
COPENHAGEN - Joint Meeting: ICANN Board & Customer Standing Committee

Wednesday, March 15, 2017 - 11:00 to 11:45 CET

ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

KHALED KOUBAA: Hello, everyone. So, welcome to this session of discussing with the customer standing committee. I think it's almost the first session between the Board and the CSC, so we welcome you guys, and before handing out to Byron, let's have a presentation. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I am presenting myself, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, member of the ICANN board.

ELISE LINDEBERG: Elise Lindeberg from the GAC.

KAL FEHER: Kal Feher, registry stakeholder group, CSC.

ELAINE PRUIS: Hi. I'm Elaine Pruis from the registry stakeholder group and a member of the CSC.

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.

JAY DALEY: I'm Jay Daley from .NZ and I'm a ccNSO appointee to the CSC.

KHALED KOUBAA: Khaled Koubaa, Board member.

STEVE CROCKER: Steve Crocker, ICANN Board chair.

BYRON HOLLAND: Byron Holland from .CA and ccNSO appointee to the CSC and chair of the CSC.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Asha Hemrajani, ICANN board.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: George Sadowsky, ICANN board.

CHERINE CHALABY: Cherine Chalaby, ICANN board.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Maarten Botterman, ICANN board.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And Chris Disspain, ICANN board.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you. So, let's have a 15-minute to 20-minute update from the CSC and then open the floor to Board members and anyone present here to have some questions for you guys. Thank you.

Byron, to you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Well, thank you very much and welcome everybody to the first session between the Board and the CSC. I do have a few slides that I'll walk us through, but hopefully if there are any questions, people can ask along the way for clarification, and of course during the Q&A as you've suggested.

I'll cut to the chase, too, give away the plot. I would say, to begin with, things have gone according to plan and quite well thus far. That's the distilled short story, but I'll provide some more detail along the way.

I think it's important just to take a moment to reflect on what the actual purpose of this committee is and what we are here to do and, to some degree, of course, what is not part of our remit is equally important.

And I'm not going to read the mission statement, per se, but I think the second bullet point really is the key one.

The mission is achieved through regular monitoring by the CSC of the performance of the IANA naming functions against a very detailed set of agreed-upon service level expectations.

That's the core of what we do on a regular basis.

We also have other responsibilities, should we determine that there's a persistent or systemic problem.

We participate in reporting out, monitoring, surveys, et cetera, but the key function is really the monitoring of the performance of IANA.

So, as just articulated, that's the key thing that we do. Once we do it, another important task that we have is to inform the community, and we do that in a variety of ways.

We write our own report based on the PTI's monthly report against service level expectations, so for people who want to stay engaged in this issue but don't necessarily want to read detailed reporting, I would suggest that you can have regular contact with us through our monthly report, which is only about a page long, and that gives you a real sort of health check of the IANA functions.

But we have our own Web site. There's a dashboard. We do our own report. Our meetings are open. Anybody can attend. They're Webcast. And we push the reports out to any number of mail lists, to our own communities, to our various constituencies, et cetera.

So, it's extremely transparent and open, so I think it's safe to say that anybody who is interested in this has very easy access to the information.

We have not yet built out the complaints and performance remediation process, which is another one of our tasks, and that -- I'll get to that a little further down this presentation.

And then of course there are consultations and reviews which even though we've seemingly only just started, the review process is already almost upon us. So, how do we actually work? We have a monthly meeting, so roughly the middle of the month -- our schedule is already determined well out into the year, but roughly the middle of the month we receive the PTI report on 63 specific metrics. We have a meeting with PTI staff and go through the report. Generally speaking, if there are any exceptions, all of those metrics have boundary conditions, and if we find in a month that those boundary conditions have been exceeded one way or the other, typically that is the focal point of

our discussion with staff, who have been -- with IANA staff, who have been candid and open with us, and we have a discussion about what is the issue.

It's early days, so some of the discussions have been around are the SLEs themselves actually appropriate, now that we're live and it's not just theory. And if we're satisfied with an explanation of why a particular metric fell out of the boundary conditions, we will have it written up with a brief description and then publish that as part of our report.

So, that's the general everyday piece of our monthly meeting.

Being that this is a relatively new entity, we've also been doing some of the forming of the entity, so operating procedures and the basics of getting ourselves up and running and thinking about the next work items.

I've already really mentioned most of what is in the top half of this slide, but when we do our report, the CSC does its own report on the PTI's metrics report, we really have three categories that we rate the PTI report by, which is: Excellent, they have met all of the metrics and fallen within the boundary conditions; satisfactory, which is they've met most of them and there are reasonable explanations for any metrics not

specifically met; and needs improvement, where we feel that IANA is simply not living up to its responsibilities.

So, it's pretty straightforward in terms of the criteria that we offer to the community of whether or not IANA is living up to the service level expectations.

We got started -- as I think everybody probably knows, we got started in October. This slide says we've had essentially four monthly meetings and reports that we have reported on. In fact, it's now five because we had a face-to-face meeting here as part of our monthly cadence and will be issuing -- we've accepted the report and will be issuing it probably later today.

So, essentially five PTI reports have been issued to us. We, by the end of the day, will have issued five of the CSC reports. And we have had pretty significant starting discussion around the customer survey, the IANA customer survey, and our goal there is we're not in the business of doing these things but certainly facilitating, helping, providing feedback to IANA, and part of our commitment to IANA is to reach out into our networks and communities to make sure that the survey is well received and well -- and broadly distributed, and then of course we'll encourage our own communities to participate fully.

We've also, just in this past meeting, adopted an internal procedures guideline, so part of the administrative work of getting this committee up and running. So, that was -- we just adopted those earlier this week and they'll be published shortly. And we worked with PTI to get the PTI dashboard up and running so anybody at any time can have a quick and very consumable -- it is actually end-user-friendly -- dashboard in terms of the IANA -- the various IANA metrics and how they're stacking up literally real time.

And we've launched our own Web site, or at least ICANN staff has launched it on our behalf with our input, so thank you to them.

One of the important pieces of work going forward will be around the survey, so that's a work in progress, and we will be providing input to IANA on that. This -- and as mentioned already, there's a number of different ways that we'll be informing the community.

So, where are we headed now? Amazingly, even though it feels like we just started, we're already starting to think about our first review, and part of that process involves, now that we're up and running and we've worked with the SLEs and worked with the PTI report, are the SLEs appropriate. And I think the good news is, there was a lot of heavy lifting done during the

transition process, and the design team that worked with IANA to work up those 63 metrics and what the boundary conditions of those metrics should be was actually a job very well done, and Elaine and Jay, who are members on the CSC here with me, were actually key to that design team, and I think the good news is, by and large the metrics are both appropriate and the boundary conditions are actually appropriate for the given metrics, for the most part.

So, -- but we will -- there are a few tweaks that will probably be required, and we'll have to make recommendations back to our respective constituency groups for ccNSO and GNSO to contemplate and provide approval for recommendations, should they so choose. So, we're already starting to think about that.

I've mentioned the survey already. It is a place where, if anybody has particular feedback or input -- I'll put a plug in right now -- that is a place to engage with PTI, more so than the CSC, but with PTI on suggestions and recommendations.

And the next -- I'm going to say the big block of work for us will be around developing the remedial action procedures.

Now, the good news there is in the development of the charter for the CSC, there's a draft, an example of what those

procedures could look like, so we have a good starting point for that, but we'll be shortly turning our attention to that next responsibility of the CSC.

So, there's the work that we have to do, of course, as CSC members, but there's also work in and around the CSC that the community has to do, and the first bit of that work will be around our charter review, the CSC's charter review, and that's a joint ccNSO/registry stakeholder group responsibility and that starts this October, on the first anniversary of the formation of the CSC.

So, it's a little ways out, but we can see it on the horizon.

My initial comment on that, I'd say the good news is, now that we're up and operational, it seems like the charter has been appropriate for the work that we need to do. We don't feel constrained by it. We don't feel that it's missing anything. Community members may have other inputs but I think it's safe to say on behalf of my colleagues and members on the CSC that we aren't really experiencing any material need for change as a result of the charter, but there will be an opportunity to review it.

A year and a half out will be a review of this committee's actual effectiveness, so, again, that's a joint ccNSO/GNSO

responsibility, so there's another opportunity for input around a review of our effectiveness. And of course, at that same time, there will be the first real material review of PTI itself.

All of those things will require community feedback and input.

So, in summary, to come back to where we started, overall, PTI performance has been very good. There have definitely been some metrics missed but no customer impact or really operational problems to note, and any -- any of the SLEs that fell outside the boundary conditions were reasonably explained, and, as a committee, we were satisfied with IANA's explanation on that front, and you can see those explanations in our reports.

So, I think also just as a functioning committee, coming together, we built our cadence. The committee is working well together, both the members and the liaisons, because of course there are five liaisons from the other constituencies, so we're getting our feet under us and it seems to be working quite well so far.

And that concludes my report and I'm open to any questions or comments or feedback.

Or I should say "we" are, because all of the voting members of the CSC are here on stage with me.

KHALED KOUBAA: Yes. Thank you, Byron. So, I would hand off to Steve to give a few remarks about the view of the Board on the CSC and then we have questions from Chris and Cherine, I guess. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. This is a very tough meeting because I don't think there's any big problems.

[Laughter]

I think we're just going to spend time on the success here.

But I do want to highlight a few things.

First of all, a big thank you to you and everybody on the CSC for taking this on, and in a minute, I will say more about why I think this is so important.

But it's also evident from your report and from the reports that you've had and so forth that you've taken this from, "We have to do this sort of thing and here's a rough outline" to breathing life into it and turning it into a regular process and making it real.

So, in fact, I think, a big round of applause for you guys on that.

[Applause]

And I'll note that an important part of the whole little micro-ecosystem, if you will, around this is the PTI board, which if I count right is four-fifths represented there. Lise, Elise, Jonathan, and Akram. Do I have it right? We're missing David Conrad? But his -- his presence is always in the air somewhere.

A few years ago, before we started this whole transition process and before the notion of PTI was ever considered, I was paying attention to the sense of unease with the -- between the community -- or within the community about how much contact they had with the IANA process, and my first thought was, "Well, this is weird because all of the relevant bodies have Board seats in one form or another," and that was deliberate so that there was connectivity, but obviously it wasn't being satisfactory. It wasn't satisfying their needs. And so, I went and thought about it a little more and I realized that in the enormous bureaucracy and political structure we had built up in ICANN, the connection with what the essence and, you know, *raison d'etre*, if you will, for ICANN, which was the IANA process, had become too distant.

It occurred to me what we needed was some sort of committee, advisory committee. I wasn't sure what the right relationship was. The bottom line is this is it. And, I mean, I stepped back. I didn't try to push on any of that because the community process became the whole thing.

But I 100% believe that what we have here is exactly what is needed for that communication and for that trust and for the responsiveness, in case there are any issues with the community. So, this is, in my mind, not just an arbitrary thing. I think this is the absolute core of the -- improving the relationship and building the right kind of mechanism.

I want to touch on something else which you've touched on, and I apologize for not being 100% up to speed on this. But I paid attention over the years to the details in the IANA contract, the NTIA contract. And one of the things that caught my attention was an enormous list of statistics that had to be reported on a regular basis. And I'm watching to see Elise's response here.

And one of the things that particularly caught my attention was reporting of both averages and medians in various dimensions. I thought, well, this is -- this is really -- you don't do that sort of thing. One or the other is appropriate, and the other probably isn't, as it's just trade craft down at that level.

And every time I tried to suggest that maybe it was time to simplify things, there was pushback, like "Well, that's the way we do it and it doesn't cost us very much." So, we get inundated with a large number of statistics, which as best I could tell were

not useful -- some of them were useful and many of them were not.

My hope is that we're in a period where common-sense discussion at that level is possible and adjustments. And you indicated there were 63 metrics. I haven't looked to see exactly what they are or whether or not they're just a carryover from before. But I would hope that there is a sensitivity to what you really need, what do you pay attention to, versus which ones are just providing noise that makes it harder to absorb and so forth. And maybe you've looked at all of that and worked all that out.

So, with that, maybe there's a little bit more to talk about here. But I think we're faced with an unmitigated success. So, thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you very much for that, Steve. And maybe I'll just pick up on the comments you made at the end there around the 63 metrics that we look at versus what was required from NTIA. There are probably few people better versed in that than Jay and Elaine. I don't know. Since you were a key part of the design team that actually came up with it -- so, okay, maybe -- Jay is going to make a comment.

But the one thing I'll say is this came from the operator community, both G and CC. So, I would like to think that -- I know that what we're measuring and monitoring right now are what are really the critical elements that the operators -- the customers are concerned about.

So, I think that from that perspective, giving the operators that freedom to have come up with what are the key metrics, almost ensures that we're just looking at what matters, not extraneous things.

Jay, did you...

JAY DALEY:

Jay Daley. So, to explain the difference between the two, the NTIA SLA had a series of end-to-end metrics where the clock never stopped even when IANA was waiting for a third party to do something. And they were then reported on in averages and medians and probably square roots and various other things as well, okay?

The new SLA is very different. For a start, there is correct attribution so the clock stops when IANA PTI is waiting for anybody else to do something. And, secondly, each individual element is set a target, generally a time-based target, in which it

must be completed. Then there is a percentage threshold of changes that must meet that target so that you can flex both of those as necessary for the distribution that you expect to see.

The depth and number of things is still there. In my view, and I think in the view of the rest of us who did that, a -- and who are very used to dealing with SLAs in our own organizations, that is probably still on the light side; but it is sufficient for what is required for us to do things with now.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. And I'm glad you mentioned the stopping of the clock. One of the things that had -- that I've thought for a very long time was one of the less good factors in the way the whole process worked prior to the transition was an inability to get clarity about why things took so long and principally NTIA not wanting to expose their side of the process in part, which I always thought was contrary to the spirit and expectation of transparency and accountability for us. I'm absolutely delighted with all that. Thank you very much for that.

KHALED KOUBAA:

Thank you, Steve.

So, let's have questions from Board members. But in the meantime, if the CSC members have also any questions for us, we would be delighted to have them and answer them.

I have on the queue Chris, Cherine, Rinalia, and then Asha, and then me, if possible.

Chris, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you, Khaled. And thank you, Byron, and everyone else.

I've got three things. First of all, in respect to the service levels, unless I'm mistaken, the mark each time, since you start it as being satisfactory, which implies that there are some service levels that are not being met -- and I assume that there are a couple of possible reasons for that, not one of which, of course, that the service level itself is problematic rather than the performance is problematic. So, I assume that as part of the review that you talked about, Byron, you will be looking at that and seeing whether those service levels indicatively because they are not being met need to be adjusted. That's right, I guess?

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes. So, let me give an example.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay.

BYRON HOLLAND: Put some flesh on the bone there.

There was a service level expectation for a particular function. It is consistently falling outside of the boundary conditions; and the reason was as a request came in, the request had to fall within those boundary conditions. But what was happening was multiple requests were coming in and getting queued up. And the current system only processes them consecutively, one at a time.

But what happened was the request fourth, fifth, tenth back in the chain, the timing was starting as soon as it came in. So, you are getting the full duration, not the specific one. We understand that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah.

BYRON HOLLAND: There's a development roadmap to think through that, about what can happen to resolve that problem. So, that's an example of something that has consistently fallen outside the boundary conditions. We are given an explanation. We understand it. And we certainly don't feel that that warrants not meeting the level of satisfactory. That's an example of what's happening.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay, thank you.

The second of the three is, monthly meetings are quite a lot of meetings. I understand that obviously -- now you feel you need them. Do you think that will need to -- that will be well over time? Do you think they will need to continue as a monthly meeting, or do you think you will be able to be less hands-on, perhaps is a good way of putting it?

BYRON HOLLAND: I can certainly put it to my colleagues as well.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm just curious. It is a lot of meetings, right?

BYRON HOLLAND: My gut feeling right now is certainly for the foreseeable future monthly meeting is appropriate.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Cool.

BYRON HOLLAND: Can we be more efficient as we build our cadence and tighten them up in terms of time and duration? Yes. I don't feel that I'd want to reduce the cycle right now.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Wasn't suggesting you should.

BYRON HOLLAND: Jay, do you have a follow up to that?

JAY DALEY: Yes, I think these will need to continue monthly forever. This is a service management process, a quality process. This is not a formal policy development or anything. So, it requires the regular interaction to do that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Fantastic. And, finally, from me at least, what are your expectations, frequency, content, for your interaction with us?

Are you expecting to meet with us at every meeting? Are you expecting to -- what are your expectations?

BYRON HOLLAND: No.

[Laughter]

Not every meeting. I don't think that would -- quite frankly, I don't think that that would be a valuable use of our collective time. I think probably an annual reporting cycle, and we can determine when is most appropriate annually. There hasn't been a lot of thought put to that specific question right now. At this meeting, we're essentially reporting out to everybody because it's kind of the first one.

But I would suggest an annual report-out would be appropriate. And I would, of course, then remind you all of our material is freely available through many different channels. So, you're welcome to take a look at it at any time.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Byron.

Cherine.

Oh.

GORAN MARBY: On this particular issue -- as you can see, we are freestanding here.

KHALED KOUBAA: Can we give Cherine -- or it's the same -- Please go ahead.

GORAN MARBY: Because on this topic of communication, we just came up, sitting here, being innovative, the three of us, the two external Board members of PTI, myself as the CEO of ICANN, every quarter, interact during one of your regular meetings just as a way to formalize the contact between the organizations as well. We would really like to offer you that opportunity and be thankful if you accepted it.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay.

[Laughter]

We'll put it on our forward agenda to consider.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So, some months you'll have two meetings.

BYRON HOLLAND: And we still -- I mean, on that front, obviously our sort of primary interaction is with PTI. And we haven't established a regular cadence of how we would report back to the PTI board, which I think is probably one of our first concerns in terms of regularizing reporting out.

As we're in the, you know, forming, storming, and norming stages of our committee, one of the key components will be how do we interact with the PTI Board in a meaningful and appropriate and timely way. And that's a discussion that has been loosely had thus far but will need to be firmed up shortly.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Khaled, if I may just add a small comment. Jonathan Robinson speaking here in my capacity here as chair of the PTI board.

And exactly that. We've been talking with Goran, Akram, ICANN staff, as well as with you. And I think there's an element here, as we've discussed in other meetings at this ICANN58, that this is an element of work in progress. You are to be congratulated by the sort of speed and effectiveness with which you have gotten up to speed as Steve has recognized and others.

And then there is a matter of sort of gluing together the way the different components work and just cross-checking that it is all coherent, which is work in progress. And I think we're all able to sort that out. Thanks.

KHALED KOUBAA: Excellent. Thank you, Jonathan.

Cherine, please.

CHERINE CHALABY: So, I had a few questions. But my first one I wrote PTI Board interaction. That's been answered, so I'm going to take this off.

The second one was the reviews that you're doing on the SLEs. Are those mandated by the bylaws, or it is something that you decide when to do those if there's an issue or no issue, or is it just a matter of good practice? So, are they mandated by the bylaws or not? I don't know.

BYRON HOLLAND: Of course, quoting bylaws without having them in front of me, I'm a little hesitant to do. But certainly, I do not think the bylaw speaks specifically to how SLEs are updated. What has to happen is we can make recommendation to our respective

ccNSO/GNSO. They can consider our recommendations and then from the feedback loop there make a recommendation to change, update, fine-tune the SLEs because the SLEs are an appendix. They're not hard coded into the document.

CHERINE CHALABY: My third question: Can you go one slide back, if you don't mind?
Yes.

So, the last one, first IFR to be convened, so as far as I remember, there are three sort of mechanisms around PTI. There is the CSC, the IFR, and RZERC, right?

Is there -- and they do three different things, I suppose. Is there any synchronization between those three, or they are really operating independently?

BYRON HOLLAND: I would say right now there isn't -- right now, at this stage, there isn't really any connective tissue between them right now.

We have been the first to really get up and running, so I don't have a crisp answer for you on that other than to tell you that at this stage, there has not been much communication or interaction between the three.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. But the IFR -- I mean, the CSC scope is the naming function, right? The IFR is also naming or naming and numbers as well?

BYRON HOLLAND: I believe it's naming and numbers. Presumably -- I mean, presumably when that happens we will feed into it. I mean, I don't want to say that 100%, but it would make sense that the CSC would be feeding into that in some way, shape, or form. But it has not been determined yet.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay, thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: We have a follow-up.

SAMANTHA EISNER: Thanks, this is Samantha Eisner from ICANN legal. Just to follow up on what Byron was saying, the IFR includes in it specific inputs from the CSC. And then we would expect the outputs to also possibly be evaluated through there. But then the components of the CSC, particularly the ccNSO and GNSO, have special obligations as it results around the recommendations of

the IFR. But the activities of the CSC are very important to the considerations of the IFR. And then the CSC also has the ability to initiate special IFRs. So, there's been no coordination yet because no IFR has needed be to be comprised yet. But the CSC will be a very important end point into that process.

CHERINE CHALABY: So, you said the CSC can initiate an IFR?

SAMANTHA EISNER: A special IFR.

CHERINE CHALABY: A special, okay. Thank you. Good.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you. Elise.

ELISE GERICH: Similarly the RZERC is an advisory committee or group for the Board for architectural changes. And PTI is an operational aspect. So, the RZERC and PTI don't have any special relationship per se except what might come through ICANN to PTI as part of our service agreement.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you.

Rinalia, please.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Khaled. Rinalia speaking.

I think I have two questions. We'll see. The first question is: I noted that you have monthly meetings to review the monthly reports. Are they face-to-face, or are all of them telephonic? And do you meet during ICANN meetings? That's sort of the first cluster of question.

The second part of it is that: Do you plan to have public sessions at ICANN meetings where you actually make yourself available to address questions from participants and the public? Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Our monthly meetings are virtual, by phone or Adobe Connect except when there's an ICANN meeting. And our intent is to have face-to-face meetings when we are all at ICANN. Now, that may vary a little bit because not all of us go to every ICANN meeting. But the intent is when there's an ICANN meeting, we'll do a face-to-face as our monthly meeting. Otherwise, it's virtual.

At the ICANN meeting, when we have a face-to-face, it is our intent to have an open meeting which we did this week. So, in Hyderabad, which was really our first coming together, that was open. And then this -- at this meeting, we had our monthly meeting held as an open meeting. And we spent -- of the 90-minute meeting, the first 30 minutes were really geared to the public, essentially some version of what you've just seen here. And then the following 60 minutes was our -- the actual meeting itself.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So, Excellent. I like to hear that. I assume when you have your annual report, then you plan to have a discussion about the report with the public the first chance you get?

BYRON HOLLAND: We don't -- there isn't an annual report per se. I mean, we put the same -- and it's a standard template report-out every month commenting on the month's performance.

The reviews that you see here, I mean, it's a charter review and an effectiveness review that are happening on an annual cycle. But there isn't an annual report per se. There's no requirement for that because we do it every month.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Rinalia.

Probably it's also good to remember that the CSC report is linked to the PTI report, which is monthly reports. So, this is why my understanding the CSC have a monthly report.

Asha, please.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Khaled.

I wanted to ask a question about the charter review. And you alluded to -- Byron, you already mentioned -- answered half my question about the SLEs being an appendix and not hard-coded into the document.

But I wanted to ask in terms of the upcoming review in October. Previous slide. Was it October this year?

BYRON HOLLAND: October 2017.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: October 2017. Do you see any areas that right now need -- would need to be changed? Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: I'll also look to my colleagues who may have other thoughts. I'm not feeling anything. To me right now the charter is clear in terms of purpose and mandate and is not constraining us in a way that we feel is unmanageable. And it is, I think, sufficiently specific that we understand exactly what is our remit and, of course, equally important what is not our remit.

And just as an example, customer complaints. The charter is quite specific that if we see persistent or systemic issues showing up because of complaints, that is something we would look at, where it's a systemic issue.

But any individual complaint is absolutely not our remit. And the charter is quite crisp on that.

And I think that's an example of how the charter has been able to give us very good guidance and hopefully gives the community good guidance on what we're actually here to do.

So, I don't feel anything. I don't know. Jay?

JAY DALEY: There is one element of the charter we've identified that we need to look at. It's very tough on liaisons who cannot make the time of a meeting. And we've already agreed because we have a time zone of the four members that stretches from Ottawa to Melbourne to try to keep it friendly for that time zone. And for some of the liaisons, that's very difficult if they are based in Europe. And that's important for us in order to establish it and get it going.

So, -- and the charter says if they miss two, then they're out, I think, basically. And so, that one element we think needs some flexibility built into it.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you, Byron. Thank you. I have a question myself about the review of the CSC effectiveness.

When you say that it's joint ccNSO/GNSO responsibility, is there any joint process that was put in place already between the ccNSO and the GNSO to work on this review or is there any working group between both of them or...

BYRON HOLLAND: Certainly nothing has been done yet on this. I mean, that's quite a ways out, so there has been no --

I can't speak for the GNSO. Certainly, within the ccNSO there has been nothing yet, but it is quite a ways out, so I think that's to be expected.

KHALED KOUBAA: Thank you.

Is there any questions from the CSC Board members -- members for the board?

I mean, Byron, anything you would like to raise?

I think we are so glad to hear that there's no event. This is probably the best thing that happened for us. It remembers me the IANA transition. It was a nonevent and this is -- was the main success of it.

Is there any question from the audience? No? Seeing none --

A comment, please? Go ahead.

BYRON HOLLAND: I think you bring up a good point. This -- in all the turmoil that was around the transition, I think this is a very good news story

in terms of the outcome. I definitely believe and I think my -- I hope my colleagues would echo that as the customers of this service, the process has been very helpful. It's allowed us to gain significantly more insight into IANA itself and make sure that the things that are important to us, you know, which the metrics are an outcome of the things happening, meet our requirements, and I would suggest that overall, we as the customers have been satisfied with that.

And I think also I'd be remiss if I didn't call out IANA staff who have been part of the journey with us to get to this point and have been responsive and helpful along the way.

So, I would also like to just acknowledge the fact that it's going well, mostly because it's going well and we should recognize that.

KHALED KOUBAA:

Absolutely. Thank you. Again, I mean, congratulations for the great work and thank you for you and for the PTI Board and staff for taking the time to have this discussion. I think we are good for lunch, and thank you.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]