALEY: Bryon, can you turn yours off? Great. Sorry. Thank you.

Yes, it was very specifically meant to be different from the dashboard, which is why they're not included in the dashboard. They're very specifically meant to be point-in-time things that are then distributable as separate reports in that way, definitely.

KAL FEHER: Thanks, Jay. Well, I guess in that case, we'd probably have to have an experiment and see what sort of data we can get regarding those. I'm happy to receive it and then complain about the format, rather than over-engineer the format early.

Sorry. Elise?

ELISE GERICH: I was going to reply to that.

KAL FEHER: Yeah, go for it.

ELISE GERICH: [That's all right.] We're sharing this microphone. You don't have to turn it off.

We're happy to create a template, a draft, and have iterations and see what makes sense for the various reports. One of the ones that I was mostly interested in – because the CSC charter explains that you'll get monthly reports for performance, and I thought they were specifically supposed to be targeting the SLAs for those monthly reports. And the dashboard obviously has a summary in a table about whether the SLA was met that month or not.

I was curious whether you wanted us to have a snapshot and whether that snapshot of that table is sufficient within, maybe, text below, like I described just verbally a little while ago, of "We looked into why the routine non-technical lodgement and hightlighted anything that didn't meet the SLA and why we discovered that," because we are still in beta with the measurements and the reporting of the measurements.

So, the report could be a snapshot saying, "Okay, we've met the SLAs except for this point in time. We've investigated, and these are the underlying reasons why that was missed." That could be

the monthly report, which was basically just a snapshot with the dialogue. But that's one proposal for the monthly report.

BYRON HOLLAND: Questions? Elaine first. Elise second.

ELAINE PRUIS: Thanks. Yes, Elise, I like the idea of having an explanation of wherever anything is outside of what's been expected or agreed upon.

Also, as a consumer of the PTI function, I would like to see some indicator that predicts for me or my staff how long it's going to take for something to happen. So, if I'm in the middle of transitioning a TLD, I can pop open the monthly report of the dashboard and say, "Okay. It's a holiday weekend and if I send this via e-mail, I should have an answer by Tuesday. Therefore, I can plan on having this piece done by Friday."

Where you've got an aggregation of response times for different actors, I think it would be useful to have those broken out by what that function is. So, if it's taking your staff 24 hours to do one function and 48 hours to do another function, but those things are aggregated, it's hard to use that information as a predictor for what I can expect as a return time on a request.

Does that make sense?

ELISE GERICH: Yes, I think that does make sense – what you're asking – but I think, if we look at the breakdowns, other than overview, which is the aggregate – give you those independent things. So, each individual requester has credentials into the root zone management system and they can track where their ticket is in the process. If you were in technical checks, there's an area in this dashboard where you look at technical checks and it shows you how long it typically takes for technical checks.

But it does mean that the requester themselves has to go in through their credentials, know where they are in the process, whether you're in technical checks or in contact confirmations – those are the primary ones – and then you can see how long it takes.

Then the root zone maintainer is an aggregate of how long because they produce two root zone files a day. If you're not around midnight or you're not around noon, you're probably going to be in the later one.

Does that make sense?

ELAINE PRUIS: Yes. Is there a reason why the information that's supplied on a per-account basis isn't supplied overall for the general public to see? If I log in and I see it takes this long for this function to occur, why wouldn't I see that just in the general reporting site?

BYRON HOLLAND: Can I jump in here? I think this is a great conversation to have in terms of the reporting. I think it also highlights the different ways that the reporting will be used and is a good metaphor for what we need going forward. I think we should, at this particular meeting, avoid diving into very, very specific details and just ratchet it up to begin with, but I think, in terms of what we're looking for generally from reporting because I think what Elaine has done is actually given us a great example of the potential specific uses of the monthly reporting as opposed to potentially the dashboard reporting, but maybe both.

I would like to just interject right now and talk about the reporting itself from a monthly perspective. One of the things that I think we need in addition to the dashboard is the ability to do easy point-in-time push reporting.

On a monthly basis, I think there's an expectation that this report, however it ends up being presented, will be pushed to a broad community of subscribers. It will be put on the CSC website and the PTI website and other places, potentially. So,

while the dashboard is going to be very, very useful, a specific, defined, monthly report will also be required, I believe.

Elise?

ELISE LINDEBERG: Thank you. Elise Lindeberg from the GAC. Thank you for the very useful presentations. That's a lot of graphics for me, obviously.

I just want to underline, coming as liaisons from the different communities. It was something about what you said, Bryon. We need – at least I need – some understandable language around all these graphics as a report so I can do something – push it forward to the GAC or I can explain it in a, let's say, bigger summary and so I can explain questions I get.

I think that the interest from the GAC is more on the overarching level of whether PTI performs within the SLA expectations. There's a lot of technical issues and nitty-gritty stuff – if you will call it that – that is very important, of course, for the customers directly, but we need, as a committee, to have something which is your own evaluation of whether or not you're in the service level agreements on a higher level.

So, we need some understandable language with the graphics, if I can ask for that.

Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Good comment. I think that was an interesting exchange in that it highlights the very different audiences and needs of those audiences that this report is going to have to satisfy, from cursory understanding of what the material actually is, with definitions and an ability to satisfy those requirements, as well as deep-dive customer-centric requirements.

Kal?

KAL FEHER: That actually segues well into a comment I was going to make earlier. Unless I've misread the chatter, we're actually obligated to hand out a monthly report to our communities. That's one of the things that I assumed – that we would be a consumer of these reports. So, it may actually be up to this committee to provide that message, provide that clarity, to people.

I think, in terms of the format of information that we get from PTI, raw is great for me, but we will have to provide that in a consumable manner to our various constituents. So, I think that's something of an obligation that we have, although we need to be armed with the correct information to deliver on that.

And I just wanted to point out one thing. You've got the raw data on your website, which maybe people aren't aware of. That's actually a potentially useful tool in the future. I've got some personal comments regarding the JSON structure and so on, but we can leave that for another discussion.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Elise?

ELISE GERICH: I just wanted to make two comments. One, I think… What I hope we can do. There's different layers of types of reports that might be needed because one of the tasks, I believe, for the CSC, for the charter, is to oversee that PTI is meeting their SLAs. So, there's that type of report, which is purely: did we or did we not? And if we didn't, why didn't we? Then you have remediation, etc.

The one format I was talking about earlier was, I think, very much focused on the CSC and the CSC's responsibility to make sure that PTI is doing its job.

And Elise mentioned that it'd be nice to have a report, and you want to have one that pushes. They could be the same.

Ria, if you could help me by projecting another demo. If you'll go to IANA.org/performance.

I'm going to present the old-style report that we've done that's not based on these SLAs and see if that's the type of information that we would want to be pushed because it's not necessarily going to be a deep dive that the CSC is going to do to figure out why things worked or didn't work. But it would be more user-understandable, perhaps. I'm just going to see if this type of template works.

Oh, my. Are you using Firefox again? No? Okay. So, if you'll click on the one that says "Performance Standard Metric Report." It's the second blue line down there. Open that and just click on the first metrics report. It doesn't matter what year it is.

This is a format that we built for NTIA based on communications.

If you'll scroll down to the first table, you'll see – it's C.2.9.2 – there. Stop, please.

Basically, there were SLAs that we had that we reported on for timeliness and accuracy. We had a small table at the top that said, "This is what the SLA is. It has to be performed within 21 days 80% of the time." Then we said actually how often we did it within that, and we gave ourselves a green check. If we didn't do it, we got a big red X.

Below that, there was information about individual root zone requests and their timeliness and accuracy. That might be,

Elaine, the kind of thing you're asking for, but it's post the ticket being closed, not during the ticket.

If this is more user-friendly, I guess, or customer-friendly than just the graphs or the tables, we could provide a template like this that aggregates the information from the graph and the dashboard and push this as this type of report. Obviously, it would have to have different things.

I'm asking the committee if this is what you were thinking in your comments. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: I'm going to answer to some degree and just say it may be. As the dashboard is helpful, this also looks to be helpful –

ELISE GERICH: As a summary.

BYRON HOLLAND: As a summary. I'm not sure we're in any place at this juncture to say, "Yes this is it," or, "This is not it." But when I look at the different streams of information and reporting that you provide already, I think there's a lot there to work with. But in terms of making sure that we satisfy very different audiences, of which

we have numerous, or multiple, at least, there's probably still some work to do.

Jay and then Elise. Or, Elise, is yours a follow-up? Elise and then Jay.

ELISE LINDEBERG: Thank you. It's Elise from the GAC again. Yes, maybe this is, as Byron said, it could be what we're expecting, but I think we also need to see that we have two levels of work in the CSC. We get something from you, and then we need to evaluate, and then we need also to summarize for ourselves.

And we should have some staff support, I guess, to also maybe make our own reports or our own evaluations. Maybe that will be once a year or once every half-year.

We have to work with the concept, also, to take all these numbers and graphics and what you have given us and say that we think, as the CSC, that this is a good performance. I think maybe we should have something like that, too. So maybe then this will be perfect from your side, and then we can use these in the other level. We don't know that yet, but that might be one thought.

Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Jay, and then I'm going to entertain a question from Greg, who's not actually on the committee. But since we don't actually have operating procedures yet, I can use a little Chair's prerogative and open it up – since we're in the forming stage of this committee.

Jay first.

JAY DALEY: Thank you. Yes, there is nothing I've seen that I don't like at all. The only thing is I can't say whether this is sufficient. That's effectively adding to what Byron said.

BYRON HOLLAND: Greg?

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. I actually come here in an official capacity as the Co-Chair from the Names Community for the IANA Community Coordination Group, which has a responsibility in the IANA IPR setup to provide, among other things, quality control information back to the IETF trust. The IETF trust as a trademark license (or to the IANA or to PTI) have to engage in quality control, but under the agreements, they've delegated that

quality control back to the three communities, particularly to the Community Coordination Group for that community.

And as the Co-Chair for that group, I will need to interface with the CSC and with this information so that I can provide basically quality control information back to IETF Trust. Again, it needs to be in some sort of digestible, summarized fashion that basically shows that everything is going according to plan and that the legal responsibility that IETF Trust has to monitor quality control is being fulfilled. If it's not fulfilled, there are threats, potentially, of abandoning the trademark.

So, that's the background, but the basic note is that there needs to be some interface, I think, between the CSC and the CCG, and we need to get some sort of a report – ideally a report that's already being generated for some other purpose. The idea is to create zero extra work if at all possible, but something that will fulfill the duty that has been delegated to our team.

Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. So, that highlights the numerous different audiences that we're going to have to satisfy. It's interesting. Yesterday in the meeting between the ccNSO and the Board, and being a Councilor as part of the ccNSO, I talked about the connective tissue between all the different groups and how all the different entities are going to have to work together and identify all of the

different pieces of connective tissue that is going to actually make this broader project work.

This is clearly one, and to be frank, it was one that was not in my field of vision until just this moment. So, thank you for clarifying.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. That's why I entered your field of vision this morning.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you, Greg.

Later on the agenda, one of the main topics was work planning going forward for this group, and certainly reporting was one of the…

Can't hear? Is this being – my mic is on. Okay.

So perhaps at this juncture, we'll wrap up this part of the conversation because it'll come back into work planning. I think it's been a good conversation because it's highlighted, even just right here at this table, the several different audiences who will have very distinct and different needs from the reporting, beyond strictly the dashboard that's already there.

Clearly this is going to be one of the work items that I think we're going to have to ask ICANN staff, whoever that ends up being, to

take away and work up some drafts that this committee can work with to begin with.

But we'll come back to this a part of work planning going forward, which is a later agenda item, if that's okay with everybody right now. Thank you, Kal, for kicking that off.

If we go back to the agenda, the next agenda item, while it comes up, is items for our last meeting of October 6th. Really, there were just a couple of items outstanding, some actual action items, and that was a determination of the member terms.

Just as a reminder, there are four members. Elaine, Kal, Jay, and myself are the members, as distinct from the liaisons. The members at the outset of this committee have either a two- or three-year term.

From the G community, had you determined who was up for the two- or the three-term?

ELISE GERICH: Rock, paper, scissors.

ELAINE PRUIS: I'm the winner of the three-year term.

BYRON HOLLAND: Congratulations. I think Jay and I had had some preliminary discussions. We were each kindly offering the other the three-year term, but I guess I'll be taking the three-year term to begin with. Then, of course, it will start to rotate over time.

Anyway, congratulations to us.

In terms if Item #2, which is the assessment of resources available from PTI and ICANN and other support, whatever that may be, as I've said repeatedly, this is very early days so I, as Chair, have had some conversations with ICANN, with Elise, with Göran, who I reached out to directly, and David Olive, who has been delegated the point person on resourcing this group.

My report back to the committee is that David has basically said, "We'll do what it takes. Clearly, we all want success from this group, and ICANN will provide the resources that we require," given I was not able to specify what those resources might look like at the outset. So, of course, he couched his commitment to some degree. But essentially, ICANN is willing to provide the resources required for this committee to fulfill its obligations and responsibilities.

I suggested – though, like I say, it's early days; I don't know for sure – that those resources will vary over the life cycle of this committee. In the early days, we probably need some more

administrative and document-creation bench strength. For example, we don't have operating procedures yet.

Resources that can help us with that who have experience in doing that and who can to some degree pull the boilerplate elements of operating procedures off the shelf and work them into our specific needs would be a clear example of resourcing that we would need in early days; whereas, as we start to push out reporting in some way, shape, or form and do some web development, those kinds of resources may be required down the line in the months or later this year, depending on how our timeline looks.

And that's what I indicated to David Olive. He was certainly open and agreeable to that. So, at this point, I don't have much more data to provide than that ICANN has committed to providing what is required. Not exactly a blank check, but a willingness to help.

And Trang is still very involved, which I was happy to hear because it seemed a little unclear a short while ago whether Trang was going to stay part of this project, but I here she was.

Trang, did you want to say something?

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you, Byron. Yes, I'll stay involved, obviously. We want to make sure that this committee will succeed, as this committee has very important work to perform in the post-transition environment. From a resourcing and support perspective, we'll provide whatever resourcing the committee needs.

In early going, as you mentioned, Byron, the needs were various. Because of the varied needs, the people who were supporting or providing the support for those needs were also varied.

So, I guess my suggestion would be for the committee to identify what deliverables or what specific needs it has. Obviously, Ria and myself and Elise will continue to participate in the committee's meetings and work. On the back end, we will internally identify what resources are appropriate to support whatever deliverable or need the committee. Obviously, that support will vary depending on what that need is.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Elise?

ELISE GERICH: I just wanted to mention – and I don't know; I think we mentioned it on our call previously – that, in preparation for having this committee, ICANN did create a Customer Standing Committee micro-site. So, this group already has a webpage,

csc.ICANN.org, and the audio from our last meeting is published there. The Adobe content is also published.

This is something that, maybe as part of our work plan, we might want to look at what kinds of things we want to publish there or not publish. If there are categories that we put in the template as suggestions, they're not fixed in stone. That might be something this group would want to look at, and how we want to continue to maintain that page.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Any questions or comments at this juncture?

Okay. Then we'll move on to, I think, the core substance of this meeting, now that we've all been brought up to speed on where we're at, and that's around the forward work planning. Hopefully, seeing the agenda, these committee members have thought a little bit about what should be included in that.

As I stated in the introduction, I think it's important to distinguish between the urgent and the important actions. Clearly, there are going to be short-term, mid-term, and longer-term activities that this committee is responsible for. I've certainly been thinking about it and have taken a stab at what some of those items could be. I don't, in any way, shape, or form,

claim that this is an exhaustive list or the only item, so I would welcome the committee's input.

I'd like to just kick it off with items that I think are of important or urgent matters. And that's how I would like to break it up between chronology and importance because, while there are some very important things we need to do, like a survey, it's not something that has to be done for some time.

Does that make sense to the committee? Okay.

To kick it off and provide some fodder for discussion, from the short-term perspective, there are some operational requirements simply for us. That would include setting up the operating procedures of this committee. So, that would be one obvious item required in the very short term.

I think, also, the process and procedures for how we're going to start to review the SLA on a monthly basis would be important. Also, how are we going to communicate out to the world in a way that meets any responsibilities we have as well as how we can meet the desires and needs of the outside community, even beyond what are base responsibilities are.

So, looking at that communication and output requirements: the website; are there any other channels of distributions?

We as a group agreed that these meetings would be as open as possible, and I think that goes back to operating procedures. So, my take on what we talked about in the last meeting is that they would always be open and as open as possible. I would say that should be our goal: they're open unless there's a special requirement from a privacy or confidentiality standpoint. Then we might have to have a closed meeting. I don't foresee it, but I think we have to leave that possibility open. But otherwise, open meetings.

David said that ICANN would provide recording service, a transcript of the recording, and then a summary of the transcript. I think that's what ICANN is willing to do for us. What do we do with that to make sure that the community is staying abreast of what this committee is doing?

Lars?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I assume this also pertains to the teleconferences that we're going to conduct? That we can have observers or at least participation using Adobe Connect or something.

BYRON HOLLAND: That's certainly my understanding, and that would be my intent. Although, as I say, we don't have operating procedures yet, so I

will say a qualified "yes" until we all agree on it. Unless there's any further comment on that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Elise?

ELISE LINDEBERG: Elise from the GAC. Now, of course it needs to be open – the teleconferences – because we're basically going to have only – or mostly – teleconferences as the way to communicate. So, we could use the [CCTV] for that or the experience we had for that, [or just] open Adobe. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. I'm just going to apologize right now. At some point, I know I'm going to get the Elises and Elaine mixed up.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And the Lisas.

BYRON HOLLAND:	And the Lisas, yes. That's why I'm sort of slow. I'm thinking, "Okay. Am I doing it right?"

So, those items to me are several of the ones that are obvious short-term activities that we need to engage in: operating procedures, how we're going to handle monthly calls, and how we're going to put out the information and make sure the community is staying abreast of it.

As part of that, what is the website going to look like? To that end, I doubt any of us are interested in maintaining websites or creating websites, so that's a perfect example of how we'll be leaning on ICANN staff to make sure that the website is effective in delivering on our needs, as well as communication needs out to the broader community.

So, those are some of the short-term actions that I see. Are there any others that people would suggest?

Trang?

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you, Bryon. I just have a clarifying question. What can staff do – what can we do – to help you with those short-term items that you have identified? Obviously, David Olive's team is very familiar with operating procedures for various other SOs and ACs that ICANN supports.

Would you like us to pull one of those standard operating procedures and draft something for the committee's consideration based on some of the items that have already been discussed? Would that be helpful?

And then, also, perhaps sharing with you some draft content for the website and potentially some ideas for structuring the website. How can we help to move forward for you the items that you've identified as short-term needs?

BYRON HOLLAND: Absolutely. There was some discussion with David Olive around those kinds of resources. Operating procedures is somewhere as an action item. We'll definitely need somebody from ICANN to take the lead on providing a draft.

So, that's something we will need in the very, very short term. Website content also. Right now, I think those would be key. Also, actually going from suggestion to execution on recording transcript summaries is something that we would want to do immediately.

Kal?

KAL FEHER: It might be obvious, but I think we should release our first report as soon as possible, either this month or next month – even if it's ugly; even if lots of people complain; and even if we don't really know how we're going to formulate it. I think we should try to get something out as soon as possible. It's part of our obligations. So, let's get going, I guess.

BYRON HOLLAND: Jay?

JAY DALEY: I agree, very much.

BYRON HOLLAND: Since we don't have any targeted dates yet, are you suggesting by the end of November/the beginning of December for a first potentially ugly draft of what the report would look like – but a draft?

JAY DALEY: Yeah. When will we officially constitute it?

UNIDENTIFED FEMALE: October 1st.

JAY DALEY:	October 1st?

BYRON HOLLAND:	October 1st.

JAY DALEY: October 1st. So, I would actually have said November the 1st. So, as soon as possible, I think, unfortunately. I'm sorry. I really probably need to think about that a bit more, but not the end of November. I would say that's too late. But I don't know how much working I'm asking for; if that's unreasonable.

BYRON HOLLAND: Lars?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: If we're reporting on a monthly basis, which is a perfect starting point at least, I think we should give Elise and her team and ourselves a few days at least to actually create the report, evaluate the output from Elise, and create our own report from that.

So, as a number out of the air, I'd say two weeks. So, November 15th would be the earliest for me. November 30th may be too late – I can agree – but at least two weeks, I would suggest.

JAY DALEY: I agree. And I think that we should be reporting for October.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes.

BYRON HOLLAND: Elise?

ELISE GERICH: I know this is a minor detail, but it's important for the reporting piece. I'm assuming, if we're reporting for October, typically – maybe not this first report – but future reports would always be due by the 15th of the month. Or is there a different cadence for the report? Typically, reports have to be due on or before a certain date after the end of the month. So, is the 15th agreeable? Not for this month particularly, but future months.

JAY DALEY: Thank you. I would say that's too late if we want to then do our own report or things that we need to wrap around that. But I don't know what others feel about that. It's not well out of date, but I'd say something more like the 10th or something, personally. It depends on where it needs to go and how we're wrapping it.

I think, actually, my date is the 15th of the month when I do those reports. I can't remember. I'm looking at the person behind you that I send the reports to.

UNIDENITIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

JAY DALEY: All right. Okay. I can't remember.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMLE: [inaudible]

JAY DALEY: All right.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

JAY DALEY: Okay. So, I do two reports – one within eight days and one within 15 days – the person I send my reports to tells me. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Lars?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think we should first and foremost ask Elise what's a reasonable time for the PTI to produce the report. Then we should add the time that we need to evaluate that and produce our own report. That number has to come from Elise to start with, at least.

BYRON HOLLAND: And can I suggest it's going to depend a little bit on what we demand of the reporting? So, it's probably a little bit early for us to dictate a number, a specific date, although I think it's probably safe to assume that we would want to put out a finished product, whatever that is, whatever wrapper is contained around it, whatever narrative, etc., by now later than the 15th of the following month.

ELISE GERICH: Going back to Jay's reports, where he has one on the 8th and the 15th, one of the reasons I was proposing the 15th is that that gives my team time to prepare the report. If we're going to have to dive deeply into any anomalies that may show up, they have time to get it to me by the 8th. We have time to analyze it, and then we can get it to you by the 15th.

So, I would prefer a little more leniency there, but I understand that we're serving at the will of the committee, and we certainly don't want to make it difficult for you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. I think at this juncture, we're going to need to understand what the reporting is before we commit to a date. We've had an exchange of timelines here. I don't think the comments are unreasonable, but I think first we need to get what is the report? What do we end up expecting from you, which would have an impact? Then we can go from there.

We've heard some general ideas, like I say, which aren't unreasonable, but let's get the report nailed down or at least get a sense of it and then start to work on what aggressive but reasonable timing is – given the consumers of it, the customers of it. You've heard what we're saying.

Elise?

ELISE LINDEBERG: Thank you. Elise from the GAC again. Can I just ask ICANN staff because we are now going to get a report from the PTI. Of course, it could be mostly technical with some language in it. Then we are going to have a conference call discussing this.

You will do the summary of these meetings? You said we will have support for the summary of these meetings. Will you also then wrap up some of the discussion to make some overall conclusion on whether or not this monthly report shows that everything is in order or something so we can send this to our community?

I can of course always push your numbers and your graphics also, but I need something more because some of the GAC people would then dive into the numbers and understand everything they see, but others will ask, "Well, how do you evaluate this? Is everything going okay?" We need something of that kind of language also.

So, will you be able to summarize our discussions in that way? Will we have that kind of support? Then we can push it back to our committee and see if we're agreeing on this as a conclusion for this month, and we can send it further on.

Have you any thoughts about this? Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: I just ask a point of clarification there. It's one thing for ICANN staff or PTI to say, "We believe we've met this month's numbers," but it's up to us to validate and concur and send that

message out to the community. So, I think we have the key role, even though PTI may say, "We've met the metrics this month."

ELISE LINDEBERG: That was exactly my point because that's our job. So, we can't just take in all the numbers and then conclude, like PTI does, that everything is okay. We're supposed to do an evaluation of ourselves. So, that's the level where we need also some support to agree on the language and summarize it as something that all of us can bring back to our communities. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Lars? No?

Elaine?

ELAIN PRUIS: Thank you. I feel quite strongly that the CSC should be the author of a conclusion, whether or not the PTI has performed its functions – and not ICANN staff summarizing our discussions. I like the idea of ICANN staff supporting our work and maybe providing some language, but that work should come from us.

BYRON HOLLAND: Trang?

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you, Byron. I agree with you, Elaine. I think ICANN's role is to work behind the scene. Obviously, we have internal coordination with PTI to ensure that PTI has the necessary support that it needs in order to be able to deliver against its obligations under the IANA functions contract. So, to that end, behind the scene, we'll be working very closely with Elise's team to make sure that she has whatever she needs.

With the data that she will be providing to the CSC on a monthly basis, I think then it's up to the CSC to then review that information and then turn around a report. The CSC should be the author of that report.

Where ICANN staff can help is if you need help with creating the format of the report, for example. That's something that we can help with, but the actual write-up of the report for each month, I think, and the authoring of that should come from the CSC. I think that's clearly defined in the CSC charter as its role.

Now, obviously there has been a lot of discussions today with regards to ensuring that the data that is being provided by PTI to the committee on a monthly basis meets the expectations of several different customer bases. There has to be some reports that have specific enough information for the direct customers

of the PTI. Yet there needs to be some kind of reporting that could be digestible by a less technical audience, if you would.

So, those are the kinds of things that I think we need to work out with Elise and her team in terms of what needs to get reported back to this committee in order for the committee to be able to do its work and report back out to the broader community.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Trang. Elise?

ELISE LINDEBERG: Thank you. Elise from the GAC. Just a short comment. I was not suggesting that ICANN staff should conclude on our behalf. I was just suggesting only as the secretariat function to listen into our discussions and then write the summary. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. Any other comments on this? I think as –

Okay. One question.

ELISE GERICH: Did we decide on when you want the report for October's month? Or is that November 30th – she says, hopefully.

BYRON HOLLAND:	Jay, you look like you're –
	Elaine?

JAY DALEY:	November 30th is going to be really pushing it. Can we have two-and-a-bit weeks from now or something so we can at least try to get something out by the end of November, if we're going to some bit on top of it?
	I don't want it to look as though we've dropped the ball on our very first one. As Kal says, I really don't mind if it's ugly. We can have disclaimers all over it telling people that if they have any complaints, they know where the ombudsman is or something. Otherwise, we really just need to get it out, I think.

BYRON HOLLAND:	Can I make a suggestion then? I won't look at Elise as I say this, but much of what is there satisfies the metrics that we need to report on already. Really, what we're talking about to a great degree is the presentation layer, particularly first one. While it may not satisfy all of the audiences to maximum effect, the information will be there.

Can we get that by the 15th? Then we as CSC have to get comfortable that we've met the metrics or not and add whatever wrapper we're willing to add in the very short term.

Simultaneously, I would ask that ICANN staff, whoever that's going to be, put forward some proposed reporting templates that we can start to work with, based on the conversation that you've heard here.

I think the other thing is – I'll just reiterate it; both Kal and Jay have said it – that we fully recognize that we're innovating here, that we're doing something new, and there's no expectation that we will come up with the final presentation in the first go. This is going to be iterative. We're going to innovate. We're going to have to think about what audiences are actually out there beyond the direct customers and the GAC and Greg. I got lost in all the acronyms there. So, whichever acronym he's standing in for – yes, the IETF Trust. Thank you.

Okay. Those are just three easy examples of the kinds of audiences that we'll have for this reporting, so I would ask that ICANN staff start to draft up some potential templates for us.

Does that answer your question?

ELISE GERICH: Yes, indeed. 15th, we'll have a proposed report. Obviously, that means, if you don't like it, there's time for iteration, hopefully, before you do your outward bound report.

BYRON HOLLAND: Which then leads to the fact that we'll have to make sure that we have another call shortly after that and have some time to iterate on whatever we're going to put forward.

So, as a takeaway item, too, from an operational standpoint, we're also going to have to work up a calendar of calls.

Kal?

KAL FEHER: Thanks, Byron. I just wanted to note that I think, for the next few months, our priorities are probably going to be a little bit different to what they will be over the lifetime of the CSC. I think, eventually, accessibility and ease of consumption are going to be high priorities for us, and how we release this information.

Really, for the next couple of months, my priorities as I see them, would be fast and open. We'll fix problems as they come. So, for any challenge, it should always be just fast and open, and let the tweaking and the complaints come. Then we will eventually have to make it bite-sized and accessible.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah, I fully agree with that. I just wanted to get us back on short-term, medium-term, and longer-term, just to make sure that we have the right frame on that. Then we'll dive more into what those shorter-terms things are that we really need to work on. So, I talked about process, procedure, website, communication vehicles, and draft reports. Those are all clearly short-term activities.

I think in the medium term, we'll be looking more at the complaints process. Using the word "registry" has certain connotations in this room, but a log, a registry, a ticketing process – all of those things in the medium term. We'll also have to look at a charter review.

And, certainly in the longer-term, an obvious one is the survey. We have to do an annual survey. So, that's a longer-term item.

That's just to set the context or frame of how I'm viewing short, medium, and long. When I go to short, we've had a discussion about some of the items: draft performance report was absolutely one of them.

Another one that I think we'll have to look at in very short order is a compilation of the complete responsibilities – what is it exactly that the CSC has to deliver on, and what is the interface

with the IFRT, etc.? – and making sure that we don't have overlap there.

So, based on the bylaws, based on the charter, based on all the other documents, what is it exactly we have to do so we can have that list clearly spelled out for us, as well as others? I know Trang can probably list that off the top of her head, so I look forward to that list.

And to make sure, then, that we can start to categorize that list against short, medium, long; urgent versus less urgent. So, that would be one action item that I would see ICANN staff taking a first stab at – a first draft of. Because that's going to be critical for setting us on the right path and setting us on the right project line, if you will. So, as an action item, I'd like to add that.

We talked a bit about the website already. The survey – that's something further out. I think we'll have to start talking shortly about the complaints management process, although that's not an immediate thing. But it strikes me that I'm sure somebody is going to test us, whether it's a truly legitimate complaint or not. We have to be ready to address complaints in the very near term.

Now, part of that is: what is the complaint process right now, and how is that going to fit into CSC, whose mandate is not to look at individual complaints but the broader suite of

complaints to detect if there's any patterns, trends, pervasive issues, etc.?

And of course, in the very short term, there's operating procedures, but we've talked a little bit about that. Somebody on ICANN staff is going to work up an initial draft of that.

That was my initial list of short-term activities and my frame of short-, medium-, and longer-term, just to put it in context. Does anybody else have any short-term items or other comments that they want to flag at this point?

Nothing? Is that a reasonable list to get us started then?

Trang, you look like you're –

TRANG NGUYEN: I'm just trying to remember all of those six action items [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND: Luckily, we have Ria, who's scribed it all down.

JAY DALEY: Would it help for Ria to read those out so we have them just again, just to remind us all?

BYRON HOLLAND: That would be great. Ria?

MARIA OTANES: Hi. One of the action items was for ICANN to provide an operating procedures draft.

And – one second.

The complaints process. ICANN staff's first draft of interface for what is short-, medium-, and long-term, and what's urgent and not urgent.

What do we want on the report before we decide on the date for when the report is due?

For long-term, you're going to have an annual review.

What is the interface for the IFRT? And make sure there is no overlap.

What does the CSC have to deliver on?

Address complaints; a broader sweep of complaint to see if there is a trend.

Have a charter review.

In the next couple of months, fast open and tweaking it; and complaints come so we can be accessible.

The open meeting.

Another call should be scheduled after November 15th when PTI provides the report to the CSC.

And proposed draft reporting templates from ICANN staff.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you.

MARIA OTANES: Did I miss something?

BYRON HOLLAND: I think you captured much or most of it. Let me just play it back in terms of what I've also noted.

Operating procedures draft.

A report draft.

Some proposed templates.

Making sure the communications and distribution of said communications are starting to flow; and that can include the website, recordings, transcripts, and summaries. And some proposed content for the website.

We also have in the very, very short term, an initial report from PTI for us to be able to add our component to.

Publish in probably the third week of November, or thereabouts.

And a review of the bylaws and documents associated with any mention of CSC. And creating a list of all requirements and obligations that CSC must fulfill.

Does that capture what we've heard thus far? Have I missed anything? Is there anything anybody would like to add?

Elaine?

ELAINE PRUIS: I heard we're going to plan a call to review the PTI report after the 15th. Do we want to plan to schedule a regular monthly call also in addition to that? Or will that be our regular monthly call?

BYRON HOLLAND: As as I vaguely recall from our October 6th meeting, we talked about a monthly call and, likely – while we didn't pin it down – more required in the short term. But this would clearly be the case for the first report, I think.

But from a logistics perspective, which I was just going to speak to, we need to nail down our monthly call. We also talked about

how there'd be some rotation of that monthly call from a time-of-day perspective.

So, I would ask staff to put some proposal forward in terms of how we can nail down a monthly call. And then, in the very near term, also put forward some proposed dates for a November 15th/16th/17th call.

Does that make sense? Okay. Elise?

ELISE LINDEBERG: No one else, so – Elise from the GAC. I also remember that we decided that all the members needed to be on the call and that the liaisons have to join if we can. Of course, we have [inaudible]. We need to be there except for three meetings in a year or something like that. But at least we schedule it around your U.S. members; that we schedule the call around the members of the group, first and foremost, around when you can meet and then the others. We have to adapt. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Yes, that was something we discussed on the call. Informally, we agreed that, to begin with, quorum was all four members until such time as operating procedures come into effect that we're comfortable with. Then we'll move on from that. Because it's a high bar, given our respective geographies

and roles, to have all four of us in every meeting every time. But until the operating procedures are defined, that's what we informally have agreed to.

Jay?

JAY DALEY: Yes. Can I also say I think the requirements in the charter are simply too hard, given the global nature of our committee? I think that's one of the early things we need to look at when we come to review that, to be more forgiving of the fact that otherwise people need to get up in the middle of the night once a month in order to do that. It's – I think the phrase you used, Byron, was "aggressive," and I think that is perhaps a bit aggressive part of the charter.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Jay. I think that's a fair point. I think that's exactly the kind of thing that will be in the operating procedures draft. We'll have a discussion about the reasonableness of it, the goal – which is noble – against the reasonableness of what is actually practical. I expect that would be part of what's in the operating procedures that we'll discuss when we see that first draft, given we recognize we are all volunteers here and it has to work around our day jobs.

So, that was my list. We've added the logistics component to that list, which is setting up a regular call as well as a very near-term call to deal with the first draft of the first report.

Is there anything else that we should add to the list for the short-term? Given there's a fair amount for short-term, so – okay. We'll take that as the work items for the near term.

I gave a sense of what I thought would be the type of thing we'd discuss in the medium-term. Are there any comments around that, or can we let that go for now? Is there anything people would like to add at this point?

Lars?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Can I ask that either you or staff make a list of this as work items so that we can have an overview of that and keep track of where we are? Maybe even a – what is it called? I wouldn't call it an issue tracker – an item tracker so that we remember and can keep an eye on where we are with the various issues.

BYRON HOLLAND: That's a great suggestion. I would totally concur with that. Perhaps I could ask that, when we go from recording to

transcript to summary, the summary contain any action items identified.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: But not only that; also the major tasks that we are looking ahead at. For instance, you're talking about the survey. That's a fine thing. That survey should be listed somewhere so that we remember to take care of it in the future.

BYRON HOLLAND: Agreed. That's a good idea. I think that will be the evolution of first understanding this total sum of tasks ahead of us, and then from there, how we determine to break them up. So, I agree.

Elaine?

ELAINE PRUIS: Thank you. Would it be appropriate once we have our long list of items we are to complete, to put that on our webpage as a checklist of, "This is what we've done; this is where we're going," and make that publicly available and transparent?

BYRON HOLLAND: Any comments on that? I think it's a great suggestion. Lars?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	I would totally support that, yes.
BYRON HOLLAND:	I think that's probably consistent with the ethos that we talked a little bit about on October 6th, and I'd like to carry forward, which is, again, making this as open as possible.
	Also, as we hold PTI to account, we should hold ourselves to account, including our own list of activities that we're responsible for and our own green check or red X. I think that's a good idea.
	Lars?
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	That would also give the general community an opportunity to suggest things that may not have thought of.
BYRON HOLLAND:	Yes. Good comment. Anything else?
JAY DALEY:	Sorry. Are you moving onto Any Other Business, or are you still on the planning?

BYRON HOLLAND:	I am, yes. This is a going once, going twice on this agenda item. Then we'll head to Any Other Business.
	Seeing no other comments, all right. Any Other Business.
	Jay?
JAY DALEY:	If you don't mind, Mr. Chair, tell me if you think this is inappropriate. I'd like to explore more what Greg said earlier about him having a formal role here from the group because I, actually, didn't understand most of it. I'll be quite honest with you. It appeared to be entirely contradictory to the process by which the charter was set up, and the structure of the group was so carefully put together. Is that appropriate for conversation now?
BYRON HOLLAND:	It is Any Other Business. I think it is appropriate for conversation. Can I just suggest maybe what I heard? Which is us providing information and reporting, upon which he can take that information back to make sure his working group's needs are met. Maybe you heard something different.
JAY DALEY:	I heard the words "official role" in liaising with the CSC.

GREG SHATAN: Sorry. No, I didn't mean that I had an official role at the CSC. I only meant that I was here in my capacity as a Co-Chair of the CCG, and that there's a need for some interface – to avoid the word "liaise – interface between this group and the CCG because our task dovetails with yours.

BYRON HOLLAND: But as a consumer of the information that we put forward.

GREG SHATAN: Indeed, as a consumer. But we need to use that to satisfy contractual obligations between – to satisfy the charter of the CCG and to satisfy the legal obligations that have been delegated to the CCG that fall on the IETF Trust as the licensor to monitor the quality control or the level of quality of service that is provided by PTI.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Just to be clear, there is no official role here in the CSC. You are an important consumer of the information that we put forward, which will help you carry out your own affairs. But there is no suggestion that your needs can impose or dictate upon this committee how we conduct ourselves or what we do.

GREG SHATAN: Certainly not with regard to the committee. And with regard to the output, it's my fervent hope that we don't need any output that isn't already being produced for another purpose. The desire is to create zero extra work.

BYRON HOLLAND: Jay?

JAY DALEY: That sounds as though you're saying that you have an independent role in monitoring the performance of PTI that is distinct from the role that the CSC has in doing that.

GREG SHATAN: That is correct. It initiates as the role of the IETF Trust, which now holds the IANA trademarks. A trademark owner has a legal obligation to monitor the quality control of its licensees – to monitor the quality of the services and goods offered by a licensee.

To try to make things easier, rather than having IETF Trust directly engage in quality control exercises with regard to PTI performance, IETF Trust delegated to each of the three

operational communities the responsibility for monitoring and providing that quality control information back to the IETF Trust.

Numbers and protocol parameters through their MoUs have their own quality control methodologies and can satisfy their responsibilities that way. Name (which is the stature in which this comes) has no such preexisting condition, so the intent would be to use output from this group in order to satisfy that obligation.

BYRON HOLLAND: One second, Jay. Then, Elise, did you want to say something?

ELISE GERICH: No.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay.

ELISE GERICH: I think I'll pass.

BYRON HOLLAND: I just want to make sure. If you were somehow unable to carry out your mandate, there is nothing that I understand your organization could do to dictate to this committee what to do or

how to govern itself. You could ask for a different kind of report or such, but there isn't – because when you say "quality control," you know you're talking to a bunch of operators. Those start to ring alarm bells, or at least they come with preconceived notions on what that term could mean.

So, I just want to make sure. I don't see anything in our charter that says somebody else's charter gets to tell us how to actually carry out our business.

GREG SHATAN: Again, I'm not looking to get anything other than what's already been produced. In terms of quality control, just to translate from your world to the world in which quality control comes from, quality control in a trademark/licensor sense merely translates down to making sure that the quality levels that – the level of service, the level of expectation, of what the entity does is consistent and is met according to whatever benchmarks there may be and to make sure that if there are deficiencies, the licensor knows about them and the licensee then deals with them.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you. Jay?

JAY DALEY: On this particular point, the suggestion was that the license obligations around quality are in any way at the same level as the type of reporting that we're doing here and are looking at within the CSC. I would almost see that it would be a much higher-level thing that says, "Is PTI abusing that license? Is there a trust issue at that license?" which is a way-up-there and very, very different from the reports we're doing down here.

Now, there is a point at which the reporting down here, if there are regular failures, regular escalations and things start to push upwards, intersects with space where you would need to say something up there. But on the ordinary basis, there would be a large gulf between those two things there.

So, I'm surprised as to where the need for our reports to fill into your bit become because of that assumption that I have.

GREG SHATAN: I think, just to work with that assumption, it's not that big a gap. What we do need to be able to report back is that performance is meeting the standards that are expected, basically, at the operational level. It's not about trust or abuse, and it has nothing to do with how the trademark is used. It has to do with how the services are carried out. So, it relates to service levels.

Again, not wanting to use that term in the way that you would understand it, but it is more high-level. So, I'm thinking, as you're talking about what report you might wrap around the heavy-duty metrics that you're getting, there's some need to have a summary report. But it is operational.

JAY DALEY: Okay. And is it monthly? Because, again, my assumption would be that it would be annual – your type of reporting – or possibly even biannual or something to the trademark holder to say, "All good," or, "There are problems"; a couple of lines like that. Is it more than that that needs to be monthly at all?

GREG SHATAN: Under the law, there's a fairly broad range of possibilities. There is no dictated amount. It really is a monitoring and oversight capacity which can be carried out very actively. I would say most typically the reporting up in this context in other relationships I'm involved with is quarterly. But again, I don't want to make any extra reports.

Sometimes it also relates to approvals any time a new service or a service change is involved. I would actually hope to avoid that. I would like to keep this at the minimum level that's legally responsible.

This is not like, every time a new perfume comes out with Beyoncé's name on it, she has to sit with the perfumers and approve the scent and the box and the marketing. So, I'd like to make it as passive as possible, but it can't fall below a certain level, at which case we're not doing our job.

BYRON HOLLAND: Jay?

JAY DALEY: Thank you. That helped me understand. Thank you. It appears to me that there is a danger of confusion and a difficulty for PTI in potentially having to report to two masters on performance here or report to two things. If IETF Trust is delegated to CCG, perhaps CCG should delegate this to CSC so that we have a single point for this to go through.

GREG SHATAN: That's a possibility. This responsibility is reflected in the community agreement and the PTI trademark/license agreement, which were put out for public comment back in August. So, that responsibility is not reflected as a delegable duty by the CCG. The idea, however, would be ideally to be a mere conduit of information.

BYRON HOLLAND: Greg, can I make a suggestion here?

GREG SHATAN: Yes.

BYRON HOLLAND: As you can probably tell, this is somewhat of a surprise. Perhaps I missed the memo in mid-August in Canadian vacation time on that one.

As with the GAC, we know we have a number of different audiences, and our goal is to make sure that the information that we're putting forward meets as many requirements as possible, given the charter for what we are supposed to be doing.

Perhaps what I could suggest is – you've seen the kind of reporting that we're talking about. You've seen the kind of metrics that we will actually be monitoring.

Can I suggest that you think about what is in there that might be of value to you? And if there is a sentence or two that, in our wrapper that we validate that PTI is performing according to plan, then we will take it under consideration. Is there

something there in particular that would help satisfy your needs?

I think we're open to satisfying the needs of the community. That's part of what we want to do, what we need to do.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I'm happy to do that. I would also take that back to the… The CCG as a nine-member committee, three of whom are nominated by the Names Group. So, I'd want to take it back to at least the other two and not be presumptuous.

BYRON HOLLAND: Who are from the Names Group?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Maarten.

GREG SHATAN: Maarten Simon and – I'm blanking on the third. I apologize.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Chris.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Christopher Wilkinson.

GREG SHATAN: Oh, Christopher Wilkinson, yes.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Well, that's why we're having a forming meeting.

GREG SHATAN: That's why I figured I should show up. I'm sorry that I did not foreshadow this.

BYRON HOLLAND: Are there any comments or concerns to my suggestion, which is, given what you know about what we actually are doing measuring and monitoring, is there anything that would be helpful for you, for us, to surface, perhaps, in a way that we might not naturally have? If you could go away to your community and suggest back to us what might be of value in the early stages of forming and norming our report, that would be helpful.

Anybody from the CSC who wants to comment on that?

GREG SHATAN: Thanks, Byron. I will take it back. Maybe what might also help is if I go back to the documents I referred to and maybe do a bit of

a short memo so that you can see what I'm dealing with in terms of what I need to satisfy so you don't have to wade through those entire agreements.

BYRON HOLLAND: I'll tell you what. Knowing how much volunteer work you have done in this process, perhaps I could suggest that that's a task for ICANN staff: to go away and provide this committee with what other connective pieces of tissue and relationships there are among other components of this broader project that are not necessarily visible to us or that we would have to go out and find ourselves.

Are there any other surprises?

Jay?

JAY DALEY: Could I just ask something? Elise, I don't mean to put you on the spot, but were you aware of all of this as well?

ELISE GERICH: I'm actually surprised. That's all I can say. I assumed that the IETF Trust agreement that I've read was concerned not about the delivery of services – such as naming function, protocol parameter functions, and numbering functions – but was

concerned with the use of the trademark and abiding by the style guidelines, etc., and not doing things that would reduce the brand. I don't know if "reduce" is not the right word, but making the brand seem unpalatable to the world. So, I am surprised.

BYRON HOLLAND: Can I just, for my own clarification – because I'm with Elise on this – let me try to put it into context of something more physical than the ethereal here. This is the trademark like Louis Vuitton. Essentially, what you want to know is: is your licensee making the Louis Vuitton bags according to that incredibly high level of quality, using real leather and Italian craftsmen and fine stitching, etc., versus banging out cheap vinyl knockoffs? You just want to make sure that the actual quality layer of the production is living up the brand's standard associated with the trademark? Is that a fair assumption?

GREG SHATAN: That's a very helpful way to look at it, and that also distinguishes between the trademark use aspect, which Elise alluded to, and the quality control aspect, which I was talking about. It connects the two of the together quite well.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. That's at least helpful for me to think about it. Thank you.

Kal?

KAL FEHER: Just extending that analogy, who sets the standard?

GREG SHATAN: The standard is set –

BYRON HOLLAND: We're only measuring and monitoring.

GREG SHATAN: Yes. In a legal sense, the standard is typically set by the licensor, although, in a case like this where you're taking over an ongoing business, in a sense, or licensing to a business that already has been producing, you typically refer to the standard of quality up to the point in which you started the license.

So basically, it's kind of a boomerang. It goes back to the standard – to IANA's existing level of quality standards, or whatever level of standards it sets for itself.

Again, this is intended to be a no-load issue. As perhaps surprising and load-y as it sounds, it shouldn't produce any additional work unless there are real quality problems.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you. Recognizing that we're at time, and knowing that we all have schedules to fill, I want to call this subject to a close with the action item being that we're going to task ICANN staff, whoever that is yet to be, with making sure that we as the CSC are clear on any of the other entities in this transition ecosystem that may impact or have some related requirement of the CSC. Thank you.

Again, I want to be very conscious of time because we actually passed 10:30. Are there any other Any Other Business items?

Seeing and hearing none – oh. There was a question in the chat. I'm sorry. What was the question?

MARIA OTANES: It was from Christopher Wilkinson. "Would it be sufficient for CCG members to be observers in CSC?"

BYRON HOLLAND: Well, that's a question for them, and they can go away and talk about it. This is an open meeting, so people are welcome to sit in on it. We don't, I think, need any further comment on that. You're welcome to sit in on it.

With that, I'm going to bring this meeting to a close. Thank you very much, everybody. Stay tuned to your e-mails because we clearly have a lot of work to do in the next couple of weeks.

Thank you, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]