
ABU DHABI – Customer Standing Committee Wrap-up Meeting
Thursday, November 2, 2017 – 12:15 to 13:15 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It is Thursday, November 2, 2017, in Capital Suite 1 for the Customer Standing Committee Wrap-Up meeting, 12:15 to 13:15.

BYRON HOLLAND: We'll give everybody another moment or two to wolf back their lunch, and then we'll get started.

All right, well, now that most of lunch has been consumed, let's get going. This end-of-week meeting was really put in the agenda so that we could do a bit of a stocktaking of what has transpired over the course of the week and any feedback or input we got from respective communities. To that extent, it's somewhat informal in terms of agenda because it's mostly about: what have heard, what did we learn, is there any feedback or input from us, and then also where are with some of the outstanding work items? So informal agenda, more of a discussion in terms of what we learned over the course of the week, if that's okay with everybody.

There are a few standing items on the docket for us though in terms of RAP and SLEs, both the generic process change and 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.

few specific items that we're working on right now. So I wonder if I could ask my colleague Jay just to give us an update on the SLEs because I know there's been some input from Sam Eisner, but it's fairly hot off the press. So just where are we with that?

JAY DALEY:

If you recall, we discussed a differential consultation process for different types of changes. We had within that a fairly clear set of rules that would enable a choice to be made about which process to follow.

The advice from Sam is that what we have to consider is an external threshold, not an internal threshold, which I'm still processing this but I believe relates to consultation as in we need to ask others about this rather than necessarily make our own rules about that. I'm still processing that, and so when I think anyone else has any idea about it or I'm forced to come up with some idea about it, then we'll have to raise but hopefully for the next meeting.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Elise?

ELISE LINDEBERG: I just have a question. When the advice from Sam was for external consultation or how to get that advice, isn't that already something that's built in that the CSC is supposed to go to the GNSO or the ccNSO for advice on things? Is this independent of that or does it replace that or is that consistent with getting external advice? I just thought that was part of the charter already.

JAY DALEY: What Sam has written that the [inaudible] paraphrased, one of the keys is the definition of what the consultation is and what the appropriate threshold for support would be. And there are still not details of that in here. So I'm still trying to understand that, which I take as being more about the threshold of external impact perhaps or the threshold of external interest in it or something. As in our view that it was down to whether or not it was a new thing being introduced as opposed to a threshold being changed internally or something like that isn't sufficient according to Sam.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think what is wise [inaudible] not trying to understand at this meeting. I think what I've seen, her comments should be read in the context of her earlier document to the CSC during the call, I believe it was mid-October. I think that's when she started to

raise the concept of thresholds. And the threshold's what she's mentioning in saying comment on your document and Kal's document should be read in that context. So probably it's a good thing to combine the two and have a review and discussion at the upcoming call.

JAY DALEY: Okay, to you think we could arrange a telephone conference call with Kal and I, if he's in a part of the world where they have telephones, and Sam to discuss this further?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't mind trying maybe. This is me, but I'll send an e-mail to the three of you, Sam and include Trang as well.

JAY DALEY: Thanks. It doesn't need to be recorded or anything [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, no. Just to go through what's the best approach to understand the concept in preparation of the call on I think it's the 15 of November.

JAY DALEY: Okay, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'll try it. I can't guarantee anything. I'll do it as soon as I get home.

JAY DALEY: Thank you, [Paul].

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. Alan?

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Thank, Byron. Maybe I could just pare it back where I think we are because I'm a little confused and maybe others are. We have some specific SOE changes, which were reviewed with the community. And there will be a specific process to bring those changes forward. So that's one item.

And then there's a second track, which is to develop generic procedures for changes which could include, for example, [insubstantive] future SLE changes as well as, for example, new items in that. So in other words, things that are not minor.

So at least in my mind, I saw those as two parallel and related but still two parallel tracks.

JAY DALEY: I think the better way to put it is that we don't understand the current change process because the current change process has a lightweight path in it. So before we embark on any change process, we need to understand the current one and see whether or not we can then take even the specific changes that are currently discussed and some or all of those through the lightweight process or not.

So it's not a parallel thing. It's actually a serial thing. Understand this now, and then move on to the next bit.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Actually, could I just follow up? Certainly in our submission to the review panel, we saw the avenue of the review panel's report as a way to codify the generic change process. So that was a way of seeking the community's approval for that, so that's why I have those two separated.

BYRON HOLLAND: Elise?

ELISE LINDEBERG: I just wanted to ask Jay as a follow-on, so the lightweight process, is that what Sam's talking about? That we have to find

some sort of outside consultation to define what's acceptable in the lightweight process? Is that how you're representing it?

JAY DALEY: The first half is true. Yes, what she's talking about is the lightweight process. The second bit about the outside consultation is my interpretation of what she said, and I'm not sure that's correct at all. So that's why I need to have an understanding with her about that.

ELISE LINDEBERG: Thanks for the clarification.

BYRON HOLLAND: So on this particular issue, it's very early days in terms of understanding the feedback that Sam has put forward since we just got it in the last 48 hours or so, 72 maybe. So in terms of an action item though, we will set up that call and start to unpack that in more detail and start to process whether it's a parallel track item or a lightweight versus heavyweight process. If we could, Bart if we can, try to get that happening so that we can feed into the November 15 meeting, that would be ideal. Kal?

KAL FEHER: I just wanted to comment that we've socialized those SLE changes this week and potentially, depending on the outcome of what we learn from Sam, we may have fallen short of whatever threshold we decide we need. So we might need to go back to our communities. So watch this space, I suppose.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah, that's probably a fair point. Yeah, go ahead.

JAY DALEY: I think the default position is that we would have to formally go back to our communities with those, and they would have to have some form of formal consultation process outwards from that. So what we're looking at is whether any of those can be brought into a more lightweight process and whether we've met the threshold for doing the lightweight process for them. So that's why we're trying to hold it off.

BYRON HOLLAND: Trang?

TRANG NGUYEN: Thanks, Byron. Just a note on timing. I know Sam is going to be on vacation next week. This week she's obviously not in Abu Dhabi. She's back in Los Angeles, but I know that she is

supporting the meeting meaning she is working Abu Dhabi hours. I don't know if it's feasible, Kal and Jay, if you have any time at all today, maybe we could try to get a quick call together with Sam.

BYRON HOLLAND: Maybe we'll take that offline in terms of coordinating a call itself.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: My suggestion is do it [the 13th or 14th] so you have the time to go back to the two documents, or you have to do it today. One of the two so we get prepared, otherwise we keep on going in circles. You've got a lot of stuff on your plate today as well.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, so we'll take that. You guys can take that offline and work out the time.

The other standing item is remedial action procedures, just in terms of any progress made on that. I think right now, Bart to Allan, did you have any comment on that?

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: We are still awaiting comments as well to make public, so to get back to you. So we're awaiting that [inaudible] and then we'll

get back. Either it's going to be for the 15th of this month or the next month.

BYRON HOLLAND: Trang?

TRANG NGUYEN: Thanks, Byron. Yes, Sam [may] take a quick look at the document that Allan forwarded and I had taken a look at it as well. I was engaged earlier in the process on that but was on a couple of vacations and got disconnected from that a little bit. So I've just taken a new look at the proposed RAPs and wanted to have some internal conversations and discussions with Sam as well as with Naela and [inaudible]. We're hopeful that we can do that as soon as we get back to Los Angeles after the ICANN 60 meeting, and then we'll collectively provide a response back to Allan and the rest of the team that's working on that document.

BYRON HOLLAND: So is that something we can do for would it be the 13th? Is that a Monday? I think that's Monday, November 13. Is that something between you and Sam and company can provide us feedback at that point that could lead into the November 15th meeting, or is that too tight?

TRANG NGUYEN: As I mentioned, Sam is going to be on vacation next week, so our first day....

BYRON HOLLAND: That's why I said next Monday could be the following Monday.

TRANG NGUYEN: We can try to have the internal conversations and be ready for an update to the CSC on the 15th.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, so unless there's a mitigating comment over here for the November 15 meeting, we'll be in a position to have at least an update and early thoughts on the RAP from you and Sam. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: For the discussion on the 15th of December.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, so those are, well, two but in a sense three separate topics that are outstanding items right now. The other thing I wanted to do is just get a sense of what we've presented and what we heard this week, particularly from the GNSO and ccNSO, but also there was a scheduled meeting with the Board that I think all the

members were at, at least, and some of the liaisons. But maybe we could just exchange from the ccNSO and GNSO how our respective meetings went. Jay, since you did the lion's share of the ccNSO meeting, do you want to kick it off?

JAY DALEY:

The ccNSO meeting really had very little to it. They listened to us, and they trust the two of us and were happy with that. We have only one regular issue that is brought up to us, which is DNSSEC key algorithms, which we explain is not within our terms for us to be dealing with but it's something that we passed on and passed on before. I believe then that Kim went on and gave a presentation about that, which I had to leave for so I missed that.

The other thing we did was berate the audience about nonparticipation in the survey and threaten them for the next time around. So if that doesn't work, I'm going to have to be nice to them and I really don't want to do that.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Because that will really shock them out of their slumber.

We went through the full 16-page deck, so they got the full version of the deck. Kal or Elaine?

KAL FEHER: The presentation to the Registry Stakeholder Group was largely similar, although I don't think I berated them quite as much as you did. I did tell them they should all be embarrassed about the 5% response rate.

Their sentiments were similar. They're happy with us. They trust us. There is no outstanding issue with IANA performance from the Registry Stakeholder Group, although I would note that morning was probably the first time they had heard Kim speak about the upcoming API. So perhaps watch this space. I know that there are registries that will probably be interested in that as they have an opportunity to think through implications of it. For now though, taking the opportunity to take a break from the GDPR fights and their various other fights, so it was pretty boring.

BYRON HOLLAND: Elise and then Jay?

ELISE LINDEBERG: Just wanted to ask a question about the customer satisfaction survey because it came up, obviously, in both. Is there anyone in this room that gets the survey that actually is one of the people who made a request during the year? Because we made some

changes to the survey from last year based on the feedback from the CSC. So I don't know if it's noticeable or if it gave you the opportunity to make not just binary decisions but to give us some more granular feedback in the freeform sections.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm not one of the five. It's a shared mailbox, and I normally leave those. I send the requests, but I don't respond to them typically. I know who to speak to and embarrass. I'll do it on company e-mail.

ELISE LINDEBERG: Just a follow up. I was just trying to get feedback on the survey format itself and if it might have met the requests that the CSC had discussed with us when we decided to make some changes based on the input. Since you're the only one in the room that got it, you're the "stuckee" I guess.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Unfortunately, I haven't looked at it. I'm sorry. I do leave those normally for the other people.

ELISE LINDEBERG: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I will certainly do that, yeah.

JAY DALEY: Taking advantage of Martin being in the room, when people from the ccNSO come to approach me about things, they're under the expectation that because the Customer Standing Committee has the word "customer" in it that, as well as looking at the SLA, our job is to have customer input into the technical development plans of IANA, of PTI, and the technological roadmap in that way.

I've explained that's not within the scope of things, and so they are wondering where that should take place and how that should take place. My answer is always go and talk directly to Kim, and that's something that they feel they have done and do do but I think would like more formalized. So whether that's something for us or whether that's something external, I don't know, but I just make clear that expectation.

ELISE LINDEBERG: I'm glad you brought that up because one of the things in formulating our operating plan and budget is to try and get feedback. This year, it was the first time we, at the last ICANN meeting at the ccNSO, one of the things we asked for in our presentation was for people to tell us if there were things that

they thought we should consider for development activities for FY19 because we were then taking input.

We did it at the ccNSO. We did it at, I think, a GNSO meeting. We reached out informally to people. It will have a more formal consultation years coming up, but this is the first time we tried it. But we did get input from – we reached out to the RIRs also and the IETF to try and get information.

So I think in leading up to the timeframe for the budget planning process which is going to be about June every year, we'll be reaching out to the community. So that's one way we'll reach out. But the other way I think it's better – and I'll speak to Kim and Naela about it – but it's better not to send things to one individual because it gets stuck and if they're on vacation or whatever else.

So we should maybe set up an inbox that we could announce to the communities if they have ideas or projects that they'd like us to take under consideration. That way, it can be more broadly distributed internally and we can prioritize instead of having them funneled just to one individual.

JAY DALEY:

The people who are coming to me are not generally talking about more strategic things. It's much more operational. It's

much more, for example, the choice of named individuals rather than roles for the new system. There are several people who want to talk about that and have views about that as an architectural decision. So it's that sort of level. The commenting on the plan and the operating plan, I think, is a slightly higher level for those people.

ELISE LINDEBERG:

Yeah, so things like the authorization model as an example, the presentation Kim gave to the Registry Stakeholders was much more detailed than what went to the ccNSO. We've talked about the fact that we're going to put out a more detailed design paper and then set up some way to provide feedback and input so we can understand if we're going down the right track or not because that is a concern.

We think answers some of the things we've been asked to do, but we'd like to get feedback before we go too far down the path and investing in the development. So if that's the kind of thing for that, we should have a better process. But right now, Kim is the person to get them on a one-by-one basis, but it doesn't give us a broader picture of what's being suggested.

JAY DALEY: I think the expectation they have is that rather than be done on a document basis and a one-by-one basis or a project basis, that there's almost like a standing committee of people [inaudible] standing process around that, that can be used for those things. But if that's unreasonable for them all....

ELISE LINDEBERG: No, I think that's reasonable, and in any development plan there should be that feedback loop. So we'll look into this and figure out a way to make it more obvious as part of the process.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just an observation. I don't know what the ccNSO has, but the Registry Stakeholder Group has a subgroup for tech operations. If there is a similar body, maybe that's the sort of thing that Kim could engage with on a more – no? Maybe not? Yeah, that wouldn't be the only location, but I think it would be an excellent way of getting immediate practical feedback.

BYRON HOLLAND: Just since I'm not familiar with that at all and my own edification, could you elaborate a little bit just on what that subgroup or working group is?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, so I'm only speaking regarding the [Gs]. It's a sub technical group that discusses technical operations, and typically our focus is actually on dealing with registrars and their concerns. So that's the normal focus. It's between those two agencies, but when it comes to IANA it hasn't come up as a topic. So this is not something they normally considered because it has just never been considered an option, I suppose. It's full of technical and operational focused people.

BYRON HOLLAND: Sure. Jay?

JAY DALEY: The ccNSO has a tech working group, but its primary role is determining the agenda for the Tech Day that takes place. Very occasionally do any other business items come up, but it's got open membership and so it could be used for this process quite well.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just to go back, they used to have the IANA working group and the group is the successor of the IANA working group. So you can go back and have a look at the former working group. That's where you will find it. That was the first working group ever created by the ccNSO.

BYRON HOLLAND: Wow, now we're dredging into the mists of time. Be careful what you wish for, right? So that, I think, is clearly not in the remit of the CSC. However, as the Customer Standing Committee, there may be an opportunity for us to at least be a facilitation role into our communities to help our community find a path to you in a more logical, constructive way than just, as you say, one-on-one interventions, which may or may not find their way into your development path or product path.

In terms of an outcome from that, maybe that's a takeaway for us in the ccNSO to see if there's a way that we can help facilitate a more constructive path to help you get any feedback you need and allow the outlet for ccNSO members at least, which randomly come to us and we're not the venue for it. But there's clearly a desire for something more than we have right now on that front. Elise?

ELISE LINDEBERG: I was just thinking of it in a normal product management kind of thing. You have a phase where it's always requirements gathering, and the requirements are from all various groups versus just focused on individuals. That's a really important part of trying to get to the end game of whatever you deliver so that

you deliver something that somebody really wants versus something you think they want.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So at the expense of probably – this is an idea that’s going on inside the staff right now, and I’m not making any commitments right now for us even. As the person that runs the operational group, one of the tough things I have with customer feedback is we do the annual survey and then I might hear about a problem in the annual survey that happened nine or ten months ago. It’s not immediate and I can’t address issues right away. So one of the things we’re talking about is doing an after-ticket survey. So at the end of closing your ticket, you receive an opportunity to give immediate feedback. I’m hoping as we implement some of these ideas, maybe that’s where some of these frustrations or ideas come through.

For example, if we hide the names behind the [role] accounts. Right now when we don’t have a name behind the [role] account, we actually go back and ask what’s the name behind this [role] account. If you have input to us about why are you asking or what are you doing with the information when we give it to you, that’s the time to give us that input.

I just wanted to share with the CSC that it's something that we'd like. We need more customer interactions throughout the year, and that's one of the ideas we have.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Just a note from personal experience. Be very careful if you go that route because I'm drenched in various types of requests for feedback. Even if I go to the grocery store, there's a feedback form: "Were your bananas okay?" Make sure it's not too much. Make sure it's very low-key and optional and everything. But I do understand your need for more interaction. Just make sure you find the balance.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: On that front, just a personal anecdote. We at Cira have struggled with feedback from our primary customer base, registrars. And we did annual surveys and got very low participation. The surveys tended to be, overall, survey results very, very high with the rare exception very, very low and nothing in between. But low number of respondents so the data was interesting but not particularly indicative of the broader environment.

So we went to that and went to a per-ticket, much shorter survey. And I agree with you. We had the long detailed survey

once a year, and you get the recency effect. So the problem with that kind of survey is people remember the last thing that happened as opposed to the sweep of the year, which is really what the survey is trying to unpack but it often won't do that.

So we went to instead of a 30-40 question annual to a 5 question straightforward per-ticket survey. We get a lot more information, not necessarily as deep. So you get that tradeoff, but we also allow freeform comments. So if somebody wants to go deep, they can. I would say it has been better, but it's still early days for us. We implemented it last year, so we don't even have a year's worth of data, but we're doing exactly what you just suggested.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's good. And a follow-up question. Do you have any sense for a participation rate with the after-ticket survey?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Off the top of my head, no. I have to admit I don't cover it in detail, this particular issue, but I could certainly follow up with you and provide the detail that we've received thus far.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, so the other thing I wanted to do – I mean, I think we’ve shared what we’ve heard from our respective communities, unless there’s anything else? Allan?

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Actually, apropos to the question of issues that are not in the remit of the CSC but if we don’t move it along it’s not going to get necessarily looked at is this issue of the two reviews that are to start next year on the same issue. I would look at this casually. One is on the CSC performance actually, because otherwise we’ll have Martin and someone else sitting in on the meetings all next year, and they’ll all be doing the same thing side-by-side.

So one is on performance. It’s hardcoded into the ICANN Bylaws as being part of the IFR review. The other comes from the naming contract, and it’s of CSC effectiveness but it’s method is to be determined by the ccNSO and the GNSO. So just trying to move this along a possible way out of the duplication of the reviews is for the ccNSO and the GNSO to agree that they would be satisfied with the IFR review satisfying that requirement.

So maybe someone could take on not responsibility but just look into that and make sure that we don’t end up next October not having answered this question. I know that Bart’s not

looking for anything to do, but I'm looking at him anyway. So Bart or Trang, I don't know, if someone could own that just to try and figure that out. I just thought I would make that comment. Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND: The duplication of effort on a very similar set of topics is something we should be aware of, although not necessarily our remit. Given I'm the Vice Chair of the ccNSO, let me flag it and reinforce it to the Chair of the ccNSO and see what I can do to get her to be a catalyst on this topic. Elaine?

ELAINE PRUIS: Thank you. I was in the PTI board member meeting the other day, and this issue was discussed. So we probably want to make sure that they're not trying to tackle this from a different way or coming up with a different solution. Just make sure that we're solving the problem in parallel.

BYRON HOLLAND: Right. So there's only ideally one vector into this not several uncoordinated ones. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: I think you're referring to the same one as I say that the CSC review team was having that conversation with Jonathan and Lisa. So the CSC review team is aware of this, very aware of this. So maybe wait for further action until they come back with you with a draft report to discuss and review it again what the next steps are. Because I think that's – yeah, go ahead, Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks. Yes, we had a discussion. In fact, we've had a couple of discussions at various stages about this, so we are acutely aware of the risk for over-reviewing. And actually quite difficult to identify the difference between the two reviews that are due next year apart from the fact that one of them is very, very much bigger activity. It's looking at the whole of the accountability processes that were introduced as part of the IANA functions transition.

But the problem we've identified is that specifically in Section 17.3 of the ICANN Bylaws is the reference to your own review. It specifically addressed the CSC. So we're going to have to try and think about how we might be able to address that in such a way that you then can try and make one perhaps considered as part of the other.

This does have a longer term consequence in that every 15 years, subsequently you would end up with two reviews

happening simultaneously. But for the intervening years, you're almost at a point where you'll be doing a review every year for three years, and that I think is really unacceptable.

So I do think we need to address it. It's just the risk is that might need to go through a bylaw change, and that in its own right is not the easiest thing to do.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, thank you. I'm perfectly willing to kick that problem 15 years down the road and let some whole other group worry about that one.

MARTIN BOYLE: [But in the meantime, we will have one every two years.]

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah, okay. Well, for my part, I will flag it with the Chair of the ccNSO.

MARTIN BOYLE: So my suggestion is wait until December because it will be documented one way or the other.

BYRON HOLLAND: In the charter review. Okay. Is there anything else that we heard or feedback that we took that would be appropriate or relevant to share here? Any other further insights? Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: More or less, it's going back to the way I look at what you're doing right now is scheduling, so for the next two meetings as well. Martin, do you want to share the initial thinking about the draft report and getting feedback from the CSC, or do you want me to list it say the schedule you agreed upon to start interacting with the CSC itself?

MARTIN BOYLE: Yeah, I'm quite happy to do that, but I don't want to go into this excessive detail but rather the headline is that in I think it's a week or so time, when in fact Bart has already prepared us with a summary of everything we've heard over the last week.

But then we're going to have a call in a week or so time to discuss an overall shape of the report. I think that's becoming reasonably clear to us. And to start playing around with the possible amendment to the charter. The intention then is that we would have something to share with CSC and other significant parties in this to talk through exactly whether we are meeting the concerns that we have heard in those documents.

So we are acutely aware of an objective to try and get this up in front of the councils for ICANN 61, but it will have to go through a consultation period and therefore we do need to produce some sort of document for consultation before the new year or just into the new year. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Effectively] if feasible and if the CSC review charter team will make it, they would like to have a [hours] exchange of views around your 15 December meeting to discuss, I would say, the outline and what is available and whether that meets the expectations on both sides.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, we'll try to work that into the schedule.

Can I just ask just a purely practical question? Do you have your calendar up? Is 15 December the week of the IGF?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, it's the week prior? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] [which year]?

BYRON HOLLAND: No, the IGF this year in Geneva.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BYRON HOLLAND: No, IGF. I know not everybody here covers that, but I cover the IGF so I have to be there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [It's the 15th. It's a Friday.]

BYRON HOLLAND: It's a Friday. So my question then for PTI is, can we make sure we have our meeting on the Thursday or the Friday and we don't kick it to the Monday because that following week is the IGF which, certainly from my perspective, makes it much more logistically challenging.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [You're saying before the 15th or after the 15th?]

BYRON HOLLAND: Before, like the 14th.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think that's very reasonable.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BYRON HOLLAND: That's what I'm asking. If for December, we can as CSC have our meeting on Thursday the 14th. Right, just to make sure that we're all good with that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Our goal is usually to get you. So you're good? Yeah, we're good.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just reminding you all that your Thursday the 14th for advanced countries is Friday. So if it was on a Friday, that means Saturday.

So pushing it back a day means I can do [inaudible]. So that's fantastic. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, with that, is there any other business? Naela and then Elaine.

NAELA SARRAS: Just [extreme] heads up. I'm so disappointed to even report this, but this month we'll have two misses of the SLEs, so we'll be at I think around 96%. So 61 out of 63, whatever that adds up to. And it's the same technical checks. We have one operator that supports multiple TLDs that lodged a request for many, many of their TLDs and it caused the requests to be serialized for the technical checks, which pushed them over the threshold. And then the same one with the retest. So I just wanted to give you guys a heads up since you're all here and then renew my interest in changing those technical check thresholds.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, thanks. Elaine?

ELAINE PRUIS: Thank you. I just wanted to follow up on an e-mail that you sent, Bart. There's a list of action items, and Number 2 says, "Based

on notes and input, the CSC individually to annotate the charter to send to the list by 14 November.” I must have been dozing when we discussed that.

BYRON HOLLAND: So you’re okay there?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Any other business? Okay, well, then we’ll call it to a close. Thank you very much, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]