COPENHAGEN – Customer Standing Committee
Monday, March 13, 2017 – 11:00 to 12:45 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Good morning, everybody. Welcome to ICANN 58. I'm sure some of you have been here for a few days. Welcome to the CSC meeting. As the agenda states, we're going to start with a 30-minute open session and go through a presentation and also enable questions from a broader audience other than just the members and liaisons who've typically been in our meetings.

But I thought for the benefit of the open meeting, if we could do a roll call. Just state your name and your affiliation, what constituency you're with. I will kick it off, but then I'll ask to start with Kal or Lisa.

My name is Byron Holland. I'm from the ccNSO, and I'm the Chair of the CSC as well.

LISA FUHR: I'm Lisa Fuhr, and I'm a member of the PTI Board.

KAL FEHER: Kal Feher, Neustar, gTLD representative.

ELAINE PRUIS: Hi. I'm Elaine Pruis. I work with Donuts, and I am appointed by the RySG.

JAY DALEY: Hi, I'm Jay Daley from .nz. I'm a ccNSO appointee to the CSC.

JEFF BEDSER: Hi. I'm Jeff Bedser. I'm with iThreat and I'm representing SSAC.

BART BOSWINKEL: Bart Boswinkel, support.

MARIA OTANES: Maria Otanes, Secretariat, Operations Coordinator for the CSC.

TRANG NGUYEN: Trang Nguyen, ICANN org.

ELISE GERICH: Elise Gerich, PTI.

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN: Lars Johan-Liman, Netnod, liaison to the Root Server System Advisory Committee.

ELISE LINDEBERG: Elise Lindeberg, the GAC representative from Norway and liaison to the CSC.

NAELA SARRAS: Naela Sarras with PTI.

KIM DAVIES: Kim Davies, PTI.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Christopher Wilkinson. Over the last 20 years, I've been associated with several of your constituencies and groups. I currently act mainly on behalf of an At-Large Structure. I'm also a member of the CCG, the Community Coordination Group on IANA IPR.

VITTORIO BERTOLA: Vittorio Bertola, former ALAC Chair and ICANN Board member, but just here as an observer.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, everybody. I'm going to walk through a presentation in terms of where we are and where we're headed. I know my back is to the open audience. Please take no offense. This is

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

primarily for you. If you have any questions, you'll have to signal to Bart and come to the mic because obviously I don't have eyes in the back of my head, in spite of what my teenage boys might think.

With that, we'll get going. We have approximately 30 minutes for the fully-open part of the session, and then we'll be moving into our 60-minute session, which is our more traditional monthly CSC meeting.

Just to remind everybody, I think it's important to set the stage in terms of what the actual mission of the CSC is, because certainly over the last number of months…

…SLE – Service Level Expectation – that was set primarily through the work of the design team – what we call Design Team A – which was really where all of the key metrics were determined during the IANA transition process. And a couple of our members were key on that on the Design Team A. Jay and Elaine who previously introduced themselves, as well as the Chair of that, Paul Kane, were really instrumental in determining those SLEs. Of course, many hands were on that. They were key to it, and as a result, were, I think, also important contributors and members of the CSC.

While some folks would like us to have a broader remit, like I said, I think it is critical to understand what our actual remit it.

We've had the introductions, but just to reinforce, there are members and there are liaisons on the CSC. I would say we have essentially equal rights and responsibilities, except, should there be a vote on an issue, only the members vote.

Currently there are four members; two from the gTLD community and two from the cc community; Kal and Elaine from the g community, and Jay and myself from the cc community.

There is also the opportunity to have a fifth member coming from either a ccTLD but a non-ccNSO ccTLD, or gTLD upon request, though thus far we've not had a request for that seat. And we have a liaison appointed by PTI, who is Elise.

We also have five liaisons from five different constituency groups who have pretty much introduced themselves here.

So we are the group that make up the official CSC. As mentioned, our primary responsibility is monitoring the performance of the IANA functions against predetermined SLEs. Another very important component of what we do is inform the broader community. We have a number of ways of doing that. I'll speak to that a little more later, but primarily taking this information, processing it, determining how PTI is doing against the SLEs, and then sharing that information broadly is another key component of what we do.

We have some responsibility in and around complaints and performance remediation, although it is fairly specific what our role is there. I'll speak more about that later. Then there's of course the consultation and reviews. We're involved in the survey, etc., and reviews of ourselves, the CSC as well as PTI, etc. I'll get into more detail as the presentation unfolds.

How is it that we work? We have monthly meetings at typically the middle of the month. We are reviewing PTI's report, which has 63 metrics in it. When we review the report, we're primarily looking for exceptions. We do review the entire report, but our focus has tended to be on any metrics that fall outside the predetermined SLEs. Essentially, we look at that, we discuss any potential exceptions, and if we're satisfied that there's a reasonable explanation, we will move on and note it in the PTI report.

We also – given we're in very early days for the CSC – have had a lot of discussions in terms of forming the CSC, what our codes of conduct are, how we're going to actually go about doing our work, those sorts of topics, and we've had some preliminary discussions on the metrics themselves. The work of Design Team A obviously was the best effort in terms of accurately capturing what the metrics should be.

But to some degree, that was the theory and the expectations. Now that we're into actual number with the SLEs, are they appropriate? Are they correct for what we're trying to achieve here?

So those were to give you a little bit of flavor of some of the discussions that we've had. I'll just remind everybody that our meetings are open. They are conference calls, but we are on Adobe Connect. They are recorded, and they are also available on our website. We have an extensive distribution list or lists out of lists. We publish our PTI report and the CSC's report to a long list, so there should be nobody who is interested who cannot find this information. It is widely disseminated.

Of course, at the ICANN meeting, this being essentially the first one since we really formed at the Hyderabad meeting, we will also have regular updates at ICANN meetings going forward. The bottom line is that the information is widely disseminated, both from a push as well as on our website.

Since we came into being in October, we have received four PTI reports and issued four of our own CSC reports on the PTI report. We've had significant discussion around the annual survey that has to be done, and we've initiated the discussion on the next piece of work that we're going to be focused on, which is around the complaints process. I should mention that we haven't had

any to date, but part of our work has to be the actual process itself, and that's something on our to-do list.

Mostly we've been involved in, I'm going to say, the administration and how we make sure the CSC is functioning effectively and that our interaction with PTI is working effectively. That has been part of the ongoing exercise, actually just building a relationship between the two entities and finding our cadence.

As mentioned, we've also created the CSC website, where all of this information is also available if you want to pull it for yourself.

However, the core of what we do is monitoring PTI's metrics and PTI's compliance with the service level expectations. As mentioned, there are 63 individual metrics grouped into eight general groups, including technical checks and staff processing time, etc. All of these are contained in the IANA Naming Functions Agreement and were developed by DTA. As mentioned, two of the members of the DTA are part of the members of the CSC.

It's important to note that there are – when I talk about reports, there are really two distinct reports. There's the PTI report which has all the metrics, and that is provided to the CSC which issues its own report on what we have seen in the performance of PTI.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

So, it is important to distinguish that there are two separate reports: one provided by PTI to the CSC, and one provided by the CSC to the broader community.

That in part is where, if there are any variances in the metrics, there's an explanation provided. The CSC has had discussion about the various exceptions that have been encountered thus far and determined whether or not we are satisfied with the variance and the explanation and whether there's anything to be done about and whether the metric itself has turned out to be appropriate and reasonable.

Within the metrics themselves, there are three thresholds defined for the overall PTI SLEs whether they're been achieved or not. There are three categories: excellent, satisfactory, and needs improvement. Satisfactory is where we found ourselves over the last four reports. Essentially, it is exactly as it sounds: that the performance PTI is satisfactory, that not every SLE has been met to spec but we're entirely satisfied with the performance because there's been a reasonable explanation for any failure to meet the specific SLE.

I did want to provide some examples. It's one thing to talk about the theory of how it's working, but to put a little meat on the bone for how it works specifically. So I wanted to provide two examples of an SLE being met, as well as an SLE not being met.

The first was just to give an example of one that is met. It's the SLE for staff processing of a request for the creation or transfer of a gTLD as ten days. In order to be considered having successfully met this metric, PTI needs to meet that threshold 90% of the time. For some reason, it seems to be missing in the presentation, but they must meet that metric 90% of the time in order to be considered to having successfully met that requirement.

PTI has met that metric. In fact, they've beaten it quite substantially. In December alone, there were ten such requests, and the longest took only 2.91 days. That's an example of the kind of metric that PTI is reporting on, and in this case, the actual versus what was in the SLE.

On the other hand, there are a few metrics that have not met the SLEs, and I wanted to provide an example of what that looks like and our thinking around it.

In this case, the SLE not met was for technical checks, which were required to be within 50 minutes 95% of the time. In December for example, 10% of the requests exceeded that metric, meaning therefore the 95% threshold was not met.

In discussion around this particular metric, it was determined that these checks are done in sequence. What was happening was that a number of these checks were having to be done at a

EN

time or requested at a time and effectively the checks were being queued. So the actual duration of the check was meeting the requirement, but the problem was they were getting stacked up or queued and therefore not meeting the total time required.

So we had a discussion about that. We understand what the issue is. PTI understands what the issue is. Actually, in terms of talking through how might this be improved, this is something that will end up on PTI's roadmap for future technology development. At least that's where the discussion is now.

So the point here is not to drill specifically into the example but to give you a flavor for how we look at metrics that aren't met, the kind of discussion we have, and then what would happen. In this case, it's something that will be likely added to the development roadmap so that these checks can potentially be done in parallel as opposed to the way they're done now. So that gives you a bit of a flavor for something that has not been met and what CSC does about it.

One of the work items on our [dance] card going forward is around complaints and performance issue remediation. Again, here it's important to distinguish what CSC's role really is in this complaints and performance process.

Individual complaints are not the remit of the CSC. Our focus is monitoring the overall performance of PTI. And if we start to see

systemic issues or ongoing and repeated complaints, those are the kinds of issues that our attention would gravitate to. But we are not in the business of getting involved in individual, one-off complaints. That's absolutely the remit of PTI itself.

For those interested in digging into this a little more, this is actually determined to a great degree by ICANN Bylaws. For those who really want to take a look at it, it's 17.1 in the ICANN Bylaws. That really talks about the process for, should we see systemic complaints, how we as a group would escalate that to the GNSO and the ccNSO respectively for their consideration.

In terms of systemic or persistent complaints, we don't have a final procedure in place yet, and that is part of what we'll be working on over the balance of this year, certainly. There was guidance provided in the CSC charter, where examples were provided. That also proposes three levels of escalation: to the PTI Board, to the head of the GDD, and then to the ICANN CEO and Board.

If you want to get a flavor for the general path that we will be taking as we work through this, you can see it in the CSC charter itself. That's something that PTI and CSC will be working on together over the coming months as we try to create and then normalize this process. That's on our to-do list at this point.

In addition to that, consulting and disseminating information is another key part of what the CSC does. One of the ways that we do that is working with or providing input to PTI's customer survey. We will be doing that in the coming survey. We have been working on that in terms of understanding the process flow of that survey, where the touch points are, and where the CSC can get involved and help.

I know that in previous years the cc community has not been particularly great at participating in this survey, so that'll be something that we take on as to surface within our community the need to participate in this a little more actively, and then provide greater feedback and see where we can continue or PTI can continue to improve.

So that's one way we'll be getting involved in it, and that's a key feedback mechanism to ensuring that we're continually improving this service or helping to improve this service.

Additionally, I would say one of the primary responsibilities – as I mentioned already a little bit – is informing the community. It's one thing to assess the performance, but of course, giving the community confidence that PTI is working with according to plan and performing with according to expectation, it's our role as CSC to make sure that the overall community is well-informed. We've done that thus far by launching the dashboard,

launching our own website, providing the monthly reports and disseminating monthly reports to an extensive mailing list.

That's what we've done so far, but where are we headed? As noted, one of the key things in our work plan going forward will be around developing remedial actions and the complaint process. Also, we'll be reviewing the existing SLEs later this year, and we'll be getting more involved in the PTI survey. So that's something we haven't been involved in yet but will be going forward.

Also, at the end of a year – our year essentially is October to October – we'll be reviewing the SLEs and determining if any fine-tuning needs to be made, and we'll make those recommendations to the ccNSO and GNSO.

I would remind all of us that while the CSC has primary responsibility for this, there is community involvement in many different ways. The CSC will have a charter review after our first year in business. Any changes, of course, would have to be agreed upon by the GNSO and ccNSO, but tere is an opportunity for feedback and input there from the community to make sure that the charter that we envisioned is the charter that we actually need.

There will be a review of us as the CSC; our effectiveness. That's a joint ccNSO/GNSO responsibility, and that will happen after

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

two years in business for the CSC. Then of course there's the review of PTI, which will be done in October 2018 as well.

So I would encourage all of you, and the community itself has a number of opportunities to be involved, not the least of which is just regular feedback. But certainly on these annual occasions, I would encourage the broader community to provide input and feedback. So you can put it in your calendars right now. This is on an annual or bi-annual cycle.

With that, we have, I would say, just a final note here. Just to give the broader community assurance that thus far I would say PTI performance has been very good. There have been some minor metrics missed or some metrics missed, but there has been reasonable discussion and explanation. Overall, CSC has certainly been satisfied that PTI is living up to the SLEs.

With that, I've taken most of the 30 minutes, but if there are any questions or comments, I'd be happy to entertain them at this point from the broader community as opposed to the CSC itself, because we will have another hour for our own meeting.

Are there any questions or comments?

PETER KOCH: Hello. I'm not shy. I'm going to walk to the microphone. Anyway, Peter Koch, DENIC.

You mentioned that the CSC is going to get involved in this survey preparation. I very much welcome that, because it would probably be helpful to ask the consumers of the surveys what exactly they might want to express. So I'm very much looking forward to that.

Do you already have any ideas for how this process is going to be organized?

BYRON HOLLAND: We don't yet. It is something in the very near-term that we're going to be working on. But in terms of a process, no, we don't yet. To be honest, in terms of survey design at this point, the survey itself is the responsibility of PTI, not CSC. We as the members and as registry operators are concerned – I don't say that because negatively – we're interested in making sure that the survey is actually culling the required information, which I think is what you're getting to, as well as making sure that we're getting a lot if input. So that's the other part where I think the CSC can really add value, is making sure we are getting the feedback from the customer base.

PETER KOCH: Okay.

BYRON HOLLAND: So it's a work in progress. I don't have a specific answer to your specific question.

PETER KOCH: That is fine. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Are there any other questions or comments?

[PAUL]:   Paul [inaudible]. Thank you, Byron. Extremely interesting and largely reassuring. My question would be whether you have data that would permit a comparison between the pre-transition IANA performance in some or all of your 63 measurements with the first year of PTI.

And secondly, whether you have any comments or recent history about the effect of the changes in the staffing arrangements for PTI and particularly the [inaudible]. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: I'll answer the second question first. In terms of PTI staffing, etc., that is definitely not our remit, so I don't have a comment on that kind of a question. We do have PTI members here; if they want to add anything – no. Shaking their heads no. Probably the safe bet. But that is not our remit and not something that we're

investigating one way or the other as a committee. Some of us may be as individuals, but certainly not as a committee.

In terms of pre- and post-transition, certainly the design team – I don't know if Jay or Elaine you want to speak to this – looked at the metrics from the previous era, and they were absolutely key in determining what the current metrics are. Did you want to comment on that?

JAY DALEY: The pre-PTI metrics are different qualitatively from the current ones because they're solely end-to-end metrics and they don't attribute to the responsible party the time taken for that party.

The new SLE/SLA is very different because it focuses on attribution to ensure effectively that we can monitor the performance of PTI and we're not monitoring the performance of other people in the process, which is not our role to do.

There is a requirement for end-to-end measurement, but that's purely for information purposes. It's not in any way intended to be a measurable metric.

So yes, you can theoretically make a comparison, but I wouldn't. I don't think it adds anything or provides any information at all to the community.

The new metrics and the way they're designed will provide significant information to that, and there is a clear process – it's not a quick process, but there is a clear process – for adjusting those metrics, tightening them if necessary and developing them. So it's not going to be static, which is another reason why you might want to do the comparison: to see whether there's any slippage there.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. With that, seeing or hearing no other questions, I'll bring this section of our meeting to a close – the public presentation section – and we'll move into our regular agenda.

Thank you very much everybody for your interest in our work. You're welcome to stay for the next section.

We're moving onto Agenda Item #3 in our regular business, and that's an overview and schedule of meetings with specific groups here in Copenhagen, just to make sure everybody is aware of where we are and what we're up to as a group.

Some of us were at the CSC-GNSO Council meeting and provided essentially a similar version of the presentation we just did to the GNSO. Rumor has it it went quite well. Elaine or Jay, how did it go?

ELAINE PRUIS: I think it went quite well. We did get some positive feedback. A shorter version of the slide deck was discussed, and I think it was just the right amount of information for the people in the room. So it was good.

BYRON HOLLAND: Any comments or feedback that came out of it in particular?

ELAINE PRUIS: I think the most significant thing was recognition that the – I hope I get this acronym right – CCG – whichever group Donna was tasked with putting together the CSC – just did a fabulous job and set us up for success. So that was the most interesting thing for me.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you. Obviously, our meeting today, and tomorrow we have the CSC-Registry Stakeholder Group and the CSC-GAC meeting. So we have both of those, and we should determine in terms of the CSC and Registry Stakeholder Group, I encourage as many of us to be there as possible. But we don't all have to be at every meeting, obviously. And same the GAC briefing.

On Wednesday, we'll have the CSC-Board meeting and the ccNSO-CSC update. The ccNSO meeting is open. Everybody is

welcome. Jay and I will present that on behalf of the group, but everybody is welcome to join.

So that's what our schedule is for the next few days.

Moving onto the regular business of the CSC. We have just under an hour, ideally, to get through it. I'll dispense with the roll call since we've already done the roll call. And since it's my observations that nobody has left, we'll consider it the same. Yes, brilliant powers of observation that I have.

We'll move onto the action items. Can we roll down to those? There's only one ongoing and two pending action items. So we have two pending. The first one is logistical in terms of updating our August meeting. There had been some discussion around changing the dates, so we have a Doodle poll out for that.

Where are we with that?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm sending the Doodle poll.

BYRON HOLLAND: Oh, you are sending it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. So that's pending because there was some discussion around the appropriate date in August. There have been a few dates put out there, August 17th, 18th, and 22nd which would be a little different from our regular scheduled meeting. So look for that, and please provide feedback on that.

Action Item number 7-2014 – or do I have a different action item? No. That's to get the IANA survey timeline by no later than May 10th. So that's ongoing.

Did you have any comments on that, Elise?

ELISE GERICH: No. I think at the least meeting we said we wouldn't be providing anything before this meeting so that we would try to get it before May 10th, well in advance. But we wouldn't have anything before the Copenhagen meeting.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you. As part of that, doing outreach and creating awareness for the survey will be part of our work. But that's something for the near-future but not today.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

Moving on to Agenda Item number three – thank you – it's the meat of our meeting, which is the PTI performance report for February.

Elise, did you want to speak to that, please?

ELISE GERICH:

Yes. Thank you, Byron. Since we do have more than just the members here, I do want everyone to realize that the report that we send every month is drafted from the SLE dashboard. So anyone who wants to, it's a public dashboard – a real-time dashboard – go to https://SLE-Dashboard.IANA.org. The dashboard was done under the leadership of Kim Davies. The content for what's in the dashboard is from Naela Sarras, who's joining us. They're both here at the table today. So I just wanted to recognize that all that good work was done by the team.

For the report itself, which is sent monthly, we had three exception this month. Two of them are in the submission manual logdement timeframe. This is something that has come up before, where we still receive requests via e-mail, at which point we have a metric to lodge those e-mail requests into the system and get them started so that they can move through the automated system.

As we discussed last time – and Jay, I think I responded to your comment. You were absolutely correct that the principle is that we're not supposed to be waiting for clarifications. Our measurements for manual lodgement have included waiting for clarification. In this case, both of those manual lodgements/e-mail requests to start a ticket didn't have sufficient information in them, so we were having a back and forth.

That meant that the ticket didn't get measured properly. So we are changing the way we'll be doing that, and that's to be consistent with what the SLA was originally defined to measure. So that's the reason we have those two exceptions again this month for manual lodgement.

The other exception that we had is in the staff processing time; validation and reviews of a ccTLD delegation, called "creation" these days. This is very typical, that our time takes longer than 60 days.

I know, Jay, you mentioned that when the design team met, they tried to look at what they thought might be a reasonable timeframe for the IANA to be reviewing a ccTLD delegation in our own time. Well, we have yet to be able to hit this ccTLD what I'll call aspirational target. We didn't have enough trending data from the past to be able to determine what the target should be.

So we did exceed the target of 60 days for the ccTLD delegation that took place in February.

So those were our three exceptions. Two had to do with the manual lodgement, and we are reviewing our process and the way we measure and report so that it doesn't include the clarification time; that that clarification time gets attributed to the requester and not to us. For the validation review for ccTLD delegation, we still strive mightily to reach the 60 days, but we haven't done it for the two ccTLD delegations that we've had in the last five months. But we continue to strive to meet the target. We call it an aspirational target.

BYRON HOLLAND: Elaine and then Jay.

ELAINE PRUIS: Thanks. Could you give us a little more detail about what that process looks like? Why does it take 60 or 90 days?

ELISE GERICH: Yes, I can, but I will ask Naela Sarras to chime in, because it's her team that actually handles all those requests. She knows the process by heart. Naela?

NAELA SARRAS:	Thank you, Elise. Thank you, Elaine. The last requests that you've seen were IDN delegation requests. I know, Elaine, you are very familiar with the gTLD creation process, where the bulk of the work is one by our colleagues in the gTLD team, and then the entering of it in the root zone is done by us.

For internationalized domain names, they undergo a process with ICANN to determine the string that's to be delegated, but that's where their process ends. Then it's passed onto IANA services to put it in the root zone.

There's a long list of – this is all documented on our website. When a request is first submitted to the IANA department, it has to have full documentation showing that that request meets different criteria. Some of this criteria is that it has government non-objection, that it has local Internet community support, that it has a sound technical plan for operating the domain, that it has a sound administrative plan for operating the domain, that they have working nameservers, and several other criteria.

Unfortunately, with country-code delegation requests, some of them come pretty well-documented, and most of them don't. This documentation that I'm describing, if you were to come and look at our desks, it's actually a stack of documentation that we have to weed through.

Most of the time, some countries even send us documentation that isn't yet translated to English, so we have to write back and say, "We appreciate different languages, but our language of business is English."

In this process, what takes the bulk of the work for us and for the end user, for the customer, is at the beginning, collecting all the documentation, reviewing it and getting back to them about what's still missing. So that's the bulk of the process.

The second chunk that adds up to the 60+ days is once we've collected all the documentation, we write a report that we then send to the ICANN Board for review to make sure we've followed all of our processes. So that also takes time from staff because there's a variety of how the documentation is presented to us, so we have to kind of distill it into something that is consistent among all requests.

Quite frankly, in this last case, as noted in the explanation and analysis, there's a little bit of: "How will the process continue after the transition? What will the role of the ICANN Board continue to be?" We had a little bit of an internal discussion, so that led up to additional time on staff time.

That's pretty much it. It's collecting a bunch of information, then going through a manual – then going through basically the same delegation process that you're familiar with, where all the

contacts have to confirm and doing the technical checks [in] the proposed nameservers. Then there's the manual piece of collecting the report and then actually sending it to our root zone partner to add it to the root zone.

ELAINE PRUIS: Just to clarify, your task is to collect the information, make sure it's complete and then pass it to the Board for approval? Or does the PTI do any sort of analysis of the adequacy of the documents that are being provided?

NAELA SARRAS: We do all the analysis. We do all the distilling of information. The report basically has a recommendation of as staff, "We see that this meets the requirements." Or if we have any concerns, we certainly raise them. The Board doesn't approve or reject. The Board just confirms that we followed our processes.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Jay?

JAY DALEY: Thank you. I've got three questions. The stewardship transition work was only for this one, not for the previous one. Was that significant? Because that's a one-off, presumably. That won't

happen again. So can we almost deduct it to work our roughly what the time was without it? Not formally, but…

ELISE GERICH: The stewardship transition work for the ccTLD delegation? That request?

JAY DALEY: Yes. In this specific one. In the text in the explanation there, it talks about [inaudible]

ELISE GERICH: Right. I'll refer again to Naela, but first I will say that her team was stalled while we tried to decide this. We could have closed our portion of it in December if we had had clarity. But we had to wait until January.

Naela, do you want to speak more clearly –

JAY DALEY: Well, that's specifically what I'm asking is how long that stalling was then so that we can just get a feeling for how much that impacted this.

ELISE GERICH: Naela, do you have it off the top of your head?

NAELA SARRAS: Roughly. Thanks, Elise. My goal for my team – our personal goal – was to wrap up this delegation request before we headed for the Christmas break. So we could have finished it between the 15th and 20th of December, somewhere around ther, but we were stalled as we figured out the process. So I think we could have finished it then, which would have put us under the 60 days.

[ELISE GERICH]:   No, no. We [came in at] 67 days. Anyway. It's closer to the 60 than 90.

NAELA SARRAS: Closer to 60 than 90, yes.

JAY DALEY: Right. So it was a fairly significant element of it, was that one particular thing.

NAELA SARRAS: Yes.

JAY DALEY: Great. So the next question then was, in this process, is time waiting for the applicant very clearly not counted towards this? Or is this a messy one?

NAELA SARRAS: No, I'm actually, I'm happy to report that it's not a messy one. We have a very diligent staff that flip the status of the request of clarification when it's waiting on the customer, and it's very well-accounted for. So this is really all truly ICANN staff and time.

JAY DALEY: Okay. Great. The final bit is the process involved the Board. Is that being counted as well?

NAELA SARRAS: It is being counted, not in the 93 days. There's a two-week/14-day period where it was sent to the Board for their –

JAY DALEY: Okay. But it's not in the target then.

NAELA SARRAS: Correct.

EN

JAY DALEY: Okay. Alright.

ELISE GERICH: If I can follow up on that, in the SLE dashboard, if you look at the third-party processing time, you'll see that that's accounted for. It says how much time was done by third-party processing, which is the ICANN Board.

Alright. And I should fess up now that we discovered a bug in our dashboard code, and it wasn't recording third-party processing time correctly until about, what, Kim? Was it about four weeks ago that we corrected that? So at one point you would have thought there was never any third-party processing if you had been looking at the dashboard in December. But if you look at the dashboard now, it is recording third-party processing properly. So I'm just letting you know we found the bug and we fixed it.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Jay?

JAY DALEY: Sorry. Just one more from me. What would you want this target to be then?

ELISE GERICH: I hate to say without consulting with my colleagues, but I will say. I think 90 days would be a better target, because that would then potentially – but I'll let folks – we almost made 60 on this one, but it was not a messy one. And there are messy ones. When we only get one a month and it's a messy one, we'll always miss the target.

JAY DALEY: Is this – sorry.

NAELA SARRAS: I just want to be clear. If they're messy, it's on the customer's end that it's messy. I think when I said "not messy" to Jay earlier, it wasn't messy in that we were very clear in the communication back and forth, on who it's waiting on, and the days that are on us really are on us.

JAY DALEY: Alternatively, rather than moving this one out beyond 60, is this one where the threshold percentile should perhaps drop significantly? Or are they very regularly going to be –

ELISE GERICH: This is near and dear to Kim's heart, so I'll let him speak to this.

KIM DAVIES: Based on my experience with the design team, I think this is one of the fundamental things we wrestled with, which is that we very rarely get more than one per month. So it's either 100% or 0%. It's not something that is likely to change in the near future, so I think that's just something we have to keep in mind. So the threshold is almost immaterial.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Any further comments on the report itself? Anything else you'd like to draw attention to?

ELISE GERICH: I do want to mention that I know we have an agenda topic later to talk about some of the requests that you all have had for our implementation or how we measure things or how we report them. So both of these topics come up there. We'd like clarity, and we really want to listen to what some of your suggestions are or what it is that you've been requesting, because these have been regular topics. It's not like this is the first time we've seen these.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you. So that was 3A. 3B is the CSC report. As per the last meeting, we had asked for a draft of the CSC report to be included along with the PTI report.

Now, just as a reminder, our time was a little compressed this month in order to make sure we had the reporting for the Copenhagen face-to-face meeting. The draft CSC report was issued on Sunday, which would be yesterday. It's hard to be believe. But hopefully, colleagues around this table got a chance to look at it even though we did only get it yesterday. We certainly knew that time was going to be tight getting the materials for this face-to-face meeting.

With the expectation that everybody has had the opportunity to review it, are there any comments or feedback or questions?

Jay?

JAY DALEY: On the particular one we've just been talking about – ccTLD IDN delegations – I think we could do with some specific text about that in here that we haven't captured. But we need to have an agreement about what we should be saying about that.

What I would propose that we should be saying about that is that this is such a low volume change to take place that we really need to wait, possibly come some considerable time, as in six months or more, to get enough data to really be able to comment properly on this one.

BYRON HOLLAND: I think that's a reasonable comment, and I might also add to that that there was some time in here for the Board, which my expectation is that it will be a once-only activity, as you've wrestled with the transition and how the Board interacts with this post-transition. So there should probably also be some verbiage acknowledging that and that it's a one-time only activity. Is that fair to say? Have you worked through your internal processes on this?

ELISE GERICH: Yes. I think it's fair to say that we won't have that delay again because we will turn our timer off as soon as we turn it over to the Board, as opposed to debate whether it's our time or their time.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. So Jay's proposal makes sense to me. Is there any other feedback on that? So then we'll just have to turn our attention to how those words get written and who's going to write them. Trang?

TRANG NGUYEN: [I'd like to ask you if you'd like to write something,] Jay, since you had something in mind.

BART BOSWINKEL: I've recorded some of it, you as well. May I suggest that, say, by the end of today, we circulate the updated draft so we can send it out during this meeting – the CSC report? That would be nice to show the efficiency of the CSC.

BYRON HOLLAND: Would that meet your – okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: But that assumes that the CSC responds.

BYRON HOLLAND: So between Bart and Trang, I'll leave that to you to coordinate by the end of the business day today, Copenhagen time. You'll have the draft text? Okay.

TRANG NGUYEN: May I ask a clarifying question in terms of how you want that text inserted into the report? I think this comment would relate to B. So would you like that to be annotated someh0w – maybe asterisked – and then the explanation provided below it? Or just…

JAY DALEY:	If you can scroll up a little bit – that section. Metrics that the CSC is tracking closely. It should be in there, I think.
TRANG NGUYEN:	Okay.
JAY DALEY:	Linking the two, the bit above it and that below it.
BYRON HOLLAND:	Thanks, Jay. Any other comments on this draft report, other than the text we're going to insert? Are we satisfied with the report otherwise?

BYRON HOLLAND:

No objections? Okay. So let's get that draft text in and we'll go from there in terms of approving this report. We'll do that via e-mail. If Bart and Trang are going to get that out by the end of today, can I ask that we all take a look at it within 24 hours of that and provide any feedback? Okay? So by the end of Tuesday, if CSC members can have any feedback. And we'll do that on the list. Okay. Thank you.

Moving onto #4, which is internal procedures, those have been circulated in draft and discussed in previous meetings.

Bring that up – thank you.

EN

I'll open the floor to any comments or questions on the revised draft for internal procedures.

Is everybody okay with the current draft of internal procedures?

This was included in the package with all the associated notes.

BART BOSWINKEL: [inaudible] map.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes, and Bart did map all of it to Bylaws, etc. Would anybody like to make a comment? Ask questions? Would anybody be concerned about moving towards adopting these as our guidelines? This is something that the members will want to vote on: adopting our formal guidelines.

Hearing no questions or further comments, could I ask somebody to – oh, Elaine squeaking in under the wire. Okay. Elaine?

ELAINE PRUIS: Sorry. I do have a question because I haven't had a chance to look at this yet since last month. I think there was some question about the voting. I was wondering where we ended up with that. We need three members to have consensus to pass.

BYRON HOLLAND: Six, one, two. I think the key section there is really the second sentence, which reads, "For a decision to be taken, it must be approved by at least three members present, unless another threshold is required, either by ICANN Bylaws or by the CSC itself prior to the decision-making."

As you'll recall, we discussed that at least in the first year, the full four members needed to be present for quorum as well. Obviously in this first year, which I think is important – and I think we think is important – it takes all four of us to have quorum for a meeting, and three of the four of us to agree to vote. So it's a pretty high bar, which I think is appropriate in the first year.

Any other comments or questions? Since this is a relatively formal part of the meeting, could I ask one of the members to make a motion for this?

JAY DALEY: Yes. I will.

BYRON HOLLAND: Jay, thank you. Seconder? Kal? Thank you. I saw the nod. All in favor of this? Members?

Four. Unanimous. Adoption of the guidelines. Thank you.

Let's go back to the agenda, please. Thank you, everybody, for that. We'll move on to essentially what we're calling here the triage list of work items. There was a list of work items that was part of your package. If we can get those up.

Okay. I just want to remind everybody that the discussion here is about the prioritization of this list. Given the meeting time that we have available, both today and going forward, the goal here is to have some discussion and try to put priority to these work items, not to actually drill into the item itself. This is a discussion about the logistics, not about the substance, so we can get this on our work plan going forward.

Well, you can't see it here, but there are seven items on this list. Ideally, I'd like to have some discussion about what we think the key priorities are and what we have to put at the top of the list and what we can float down to the bottom of the list in terms of scheduling. I would try to look at these items in two ways: urgency versus importance, or urgency and importance. Are there things here that we really need to do right away from a logistics standpoint?

Okay, Elise. I see your hand up. We'll get to that.

What do we need to do strictly from a chronology standpoint first, and what are the truly important? How do we balance between urgency and importance? If we could view these items through that lens, I think that would be a helpful start. But of course, I'm open to other ways of viewing it.

So, I throw it open for discussion in terms of what we need to tackle first. Elise, your hand went up very quickly. Did you have a comment?

ELISE GERICH: Yes. Actually, we have an agenda topic on Point number one on your list up there, which is review of implementation of existing SLEs. It's on the agenda for today also. But from a PTI operational and reporting perspective, we clearly don't like having exceptions and we really like to understand what the implementation requirements are from the perspective of the members of the CSC so that we could then schedule that.

As you note, we had handed a high-level overview of development projects that we have, but we may need to readjust that or shift it in order to prioritize things in order to meet the CSC requirements. We'd like to be able to do that sooner rather than later.

Obviously, the procedures and the way the CSC operates is equally important, but from an operational perspective from PTI, we'd really like to understand these implementation topics, the technical checks, the manual lodgements, and make sure that we're on the same page before we start a development project.

BYRON HOLLAND: Maybe I could ask Jay or Kal because you were catalytic in surfacing this particular issue. Is that something where you could meet offline with Elise and report back to the broader group at a future meeting? Is that something that would make sense?

JAY DALEY: Yes, potentially. I don't see any concerns with that.

Sorry. Could you explain to me again the linkage between the two? Between the need for a potential review and the roadmap?

ELISE GERICH: We're having a major re-architecture of the RZMS system right now, and we have a lot of things on the plate that go into that. I know Kim can give us more detail if I'm bumbling it, and then Kim will just raise his hand and take over.

We have the framework of interpretation part that's leading into that re-architecture, how we do the concurrent versus sequential technical checks as part of the re-architecture, things like that. We want to make sure we understand exactly what it is that you're thinking you want for each and every one of those issues that have come up – the manual lodgement. We want to be clear that this is how we're going to measure it and the implementation will be this way. That will all be part of the RZMS re-architecture and enhancements.

Kim, do you want to say something? Did I bobble it too badly?

BYRON HOLLAND: Can I just ask, before you getting going, can you give us a sense of timing on that?

ELISE GERICH: What's the "that?"

BYRON HOLLAND: In terms of re-architecture of the RZMS and how the work that we're considering would feed into that and what the linkages are from a timing-and-dates-milestones perspective.

ELISE GERICH: I will defer to Kim for that, but the re-architecture is a multi-year project with phases.

BYRON HOLLAND: I guess that's what I want to understand, is where are the touch points for us? Because clearly, that's far broader than the specific things we're worrying about. In order not to delay a multi-year project or adversely affect it, what are the milestones that we need to be considering in order to try to govern ourselves to be part of the inputs but not to waylay your much broader project?

KIM DAVIES: Thanks. I think there's a slight chicken-and-the-egg thing here in that we don't know where the touchpoints are unless we fully understand any requirements that have come from this group. I think what Elise is alluding to is that over the past few meetings, occasionally there have been some suggestions, some asks, and we wanted to get a good sense and ensure that we understand them to your satisfaction so that we don't go off and implement something that is divergent from what was proposed. And also classifying those things, whether they're just merely suggestions, like, "Have you thought about doing it this way?" versus, "We would really like this new mechanism to be implemented in this particular fashion. That helps us out."

So any additional feedback we can get so we're all comfortable that we all are aligned, we can then take back to our engineers to make sure we understand the impact on the project.

As for timing, the next version of RZMS is actually being developed right now. So from my perspective, coming to clarity in the next month or two on these issues saves us from going too far down a road where we have to step back.

To be honest, the kinds of issues we've discussed here I don't think are radical changes to anything we're going to do, but it's a good opportunity to make sure we're aligned.

BYRON HOLLAND: Jay?

JAY DALEY: Thank you. I think, as a matter of principle, everything that we ask is only a suggestion or anything otherwise unless it's formal through a review of the SLE. I think that's vital, because the SLE has to be the normative document for how these things are done. We simply can't go adding other things on there. That's a nightmare.

There are two particular bits here. I might ask Kal to do one of them, and I'll just do the first one. The first one is the manual

lodgement time. I think that was simply a clarification issue of correct attribution. That was all. There was nothing else beyond that. We've had that and that's resolved from my perspective. I don't think there's anything else that we need to explain or otherwise get across in that regard with you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

KIM DAVIES: Yes?

ELISE GERICH: Kim, could you confirm that we understand exactly what they want us to do with manual lodgement?

KIM DAVIES: I believe we understand the principle, which is that any time attributable to staff in that phase should be in the reporting, which our tools have not done with 100% accuracy to date. So that's understood.

JAY DALEY: Then the other one. Did you want to pick that up, Kal?

KAL FEHER:	You're referring to the technical checks, the fact that they're queueing up?

BYRON HOLLAND:	Can I just jump in here? I know we're all operators and it's almost impossible for us to not drill in, but I just want to manage time because we have 15 minutes left and a longer agenda. The goal here is if we have seven – I know we can only see five up here – activities on this list of priorities, my goal is we're not going to solve these here. But how do we prioritize them so we know what to get working on next among these seven and provide guidance? That's what I think we need to achieve today so we can carry on with the rest of the agenda and prioritize our work for the balance of the year.
	To me, when I look at this, this is of high importance but not necessarily urgent. Now, I guess I have to define "urgent." It would be in the next meeting or two that we could provide this.

ELISE GERICH:	I was just going to say we can close the discussion. Jay, if it's okay with you, we can just set up time with Kal and you. We can clarify the four or five things. It wouldn't take more than ten minutes if you think we already understand. But if we don't, then you'll know. Instead of doing it in the CSC.

BYRON HOLLAND: So as the action item, that will be the takeaway here. In terms of prioritizing the rest of the activities, are there any other comments on what we need to attend to –number two, three, four items – from a chronology point of view?

JAY DALEY: From a chronology point of view, number four in my view is one of the earliest ones. We don't need a full review of the SLE. We need a quick, simple review of it to instantiate the one change we've already recommended so that we then get that off the list, because I think it becomes credibility thing if we say, "We think this should change" and then there's a breach every month for the next however long until they're done. So, we ought to have a fast process of getting that change put in.

BYRON HOLLAND: Now, given that that would have to go to the respective bodies for a change, are you saying we should initiate that now? Or should we wait? Should we be recommending it and providing a heads up, but doing that on an annual cycle basis? Or are you suggesting we try to attend to that now?

JAY DALEY:	I think that we are going to learn a lot through the process of doing that. I am scared that it is actually a very heavyweight process of change for what doesn't need to be quite a heavyweight process of change. And I would like to get on with it sooner rather than later so that we can flush out the problems that will come from doing that.
	That may be asking for trouble. I'll certainly [inaudible] to that one, but I'd rather we start it. But that's my personal view.
BYRON HOLLAND:	Any comments on that? Any concerns? Kal and then…
KAL FEHER:	I was just going to say that I agree that there is a credibility element to this, that if we perpetually have a comment but no action, the community may lack comfort that we're addressing those things. I also agree it's probably going to be quite a heavyweight process. So strap in.
BYRON HOLLAND:	Okay. Lars?
LARS JOHAN-LIMAN:	I just want to comment that I see the two benefits of doing it soon. One is to actually hack out the process to define it so we

are done with that. When we need it the next time, it's already done. The second one is the credibility thing. We want to show that we are on top of that and actually take action when we see the need to do it.

BYRON HOLLAND: Trang?

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you, Byron. I just wanted to let the group know that I did have some conversations with ICANN Legal regarding potential changes to the SLEs. As you know, it is currently contained in the appendix or annex of the IANA naming function contract – and whether or not that would trigger a Bylaw-related process. Per Legal, it is not defined as one of the actions that would necessarily trigger the Bylaws' process. It will still require a change to the contract, and we need to work through that process and what that means. But at least it's not one of the actions that will require several other steps, as defined in the Bylaws.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Lars?

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN: [inaudible]

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Are there any substantive objections to proceeding with that?

No? Okay. That's a piece of work we want to get done. In terms of prioritizing it, any further feedback on that? Something we should commence forthwith? Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Might it be that, say, Trang and/or I come up with a kind of process and lay out what is involved as a first step for discussion [of] what you've done already? By maybe the next meeting is too short, but in two meetings. So by the May meeting, we'll get back to you with a description of it. Then you have a full assessment and then a full overview of what is required.

BYRON HOLLAND: Can you meet that? Does that satisfy the members? The May meeting?

Okay. Let's do that. Thank you. In terms of the list itself, I think our next, in addition to that, key couple of items are going to be around working through the remedial action process. So I would say at this point we have to a great degree normalized the

reporting cycle, the CSC report, what's in it and how we're doing it, and it's time to move on to the next – other than the SLEs, to just discuss the next big piece of work, which is around actually determining what the remedial process is. To me, that's certainly of high importance and relatively high urgency. So I'm going to suggest as the next material work item that that be at top of the list for us.

Any feedback? Does that make sense to members?

Okay. Jay?

JAY DALEY: Won't the survey come in between – before that? I agree with you, the RAP, the Remedial Action Procedures is more important. But isn't the survey, while far less important, going to come sooner?

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes. You've taken the words right out of my mouth. The survey is the next thing, but it's more of a logistical execution as opposed to significantly substantive, at least from the work that we will do. So in terms of how I'm viewing it through the paradigm of urgency and importance, it's not as important, but from a chronology/urgency point of view, it's something that we need to attend to, I would say, next.

Does that make sense? Consistent with your comment as well? And we already have the May 10th date in mind. So that to me is the milestone that will determine our input and feedback. I think we as members in our own constituency should also start to – I know we've already had the GNSO meeting, but we have the Registry Stakeholder Group meeting coming up, the ccNSO meeting coming up. We need to start planting those seeds for participation at the very least.

Kal, you had your hand up?

KAL FEHER: Yes. On the topic of parallel versus serial, this time for the CSC, I imagine that the remedial action procedures will not be quickly developed. I imagine that also we will start to have a fairly lengthy discussion regarding the update of the SLEs. So we will be approaching a period of time when we'll be working on several parallel, important work items. We may need to look at streamlining our processes or dividing them perhaps at some point, because if we keep having a queue of work items, the first year may quickly come and go without us having completed much.

So just an observation, not a suggestion of anything.

BYRON HOLLAND:	So, what are you volunteering to spearhead? I agree with you, and I think there is an opportunity to set up parallel activities spearheaded by individuals. I think to some degree we've already seen that in terms of the SLEs. In terms of the survey, that's certainly something that I would be willing to spearhead and to start working those in parallel.
	Any further comments on this? At least for the near term, which for me was the primary goal in terms of prioritization, we've already had an agreement on how we're going to get started or at least who's going to get started on the SLEs. Bart and Trang have signed up for a little bit of work. I'll take it to lead off on the survey.
	So I think that gives us a forward view for the next couple of meetings, certainly into May. And no doubt the work beyond, but certainly into May from a chronology standpoint.
	Thank you. That satisfies my needs in terms of prioritizing some of the agenda items over the next several months.
	If we could go back to the agenda proper, please…
	In terms of 5B next steps, I think we've articulated who's going to be the point on several of the items. We are going to also update the August meeting.

Now, here in B, we've articulated intersessional meetings for the April and May timeframe and what exactly we're going to be working on. We know we have the May timeframe for the survey. I think right now we've identified who's going to take the lead on a couple of issues. What I would suggest is letting me iterate on this list of priorities based on what we've heard today, and I'll push it back out within the next 48 hours just to make sure we're on the same page. And then feel free to comment and feedback on that, but just based on what we've heard, who's signed up to at least spearhead several of the issues, we'll provide another iteration of this, and that will lead to the agenda items for April and May. Thanks.

Agenda Item number six was the review of implementation of existing SLEs, including the introduction of the roadmap. To me, I think we've probably already covered what this item was expected to be. Unless there's an objection, we'll take this as discussed since we already have next steps, at least, in motion.

Item number seven was Any Other Business. Did anybody have any other business? Jay?

JAY DALEY: I have a question. If there's a request that's in progress but has breached the SLA, then are we notified about that before completion, or during?

ELISE GERICH: No. The CSC is not notified about that before completion. We internally notify ourselves and we have internal mechanisms that we track to make sure and we know. For instance, the ccTLD delegation we knew we were exceeding. The way we've interpreted the performance reporting requirements was that the performances on completed tickets and meeting the SLA for completed thing. And operationally, internally we are aware of that, and we obviously drive ourselves towards meeting the SLA. But we're aware when we miss them.

JAY DALEY: To be clear, I don't have a view. I just wanted clarification. That's all. Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND: I just want to pick up on that item. In theory, if we had something that was dragging on for a very long time, you would be aware of it. You would be working towards it. Do you think it would make sense to provide a heads up to the CSC as opposed to us just finding out that something was way outside the bounds? Or do we just wait until that moment?

ELISE GERICH: Well, my hope is that that would never be an issue, except for potentially delegations of something. But I guess it would make sense, if we saw something that was going to take an extraordinarily long amount of time, that we could give you a heads up.

BYRON HOLLAND: Do any of my colleagues around the table have a view on that? Kal?

KAL FEHER: Just an observation that our concerns would not be for any one instance but rather all [trains] and so on. I don't think it's critical that we be informed, but it will affect, obviously, the percentages and so on. So, it would be useful. If it was indicating a trend, then obviously it'd be further useful. I think we need to emphasize that any one instance is not of interest to us. It's just of context, I guess.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Can I just suggest then that you use your best judgement, and that, should you see something that's falling well outside the bounds that you think we would be surprised be in the future, that a verbal update would probably be helpful for all so

that we don't experience those kinds of surprises? I'll leave it to your good judgment to determine that.

ELISE GERICH: Thank you. That seems quite practical. Kal, I agree with you. I wish I had thought to say what you just said, that it really is trends that the CSC is tracking. And we obviously will do our best not to have any extreme issues.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thanks. Just before we adjourn, as we've all been listening to our communities and talking about the work of the CSC, are there any observations or comments that anybody around the table would like to share? Any themes? Any messages?

Jay, and then…

JAY DALEY: I have one, which is actually out of scope. It's that there are things that are being raised with me that I am saying are not to do with the CSC, which is largely about technical changes and other things and the features of the system. I think a process is needed outside of the CSC for some more interaction or engagement around those and how that builds into the

roadmap. But just to let you know that that's the [inaudible] I'm getting.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. I would probably echo that it was those messages that led me to start the presentation with, "This is what we do," which is actually a much more confined remit than what a lot of people that I've spoken to think the remit of the CSC is.

Elise?

[ELISE]: We see that the representatives in the GAC are shifting a lot now, so I think that basically what we are seeking also in the GAC briefing is to explain the background of the CSC. I actually see when I had to write an update, as I always do, on the working group before we came here, and I had to explain the background for why the CSC is there in the first place. Many people know. Many people don't know. So it's just to say that with the shifting environment we now have, we need to reassure at least the GAC about why we're there and that they will be notified if something is out of hand, especially with the IDN ccTLD things, which are on the GAC agenda. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Jay?

JAY DALEY: Just on your last comment, the people who are coming to me who are out of scope don't misunderstand the role of the CSC at all. Basically, they feel that they don't have another route to get things through. And [inaudible] this is a formal route, even if it's not the right one.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you for that nuance. Kal?

KAL FEHER: [inaudible]. I've had similar feedback or comments coming from the Registry Stakeholder Group and a similar observation that there is a gap, if there were, somewhere between RZERC and CSC and any other mechanism to communicate feedback. I don't know what our role is resolving that gap, if there is a role at all, just that that's what I'm hearing.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks for the comments. Let's just make sure Bart captures them in the notes that are going to be published. Obviously, you can hear the early warning.

Kim, did you want to say something?

KIM DAVIES: Can I just make the comment to please informally relay these to us if there's no process today? I think I know what they're about, but I might not. These might be new issues I've never heard of or we've never heard of. So please do relay those.

ELISE GERICH: Byron, can I respond?

BYRON HOLLAND: Sure, Elise. Then Elaine.

ELIE GERICH: On this same point, please don't just informally send them to anyone within the PTI team. We have the IANA@IANA.org e-mail address. We do collect feedback there. We do read that, and we do collect that data. Going to one or two people because you know them individually is not always the best way to get the message to us.

So I think we'd like people to use the IANA@IANA.org, which is what we tell them anyway if they have comments or things. I know, Peter, you've come to us with stuff individually, but it can sit in somebody's individual mailbox and maybe not make it into

something. Not that it sits in Kim's. I'm not implying that in all. But in mine it might.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Elaine, we'll give you the final word here.

ELAINE PRUIS: Thanks. That was my question: do you have a support@IANA – an e-mail or something that we can direct people to? So it's IANA@IANA.org. Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you very much. Well, with that, we'll adjourn this meeting. Thank you very much. I appreciate all the efforts thus far. As you can see, we have a pretty full [dance] card for the next couple of meetings. Enjoy the rest of your Copenhagen meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

BYRON HOLLAND: Of who's attending? I think we did.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes. The liaisons are doing – so I'll be there. I'll be at the GAC. I'll be doing it for the Board. Jay and I will be doing it for the ccNSO, and –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

BYRON HOLLAND: No, no. We'll be there.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]