

---

ABU DHABI–Customer Standing Committee Review Team  
Wednesday, November 1, 2017 – 10:30 to 12:00GST  
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Customer Standing Committee Review Team at ICANN60 Abu Dhabi on November 1<sup>st</sup> 2017 in Capital Suite 3.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, so we'll get started. Thank you, everyone, for joining us today for the public session on the Customer Standing Committee Charter Review process. My name is Donna Austin and I am one of the members of the Charter Review Team and what we will do today is take you through the review process and take your feedback or questions at the end.

Next slide please, [Ria]? Elaine could you go through the what is the CSC for us, please?

ELAINE PRUIS: I'm Elaine Pruis. I'm the Registries Stakeholder Group appointed member of the CSC. We have Kal is the other Registries Stakeholder Group appointed member, and then Jay and Byron from the ccNSO.

The mission of the CSC is to ensure continued satisfactory performance of the IANA function for the direct customers of the

---

*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.*

---

naming services, and the primary customers of the naming services are top-level domain registry operators, which is ccTLDs and gTLDs but also include root server operators and other non-root zone functions.

Our mission is accomplished by monitoring the IANA naming function against the agreed service level targets and if there are issues, we go about trying to remedy those areas of concern. Next slide.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks Elaine. The CSC was established as a result of the IANA transition so it was part of the package that went to the NTIA, the U.S. government, and it was one of the requirements of moving forward with the IANA transition.

The CSC Charter requires a review of the charter one year after the first meeting of the CSC, and that first meeting of the CSC was the 6<sup>th</sup> of October, I think, last year.

The reviewer's bit is to be conducted by representatives of the ccNSO and the Registries Stakeholder Group. Martin Boyle and Abdulla Amari are from the ccNSO and they're both in the room with us here, and myself Donna Austin and Keith Drazek are representing the Registries Stakeholder Group as part of the Review Team.

---

Any amendments that we recommend be made to the CSC as a result of this process have to be approved by both the ccNSO and GNSO Councils and there's no requirement that the Board be involved with this.

And the CSC Charter doesn't form a part of the ICANN Bylaws but it's actually referenced in the Bylaws so once the ccNSO and GNSO councils approve any amendments to the charter then that becomes the charter moving forward. Next slide, please?

The purpose of the review and the scope. The purpose of the review is to consider whether the CSC Charter provides an adequate and sound basis for the CSC to perform its responsibilities. The scope of the review is to establish whether the charter enables the CSC to fulfill its roles and responsibilities as envisioned when we developed the CSC during the IANA Transition Working Group.

And when I say "we," Martin and I were part of the design team that developed the parameters of the CSC and the charter – are there any aspects of the charter that are ambiguous or require amendment and are there any additional work items of the CSC that should be captured in the charter. Next slide [Ria]?

So what's known in the scope of this review is we're not looking at the effectiveness of the CSC or the performance of the CSC. There is provision of those but the effectiveness and the

---

performance will be reviewed in 12 months time so the effectiveness will be done as a separate effort and then the performance is done as part of the IANA naming function review. And I'm not 100% clear on what the distinction might be but I don't think it's particularly relevant unless anybody really wants to know.

Given this is the first time that there's been any public discussion about the CSC, one of the things that we agreed is that any issues that we identify as part of this review that are out of scope but we still think are relevant for the proper function of the CSC, we'll bring those to the attention of the ccNSO and the Registries Stakeholder Group.

So the charter itself, when we were looking at the CSC and what its mission should be, there was a lot of discussion about making the CSC the place for all things IANA-related but what we agreed as part of the CWG Working Group is that this should have a really narrow focus in scope and that's what's been captured within the mission and that's what Elaine spoke to earlier.

We've had some conversations with Elise Gerick, who is the VP of IANA. Also I'm not sure what that translates to in the PTI world but it continues in that role on the PTI. Because Elise is moving out of that role, we thought it would be valuable to speak to her so when we had the conversation with her around the mission in

---

particular, she was very [complimentary] that part of the reason the CSC works is because the mission is very narrow and it allows the CSC to focus on a really dedicated scope of works.

And similarly we had a conversation with the CSC and I think the feedback we got from them was similar so that's, I think, the early feedback we've got is that we've got the mission right and the scope being narrow actually [assists] in the work that they do.

The scope of responsibilities. I won't go through this. I think the reason for bringing the charter up is just to make sure that people understand what the document is and what's captured within it.

So scope of responsibilities. That just outlines what they can and can't do, what falls within their remit. And, Martin, if you have anything you want to add at any point in time, let me know.

Next. Scroll up please, [Ria]? Back down a little bit just to the membership. Actually, yes, you've got it, that's fine, sorry.

So membership and composition. There was a lot of discussion around this in CWG. I think at one point in time we had potentially 27 members for the CSC so we've been able to... As we went through the discussions and understood that the CSC

---

was to have a really skinny focus, we were able to pay back that membership.

Some might think it's [inaudible] on but it seems that in the conversations we've had is that the composition is working well and it's at the moment two representatives from the Registries Stakeholder Group—well, not Registries Stakeholder Group but two representatives from registry operators and two representatives from ccTLD registry operators. And they are members and there is one liaison from the IANA functions operative, PTI, and that was originally Elise Gerick and it's recently been handed over to Naela.

Within the membership it's mandatory to have two reps from the registries and two reps from the gTLD registries and two reps from the ccTLD registry operators, and there's provision for an additional TLD rep from .apa and they are an unusual case because they're not considered a ccTLD or a gTLD so that's why that extra provision was put in there.

And then there's the ability for ICANN SOs/ACs to include liaisons and one from each but it's not mandatory. Bart, do we have liaisons from all of the SOs/ACs?

BART BOSWINKEL: Sorry, can you [repeat please]?

---

DONNA AUSTIN: The liaisons from SO/ACs, I don't think there's a liaison from the NRO?

BART BOSWINKEL: No, there isn't. I think they've shown... because they are... say they're not so much interested in the naming function.

DONNA AUSTIN: But we have liaisons from the rest, yes, okay. But that's up to each SO and AC to decide whether they want to appoint a liaison. You look like you have a question, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINS: I'm just checking. Maybe I didn't hear you. Did you say if you do have or have a liaison from the PTI?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, we mentioned that and that the PTI liaison is mandatory so the others are optional but the liaison from the PTI is actually a requirement.

BART BOSWINKEL: For clarity, it's Jeff Bedser who is appointed by SSAC, Mohamed El Bashir who was appointed by ALAC, James Gannon from the

---

GNSO Council so Non-Registry, Naela Sarras, she's now appointed by PTI, Lars-Johan Liman from RSSAC, and Elise Lindeberg from the GAC.

JONATHAN ROBINS: Thank you, Bart. It was just the name of the PTI liaison, thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: So the membership selection process, we spent quite a bit of time on this because we really wanted to make sure that we had the right skillset, particularly on the first CSC that was set up.

We did have a reasonable amount of detail as to what the membership selection process should look like so that's why we've provided quite a bit of detail on that within the charter itself. And I think the feedback we've got so far is that that's been a positive and that's something we should continue within the charter. Next slide? Thanks [Ria]. Next page.

The terms of the CSC. Currently it's a two-year period with a possibility that you can extend for two additional periods?



---

ELAINE PRUIS: Yes, I think for the first membership we decided to stagger two so my appointment is three years and Kal is two just so there'd be some carry over in knowledge into the next group.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Elaine. So that might be something that we need to make sure is reflected within the charter if it isn't already at the moment.

ELAINE PRUIS: Yes. I don't think it's detailed on the charter.

MARTIN BOYLE: I think the charter established a requirement to make sure that terms did not overlap. So, for example, from the ccNSO members, Byron is appointed for three years and Jay for two, and then when you've gotten past that then it is it continues as a two-year rotational thing.

I'm not clear at all, or rather I cannot remember at the moment, whether we said anything about somebody who resigned during the period but I would assume that the replacement would fit into the same recycling slot as was originally identified.

So whether we really need to pick out specifically the how do you get the non-overlap, it doesn't seem to me to be relevant

---

any longer now that the organization's working, unless everybody resigns on block. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yes, that's going to be a problem. Thanks Martin. Included in the terms is a requirement that each CSC appointee must attend a minimum of nine meetings in a one-year period and not be absent for more than two consecutive meetings. I don't know whether that's been a problem for the CSC at all? Okay.

Recall of members. We do have a provision within the charter to address that the appointing organizations can recall members and what the replacement process would look like.

Meetings. There's a requirement in the charter that the CSC shall meet at least once every month via teleconference and from the conversation we've had with the CSC so far, that regularity of the meetings has been very helpful, particularly as in the first 12 months of the CSC they're establishing operating procedures and developing the relationships and also interaction with the PTI liaison. So I think that's worked well and likely to continue but maybe further down the track it might be something that doesn't need to be done on such a regular basis.

The charter currently requires the CSC to provide regular updates no less than three times a year to the direct customers

---

and the feedback we've got from the CSC is that if we can make that no less than two or at least two.

And when we set up the CSC, there was no travel funding attached to any CSC member so what the CSC has recognized is that there might be times when all CSC members can't attend an ICANN meeting and those updates wouldn't be provided so this kind of mitigates the risk that they're not going to meet the charter requirement.

Record of proceedings: I think is pretty standard there and I assume everything is being made public within five business days. The Secretariat is—we said that it had to be provided by the IANA functions operator.

BART BOSWINKEL: We have policy support so that needs to be updated. I think that's in your document as well.

ELAINE PRUISE: Suggestions from the CSC membership review work was that that should be updated to indicate its support should come from ICANN rather than PTI.

---

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, and I should note that when we developed this charter we had reference to the IANA functions operator and as a global replace we'll have to change that to PTI now that that's the formal naming of it.

ELAINE PRUIS: That was another one of the suggestions but then it was brought to our attention that PTI may not always be the contracted party. It could be fulfilled by someone else so we leave it as the IANA functions.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay. That's good feedback. So to the review requirements in the charter, this review that we've kicked off now is the first one and any time thereafter, the charter can be reviewed at the request of the CSC itself, the ccNSO or the GNSO. We only envisioned one review of the charter initially but it's up to the other bodies after we complete this one to determine whether they need any further reviews.

The effectiveness of the CSC will initially be reviewed two years after the first meeting and that method of review will be determined by the ccNSO and GNSO.

---

So this is a question, there's also a requirement under the IANA Functions Review at the same time but that's a performance related one so—

BART BOSWINKEL: If you would look at the IFR, the initial one, there is a relation with—or part of the first IFR will be a review of the oversight mechanism provided by the CSC with respect to the PTI. And that's at the same time, more or less at the same time so –

DONNA AUSTIN: Yes, so I think it might be worthwhile. I was thinking about how we make sure there's no duplication of effort in that and remove any ambiguity. I would hate to think that the CSC is undergoing an effectiveness review by one body and a performance review by another body at the same time. I don't think that makes sense.

BART BOSWINKEL: And maybe there is some room for maneuvering there as well if you look at the terms included in the charter, because the effectiveness will be done every three years once you've done this one, I've just got the charter in front of me. So you've got the effectiveness will initially be reviewed two years after the first

---

meeting of the CSC, so that's next year, and then every three years thereafter.

So that is something if you look at the schedule and everything else, you could also link it or build in the same type of mechanism as in the say the way the charter will be reviewed. There is initial review and then whenever needed either initiated by the CSC itself, ccNSO or GNSO. But that needs to be matched with the language in the Bylaws.

MARTIN BOYLE:

Yes, I think Bart's last words were particularly important. It's actually what it says in the Bylaws and the IANA Functions Process Review is something very clearly mentioned in the Bylaws.

It is a process that looks at how the sum total is working whereas we actually called for this particular review so this happens to be accidentally for this first time coincidental with the IANA functions review.

One would hope that the system could perhaps be brought a little bit more together, like you all have difficulties in understanding the difference between effectiveness and performance, but I think we have to think very carefully about

---

exactly what we can say is part of this review about any particular of the second of those reviews. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yes, thanks Martin. I agree. I think we have to find a way to address this, whether it's a change to the charter itself or whether it's information that we feedback to the ccNSO and GNSO and say, "We really think this is something that you need to address to make sure that there is no duplication. It just seems ridiculous."

The proposed remedial action procedures. This was included in the charter as a kind of suggestion about how the CSC could work to resolve or escalate problems that weren't being resolved from their perspective in managing the performance of IANA. And the intent was that at some point in time the CSC itself would develop its own procedures and they would be captured within the charter and I think that's work that's underway, Elaine?

ELAINE PRUIS:

Yes.

---

ALLAN: This is Allan [inaudible] for the record. I just want to ask you about your final remark which is that these would be captured in the charter. Is it your interpretation of the charter that the remedial action procedures would continue to be part of the charter?

DONNA AUSTIN: That's a good question, Allan. I guess we can as part of this review decide whether—I don't remember what the original intent was but if you think there's a reason not to include them but they would still have to be referenced somewhere, I think. But that's something we can sort out as part of this review.

ALLAN: I would point out that currently the charter contains what are called an illustrative set of procedures which are to be approved by PTI and the CSC, and it flows from that the changes to them would also require that approval. But if they were contained in the charter then it would require an amendment process to the charter to change their [RAPs] so I just would kind of point out that dynamic. Thanks.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks Allan. Elaine did you want –



---

ELAIN PRUIS: I just wanted to say along with Allan’s comment that we would probably prefer to reference them for those reasons and same with the proposed method for SLE changes. It would be better to reference them rather than include them in the charter.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, thanks.

BILL JURIS: I wonder if I might offer a suggestion from totally outside the group. Maybe what you want to say is recommendations after the review may be included in the charter or not depending on what the Review Committee determines is appropriate.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Bill. So that’s it? Okay, thanks. So we can go back to the presentation. Welcome, Elise.

I’ve taken you through part of the different sections of the charter so I guess this is an opportunity if you have any questions or suggestions to any of those sections, we’d be happy to hear them now or have some discussion around it.

---

ELAINE PRUIS: I just wanted to point out that the CSC membership and liaisons have done a charter review and provided suggestions to the Charter Review Team for consideration so we won't go through those today, but just for the record we have provided some recommendations for changes.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Elaine. No questions so can we just go to the last slide please, [Ria]? So this is just to wrap up what we've heard so far and I've spoken to some of it.

So based and bearing in mind that we've only had a conversation with Elise Gerick and the CSC so far, but the narrow scope of the CSC contained in the charter shouldn't be expanded. The selection criteria and process for members and liaisons should be maintained. The composition of the CSC is a success. The distinction between the members and liaisons doesn't constrain input to discussions.

When we went through the process of identifying the membership, there was quite a bit of discussion about the difference between the members and liaisons but it seems that we might have managed to get the right balance in the charter because it's not hindering any input from the CSC as a whole.

---

Monthly meetings should be maintained, particularly at this point as the CSC still has some operational things that they're working through.

Regular updates to be changed from—and these are the updates that are required to be provided to the direct customers and that be changed from no less than three times a year to at least twice a year.

And then, Elaine, you might want to speak to this a little bit but the charter makes provision for the CSC or PTI to request a review or change to the service level targets.

In addition, any change to an SLE would also require a change to the IANA naming function contract to be agreed by the PTI and ICANN, to the CSC in the process of developing an SLE change procedure to be referenced in the charter for consideration as part of this review. Elaine, I don't know if you have anything you want to say on that?

ELAINE PRUIS: I have nothing to add there. You've covered it. Thank you.

DONNA AUSTIN: And this is our timetable so we intend to have a consultation with Jonathan Robinson and Lise Fuhr who are part of the PTI

---

Board—Jonathan? Yes, so we'll have that conversation within this week.

And then reports on findings and suggested changes, we hope to have a report available by the end of this year or in the first quarter next year with the finalization during March and April.

So I think we're on a good path. I don't think this is going to be a huge effort. I think there's some minor tweaks and clarifications but I think we're in pretty good shape to make that timetable.

That's all I have in terms of presentations so if there's any—yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL:

The reason for this, and that's probably the determining factor, is that if there is a change of the CSC Charter, it needs to be adopted by the ccNSO and GNSO councils so the target is ICANN61.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks Bart. Any questions from our remote participants, [Ria]?

[RIA]:

No questions.

---

ELISE LINDEBERG: Thank you. Thanks, everybody, for coming. Please add it to your input. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**