

---

KOBE – Customer Standing Committee (CSC) Public Session  
Monday, March 11, 2019 – 10:30 to 12:00 JST  
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

BYRON HOLAND: ... with the overview, proceeding with the SLA changes and then the second document about how we're actually going to do it with the technical checks, which I thought was very helpful and well done, but perhaps you could walk us through the two documents so we, as a committee, have a real sense of where we are going with this.

NAELA SERRAS: Absolutely. Thanks, Byron. So, after talking internally with staff and kind of consulting on how we would recommend going through this. And, again, based on the timeline that you and Amy just discussed, this is all for after the agreement has been amended and approved by both boards and everything is updated.

So, I think what I heard was that the ask from the February meeting was that we need sort of or kind of a plan – this is for the CSC consumption on how we are going to proceed – and then an actual document outlining how and what the process will look like for what we choose to proceed with.

---

***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.***

---

So, the first document, if we can go through the overview document, thanks, Ria. So, the first document here kind of just again goes back to the process document that we agreed on in the January meeting, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: December.

NAELA SERRAS: Okay, the December meeting. Okay, so if you recall in December the CSC approved a process document that agrees to what the process would look like or if the CSC, PTI or ICANN bring to the table a request to change SLAs, what consultations are requested and what processes have to be fulfilled. So, we tried to go back and be true to the process and say, based on that, what do we need to do?

So, in the overview document we refer to the process we approved, or the CSC approved, in December. We say, to date, we've discussed through the last 20-some meetings we've had, we've discussed several technical checks that the CSC has flagged – several SLA changes, sorry. Technical checks being one, IDN tables or the LGRs, as flagged by the CSC as needs to become an SLA or something that's tracked, and then the ccTLD delegation

---

or transfer processes and how much time is spent there on the staff side.

So, then we started thinking about how would we actually go about these changes in terms do we tackle them all at once, once we have all the approvals in place in terms of the IANA Naming Function Contract and the approved process. So, or do we take them one of the time. So, then if you look back at the process, we've defined four change types that could be requested as an SLA change.

You have introducing a new SLA altogether, removing an SLA if it's no longer relevant, changing an SLA item definition or target and then changing the threshold itself.

When you look at the process and you study the requirements for each one of those change requests, against what consultations are required by the CSC to do with the community, you'll see that categories one, two and three require full consultations, including public comments, which comes with a built-in minimum time that you have to meet for public comment. The fourth category is the changing in threshold only which does not require a full-on public comment, but it does need notifications to the community.

So, based on that – and if you can scroll down to the next one – we say that based on this and the changes that are being

---

considered, and again technical checks, LGR tables and the ccTLD delegations or transfers. This table here sort of lays out what state we are in with each one of those and what would be required against the consultations.

So, you will see that technical checks is a category and change threshold only, which is that number four. In terms of consultations, the Phase 1 as is required by the process, we are nearly there, or we actually marked it as complete. It's something that we've talked about over many meetings. Some stuff is missing there.

Phase 2 of the change process is to, again, is for the process to begin which is documenting what the change is. That's the second document that will go through. And then community consultations is where we need notifications to the community. And then the same thing we take for the IDN tables and the ccTLD creation or transfer. You'll see that the second two need the full-on consultations.

As such, when we looked at this table, we said we're recommending that the CSC take these in sequence. So, take the technical check one first because that seems the most straightforward one, and it's the most ready to proceed, then the LGR tables and then continue to talk during that time on the ccTLD delegations and transfers.

---

The reason behind this, another reason is, if you will, since it's a new process and it took us a long time to get to this point, and then the IANA Naming Function Contract to remove the SLAs and to then build the process by which we can request amendment to all SLAs, we feel that it might be prudent to do them cautiously, one at a time, so that we can exercise different aspects of the process, and maybe learn from the first one, etc.

So, that's the overview document. I want to stop here before we go into the second document which is actually Phase 1 which says once you agree on one, where do you go there, and what do you have to document against the process. So, I'll stop and see if anyone has a question or anything.

BYRON HOLAND:

Yeah, and I think it's probably worthwhile to think of these as two separate but related sets of documents. One is the how for the bigger picture, how, and then our second document is really the what are we actually going to do to affect this change.

NAELA SERRAS:

Right, exactly.

---

BYRON HOLLAND: And maybe there is an opportunity right here to have the discussion around the last point Naela made in terms of the sequencing and how we want to break these up, or not, whether we want to take PTI's recommendation or Naela's recommendation to do them one at a time or bundle them in any way.

So, I'll throw it open to the floor if there is any feedback on that. We have had a fair amount of discussion around the IDN tables. There is still work to be done, probably, there. Technical checks, arguably, are the most straightforward and we could get done the most expediently, but any feedback from the members or liaisons?

BRETT CARR: And I have one question/comment if you can—

BYRON HOLLAND: Brett, could you speak up a little bit, you are very faint for us?

BRETT CARR: I have a question/comment about the document. Could somebody scroll to the first page for me? Thank you. So, in those four categories, I was wondering if you had considered, or if you decided that it wasn't worth it, but it seems to be an obvious

---

possible category missing there [inaudible] definition but not the target threshold. Do we consider that if we change the definition, we would definitely change the targeted thresholds as well?

BYRON HOLLAND: That's a good question, Brett. Naela, did you have any thoughts on that?

NAELA SARRAS: Yes, it seems like what Brett is saying is that it's a category 3. A change in SLA definition, we'd need to change that to change SLA definition and/or target threshold, right? No.

AMY CREAMER: I think to save the SLA definition you'd have to reset the target too.

NAELA SERRAS: That's right, yeah. So, Brett, I think what – Amy, you should chime in and see how you understand Brett's comment.

AMY CREAMER: When we were developing these documents my understanding of changing the SLA definition is that you're changing something fundamental, but it's still sort of the same representation of the

---

same service, but if you were changing something fundamental to that, that logically you would need to reset the target and threshold or at least re-discuss it.

BRETT CARR:

I agree and that was my thought process as well. I just wondered whether that had been thought through. So, do I take from that if the definition is changed, and it's a wording change, but it doesn't have a high impact, that then it wouldn't fall into the process at all then?

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks, Brett. I see you Bart, and then Alan I'm just going to make a comment to start with. I think you raise a good point from an absolute perspective. I think from a practical perspective, if you're making a fundamental change to the definition of an item, even if the threshold is not being changed, due to the nature of making a fundamental definition change, you are probably at least going to have to reaffirm it's the same target or threshold, or there's a change to the target and threshold. The wording here might not be crisp enough to capture that, perhaps, but I think almost by definition, if you're changing the definition you have to either reaffirm the targets or make a change to the targets, which I think that this captures that, but maybe it could be a little more crispy defined.



AMY CREAMER: One thing I will point out about the process is it's very clear that it's up to the CSC and PTI to determine which of these categories the request falls into, so I think that allows you to have this discussion and decide if it's 3 or 4 without having to excessively write lots of definition and an extensive definition of the process.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Amy. Bart and then Alan. Alan?

[ALAN]: Yes, I just thought that I would point out maybe for Brett's background that there is a bit of history on the four categories and when we started this, say a year-and-a-half ago, we went through the fact that there were four categories with a view to potentially having a different process for each category, but actually and as Naela explained a few minutes ago, in point of fact, the process is exactly the same for 1, 2 and 3. So, practically speaking, it's either Category 4, or other. It's in other, and so it's the same process. So, even though I certainly acknowledge the point you are making, Brett. Thanks.

---

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah, I think that goes back to the notion of a theoretical or an absolute. I hear what you are saying, Brett, but from a practical standpoint I think we have it covered.

BRETT CARR: Okay, fine, no problem.

BYRON HOLLAND: Is that okay with you? Okay, thanks.

BRETT CARR: Yeah, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Nigel has a comment also. I'm fine with the existing wording of Category 3.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Nigel. Sorry, Elaine, go ahead.

ELAINE PRUIS: Thanks. So, I'm scrolling to page 2, the end phase one of the change process for the ccTLD creation and transfer pending. Do you guys have some more details on why that is in progress and what needs to be discussed?

---

BYRON HOLLAND: Go ahead.

NAELA SARRAS: Thanks, Elaine. So, yes, I think that we took a lot of time during the February meeting discussing. This is essentially the creation and transfer of ccTLDs, and so that's a fairly complex process and the PTI staff handled it all from beginning to end as opposed to gTLDs where a lot of that work happens in other departments within in ICANN. And so, I think, based on the discussion we've had in February, we need a little bit more discussion on how to change the current thresholds. The current threshold only measures on one thing which is how much time staff is spending on this from beginning to end, and it gives us 60 days to do that.

Throughout the discussions we've had, since CSC really commenced since we started talking, it's obvious that not all ccTLD delegation and transfer requests are equal. Some come a lot more documented than others, and we take a lot of time in the back and forth with the requestors and asking for additional documentation and then reviewing it. So, we discussed in February that perhaps we, as staff, would like to see ourselves perform better and differently on how we process these requests.

---

For example, from the time we ask for documentation and the additional documentation is submitted, how long are we taking to actually process that documentation and realizing whether we need more, or we can actually proceed. From when we establish that we have all the documentation we need and until we write the delegation or transfer report that we submit to the ICANN board, how long is it taking us to do that? So, we feel like there are smaller and more measurable chunks that better measure our performance than a big 60 days, from beginning to end.

And with that, what we're doing internally, regardless of what happens here, is improving our documentation to better explain to the customer whatever it is, or to the customer whatever it is that they need to expect when they submit to us, and what they can expect in the process once they've submitted it. So, we'd like to come out of this, if possible, with maybe better measurements. So, take that 60 days, maybe, and break it into two or three measurements that are more meaningful to our performance and to the customer. And I think that we just need a little more discussion on what those measurements are. That's why it's still in progress. And I think those in the CSC that are CC-related customers are probably a lot more aware than I am of the sensitivities that are there. There is quite a bit going on there within the CC world.

---

**ELAINE PRUIS:** Okay. Thanks. So, the under discussion and more community input, are those PTI action items? Is it something that we should have on our agenda for next month, who is discussing and who is doing community outreach?

**NAELA SARRAS:** So, that's a really good question. I would say that there are two aspects. There's the internal PTI work that we should probably commit to and come to the CSC with as our proposal and that is improving our documentation and improving our measurement system to measure the different pieces, and then get agreement from the CSC that those are indeed the pieces that they'd like us to see to begin measuring and reporting on. So, I think maybe the April meeting is a little too soon for us to come up with that proposal. Maybe a few more, maybe a couple more meetings, at least, for us to put together a proposal and then present it to the Customer Standing Committee.

**BYRON HOLLAND:** Do you have a follow-up? If I could make a comment on that, though, I think it would be very useful to differentiate between the time the PTI takes, which is where I believe you are going, and the time that the requestor, CC, or manager is taking to provide feedback documentation, or whatever.

---

Because these are so relatively infrequent and everyone is fairly unique in its own way, and without a doubt, having been fairly close to this within the CC world, they're all incredibly different, some very political and some very light on documentation. I think it would be very helpful for you to put together a crisp proposal on when it's in your hands, what exactly are those stages and being able to define those because I think it's going to be very difficult to have—with the benefit of hindsight—a single metric where PTI could be extremely efficient and yet completely blow through the metric as we've seen already, and it's probably not reasonable that PTI be held to account for that.

On the other hand, we want to be able to hold you accountable for what you are actually responsible for. So, I think it would be very helpful if you could put together a proposal that clearly identifies when it's in your hands, what the metrics should be, but I would ask did I hear you say a couple months beyond April, or a couple of months from now?

NAELA SARRAS:

I was thinking a couple months from now. I don't want to be too aggressive. Actually, just thinking of timing, probably a couple of months from now, and maybe for the May meeting with further discussions to be had during the June Marrakesh meeting, maybe even have ... And then I need kind of like a nod from Kim to see if

---

this is something that we can even socialize like, let's say, in Marrakesh when we do ccNSO presentation, that we are thinking and discussing this metric, and if he thinks. And because I'm kind of sort of making this up here. We haven't discussed this.

BYRON HOLLAND: And I think that would be very helpful. One of the things that I was going to add was that it was going to be very helpful to bring this to the ccNSO as tactically something that gets socialized, but also if there's any feedback and input that would be useful to the discussion. So, if we could have a draft for discussion for the May meeting and then we can bring it forward to the ccNSO meeting with Bart, let's make sure we have it on our—

BART BOSWINKEL: It's on the agenda, anyway.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah, that we make sure to flag that this is an item that we absolutely want to bring to the ccNSO meeting. You're good? Okay, let's back it up to the middle column, IDNs, because I will admit, Gaurav and Elaine, you are probably closer to the IDN subject than I am, and if there are any questions or commentary feedback based on what you're seeing here.

---

ELAINE PRUIS: Thanks, Byron. I do recall a document with some proposed SLAs for timing which I was satisfied with. So, I don't have any concerns about this particular one, and I think overall our discussion is about do we start all of these processes at the same time, or do we do them sequentially? And I would like to hear if there is a good reason not to do both technical checks and IDNs as soon as we can.

AMY CREAMER: I don't think we are necessarily saying sequentially, but separately. There was an earlier proposal at the last meeting about putting them together so that they would be getting them in at the same time, but we don't need it, and these are absolutely not dependent on each other.

BYRON HOLLAND: Alan?

[ALAN]: Yeah, I think it's both repeating what Naela said. If they go together as a single, the process is longer for technical checks because they have to get council approval, or the LGRs would have to get council approval and the technical checks wouldn't,



---

so if you bundled them together, they would go at the speed of the slowest one. If you go separately, you can get one done quickly. So, it's a judgment call, but there is that factor.

BYRON HOLLAND: So, based on what I'm hearing—

BRETT CARR: Try and go separate.

BYRON HOLLAND: So, Brett, I'm going to ask for your comment in just one second, and you are very faint. I don't know if OUR av can raise his volume, or Brett if you can speak louder or more close to your microphone, but in the interim, just for clarification, what I sense is that we want them done concurrently or initiated concurrently but separately. Brett, go ahead.

BRETT CARR: You took the words right out of my mouth, Byron. That's exactly what I was going to say. Basically, do them at the same time, but separately.

---

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, thanks Brett. I'm seeing nodding around the table and I think that's the path forward. Any other commentary or questions on the how document before we get to the what document? Anything else? Okay, Naela, let's move to the next document.

NAELA SARRAS: Okay, thank you. So, for the what, the first one will be the technical checks, if you can bring up the request analysis for technical check SLAs. So, again, going back to the SLA admin process that we agreed on, there are two phases. The first one is bringing a request forward by any of the parties, discussing it, and then the second phase is putting down the rationale and the cost benefit, etc. So, this document walks you through that part of it, of the process and closely calls on each step in the process that we need to fulfill.

So, the two categories we are considering here are the technical checks recast and the technical checks supplemental. The background or the rationale of why we're doing, why we are asking for this change, is that if you recall for those people that remember doing the transition, once the design team agreed on the SLAs to be measured, there was a request that went to PTI or IANA at the time and said, "Can we get some operational data out of your ticketing system to see how long these things have taken you, historically?"

---

And so, we provided a large enough set of data. I think it was like a March to October timeframe of data, and so about seven months. But unfortunately compared to the type of request that we go through, it wasn't large enough to base SLAs on.

So, some of those SLAs ended up being a little more tight than we normally operate under, but now that we have 30+ months worth of data, it's obvious that some of those thresholds could use a little bit more adjustments. So, that's the change that we are asking for.

If you can keep going down, please, I'm just walking you through the document that we've submitted basically. So, what we are requesting here, what we have in the system right now, or according to the SLAs, is that we have a technical check retest that is currently at three minutes' performance based on the data that we have in the system, and the SLE dashboard is three to eight minutes, and so the requested adjustment is to ten minutes.

The second category is even a little shorter. It's a one-minute SLA and the performance, again, is around the same time and the requested adjustment is also at the 10-minute level.

When we analyzed this request against implementation and why we are asking this ... Sorry, I'll come back to that. So, let's keep going through the document as you are scrolling.

---

Again, this will try to create a template that we can keep using, going forward, which so then we what category this would be, so then this is Category 4 which we just discussed which is just changing the threshold.

Then going on to the impact analysis, this is now the Phase 2 of the document that says, if you do this, what is the impact on the customer, on PTI in terms of the documentation, etc. So, it calls for defining why are you asking for this, what's the benefit to the community? So, the benefit here is that you're giving a more predictable process to the community, they know what to count on, and that really the SLAs are living up to their true design which is let's give each party the responsible time and judge them against the time that they are responsible for.

And so, some of these technical checks happen because we have nameservers that are not responsive which get submitted in change requests, and there are multiple tries that go out from the RZMS system to those nameservers, and so that time spent is not really IANA staff time, it's just the system trying multiple times to reach those nameservers.

The feasibility, what that would need from us on our end to do is to update both the tool, the dashboard that we use, to have that real-time data coming out of RZMS updated to be aware of that different threshold so that it can mark each request correctly, and

---

then from that tool we have another tool that generates the monthly report. So, those two pieces would need to be updated.

In terms of budget requirements, that change can be done in-house, within PTI, using our development resources. The only reason why we didn't commit to that one is that I just wanted a little bit more consultation. As you can see, this is just a draft for consideration and I wanted an accurate quote from the development team on what it would take to do that, but I don't anticipate that it will be a large effort for them. We just need to build it into their timeline or pipeline.

So, again, same thing, if you scroll down a little bit, please. The implementation, and again it's that one, it's that developer's time to put it into their pipeline to update their SLE dashboard, and the report, and that will do our internal processes when we do any changes to the dashboard, where we have to do testing and deployment and follow all of the IT processes. But, again, it's all done in-house, and we don't have to contract with anyone for that.

And then what else do we put there? Then we said, okay, so back to the process and looking at the different pieces that were required to finish. Phase 1, we tried to break it down here in terms of as in action items. And so, you have Step 1 is the SLA change request distributed to the CSC and PTI and this is this discussion

---

right here, and actually this is a summary of the discussions we've had for several months now, and then the request analysis document which follows again the process that we've defined. So, as you can see from this table here, these are the steps that are to be completed going forward, and again none of this can be completed, yet the reason why we didn't mark too much as completed is because we need an amendment to go through before we can say that we finished these steps.

And then I think one thing to flag, based on this and a little bit of discussion, is so when we follow all these steps, what we need to do is, as a CSC here, we need to figure out our communication to the community, how are we going to communicate to the [CCNG] community that this change has been discussed and agreed. So, that I will leave in the capable hands of Bart and the CSC on how that communication goes out, but it's definitely a CSC-to-the-community communication.

Oh, I'm sorry, and one more thing. Since in the previous discussion we agreed we'd do these concurrently so that we can lodge two processes, if we agree that this is the right document and the right cadence of what you expect to see, then we'll produce the same thing for the LGRs, Elaine. We just didn't want to go too far into this without knowing that these are the things that you expect us to hit and to see in the document. Thank you.

---

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you very much, Naela, and I appreciate that we're doing two things here. One is actually looking at the check and seeing if we want to make these changes, and the other is going through the process for the very first time to see if his process is going to meet our needs going forward. So, we have these two concurrent activities that we're actually engaged in right now, so thank you very much for walking us through essentially both and also just recognizing the fact that we're using one as our test, even though it's a live test, so to speak. Questions or comments from the members or the liaisons? Elaine, go ahead.

ELAINE PRUIS: Thank you. So, I'm happy to see that Step 3 happens before Step 4 and that we would agree to proceed or not before the larger community has access to the concept or documents. I think that will help us avoid a lot of unnecessary reassurance to the community before we decide if we are actually going to do anything.

So, the other item that I want to discuss is how we are going to provide access. So, is that going to be along with the monthly report? Do we post them on the website? How do we notify people that this is available and something that they should

---

consider besides our own individual responsibilities to our groups?

BYRON HOLLAND:

That's probably a question for the entire group as opposed to ... Naela, you're off the hook specifically, but your thoughts are welcome of course. I mean, I guess the first thing is we do publish our report to the broad community across many lists, etc., so I would think that we would leverage that same mechanism specifically for this as well as posting it on our own site, and I don't know how ICANN feels about giving us some real estate on their site to post it, but certainly our own lists, our own channels, the way that we distribute our information currently would be the first step, but any other suggestions? Brett, go ahead, speak loudly.

BRETT CARR:

What I was going to say was that I wondered if there could be a section in the monthly report that lists SLA changes currently in flight, and then people have only got one place to go to, to find the information.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you, that's a good suggestion. Alan?



[ALAN]:

I don't know about some of you, but I have a little jetlag, and so I had trouble sleeping, so in an attempt to get to sleep I actually took Amy's document out and read what the actual requirements are and it says the naming customer consultation, all four categories of SLA changes require the CSC to present the change request to their stakeholders, i.e., naming customers of the draft changes. Now, so I guess I would point out that, as well as trying to communicate to the community that you also have to respect the letter of the approved policy.

So, in that spirit, I'm wondering if, for example, the CSC list that we have, is that an opt-in list, or is it really all the registry operators get pushed? If it is and everyone will get informed by that, that could be satisfactory. If indeed it's an opt-in process, we may have to go a step further and either through IANA or some such process push something out to all naming customers to use that process. And I would point out that it says that the CSC has to do this, which means – and I'll say not IANA, but is there some issue with the CSC accessing that list, or whatever, and could it be done on IANA on behalf of the CSC? So, I think those are just a couple of things to think about. Thanks.

---

**BART BOSWINKEL:** Just for the record, the list we use, one is to all the registries on the contract. So, that's the gTLD registries and registrars. The second one the ccTLD world list and the other ccTLDs are community-based. And I don't know with the direct customers whether the RSSAC is considered direct customer or what isn't?

**UNIDENTIFIED MALE:** It says naming customer.

**BART BOSWINKEL:** Naming customer, but that would be, yeah, you could argue root server operators, but it doesn't matter. So, you've got the main category of naming customer covered in the e-notice, and so that's your cover letter and the reports will be sent out. Whether that is enough is something else.

So, I think the cover letter, or your cover note is probably the best to alert people that this is coming because that's what people will see. Whether they will check the report is another thing, but at least in your cover note we can include a link to say what is happening. I think a second one is once you've agreed on, say, a change process through this template that it will be published somewhere, and we include a link to what is happening because this is more of the details than you will find in a CSC report or anything else.

---

So, that's effectively included in the link in the report itself with the updates and then, secondly, in the cover note include the link to the final report, as agreed, or the final template as agreed between the CSC and PTI on how to move forward, especially with these threshold changes, and of course you've got your regular updates with, let's say the RSIG and that's another channel to be used for your regular updates to the ccNSO meeting members and to the RSIG at a face-to-face meeting because this will not happen overnight. So, you could announce it already during these meeting, either PTI or the CSC.

So, effectively, you've got three channels you can use, but the basis is when will you publish this report and, say, announcing this to the community? Is this coming as one, and so alerting is one, but the real information is the basis of what you're agreeing is this report, and that needs to be posted somewhere and remain accessible and so we can use it as a basic link. And whether that should be on the CSC site, or a website or the PTI.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Yeah. I think that's an important point as we're discussing this report, but to me it's not, it's clearly not just for us. This is likely to become the public-facing document of this particular change. So, when we are considering this report, we should also be considering it through the lens of the recipient who is not

---

paying particularly close attention to what we're doing, and this is what they will see as our explanation for the request. So, I think Bart brings up a good point too. There is the alerting of what's coming and then there is this is what it is. Naela?

NAELA SARRAS:

So, not having thought about this too long, but the agreement that we made so far is to amend the IANA Naming Function Contract, take the SLAs and house them somewhere on [pti.icann.org](http://pti.icann.org) or [icann.org](http://icann.org), not defined yet, and then in there we are going to reflect pretty much what we are going to do with pretty much any contract amendment that happens through ICANN. So, it will be here's the contract and then here are the several amendments that we are going through.

So, each one of these SLA amendments will be sort of represented as an amendment on its own and I think that's where this report, this agreed process, needs to live as the documentation behind why this change happened and then can be referred by anyone. And so that's, I think, the link that you are looking for eventually.

I think that Kim and I have this really cool idea of how we want to represent the SLAs once they are changed which is to take the 63 measurements and have somehow a cool table that does what they are currently, but then somehow you are able to dig in down

---

to like what they were in the past, and so we are still in this idea mode, but it will be there sometime at some point. Yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL:

And to say that, for the record, in principle that you will look together with icann.org, say, to a webpage where you will post the finalized version of this change document and that will be used as a source to, say, inform the community that this is happening and alerting can be done in another way, and just refer to the discussions that we have and the documentations we have on the CSC Wiki space, for example. That's the alerting function, so separate the alerting and the informing function, and then the informing function will refer to the finalized document and at CSC you can always look at the updates, etc., revert to the notes, the recording, etc.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Alan?

[ALAN]:

I'm sitting and looking at this. I think that we may be missing a step and that is I think that what the process is, it's that the CSC agrees to a change, subject to consultation from the community. The consultation is received, I think the CSC has to formally

---

approve it after the feedback has been received from the community.

BYRON HOLLAND: Are we not talking about Category 4, here, now?

AMY CREAMER: Let me just say that I started this template for the other categories, and we do have that in there, so this is the abbreviated version where we, actually, technically the CSC doesn't require feedback. You're only required to notify them, but I had planned on adding those extra steps for the others.

[ALAN]: So, I have a related question or comment to that. Do we need an effective date for the change, and therefore what is that date? Is it prospective? In other words, on April 1<sup>st</sup> you agree that effective July 1<sup>st</sup> it will be, or whatever, because do we have to allow for their developer time, etc.? So, I think that you have to think that through a little bit, and I think that we should be clear, so which is why I'm thinking there should be a secondary decision. We've agreed that it's going to change, and the change is effective this date. Therefore, it's clear to everybody.

---

BYRON HOLLAND: Naela or Amy, are there any comments on that?

NAELA SARRAS: No, actually, I think that's actually a good point and I think that we should build it into this table.

AMY CREAMER: Yeah, like here.

NAELA SARRAS: Yeah. Yeah, I think in the next version that we give you this, it should say that if this whole thing should go through, it will be effective this date.

BRAD VERD: And maybe check in the amended contract what will be the effective date of the change so that they could imagine that it could be effective the day it's published. That's normally what you do with these things. So, it's not the decision time. It's the decision and day of publication, and the ultimate date is the day of publication on the website.

[ALAN]: I would add that, legally, it's very legal to agree on a prospective date. In other words, the date of the decision is the date that it's

---

published on the website, but the decision could have a prospective effect of the actual—

BART BOSWINKEL: It's already documented in the contract, in the amended contract, how it works.

BYRON HOLLAND: So, Bart, is it clearly defined in the amended contract, which I have to admit I don't recall off the top of my head.

BART BOSWINKEL: Nor do I, but that's normally the mechanism. I know that's in, for example, with the RAP. This is where you agree between the PTI and the CSC on the changed RAP and then it will become effective on the date of publication after. You can't say that it's a special date. The only thing is that it will be published at one point, and so I could imagine that something like this is with the SLA as well, but you need to check.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, so given that it doesn't sound like any of us, right here, right now, have that information accessible to us, I would ask as an action item between Bart and Naela, you find what the exact requirement is. I think Alan's point is a valid one. Now let's



---

determine the boundary conditions that we are constrained by and go with those, and then we can add that, depending on what plays out. Thank you.

Okay, any other comment or feedback, or questions on this? So, we will, and I think what I heard, just to summarize a couple of the points. In terms of the actual draft report here, you've heard the discussion we've just had and so there's probably a step to add that would clarify the timing, depending on what we uncover from other documents on the contract.

And then in terms of distribution of information, that we could publish a prospective alert, but in terms of providing information on the actual change, that we will use the list that we have already. We will identify the change in the cover note and the effective time. we will publish it on the website and of course we have sessions in our respective communities, GNSO and ccNSO, and that's just for change 4, which of course we are using this as an example right now, but it's also live and real, and for 1, 2 and 3, that would have its own process where we have to do the public consultation, etc.

Fair summary? Okay, so agenda Item 4B, I think we've covered all the ground, is there anything else that anybody else wants to raise on this right now? Naela, do you have what you need?

---

NAELA SARRAS: Yes, I do, and I will undertake and commit that for the April meeting I will bring an updated version of this document that we just discussed, plus the one for the LGR, so that those can be fully fleshed out at that point and we'll be close to everything that you were going to do.

AMY CREAMER: Yes.

NAELA SARRAS: And then that will give us a step closer to finalizing, right, what we need to do?

AMY CREAMER: Yeah.

BYRON HOLLAND: Great. Thank you very much. I think we're very close. Okay, then we'll move on to agenda Item 5 which is the review update, and in terms of the effectiveness review I think we've already had some discussion around that. Comments were submitted by the ccNSO, RYSG, business community, Internet service providers and they were all favorable. There were no really dissenting or critical comments or any comments at odds with the effectiveness review report. Some recommendations were made

---

and given that we have a bit of time, I think there's an opportunity just to have a very, very preliminary conversation there.

Before we go to that, I'm just going to ask if we go to 5B in the IFRT update, if we know any ... I don't think we know anything further than we talked about yesterday.

AMY CREAMER:

So, ICANN is giving the ICANN board a resolution to direct ICANN Org on what to do with the review. As you know, this is one of the accountability mechanisms of the IANA stewardship transition that ICANN is accountable for holding and the current issue, we resolved the APAC issue. We did get a member who represents APAC, so that leaves us with the ccNSO seat. The third seat that the ccNSO elects a member to is to be from a non-ccNSO member that's a ccTLD operator. We went to the OEC, the board's organizational effectiveness team, who oversees reviews and now also the IFR will be in their purview. We asked them to put forward a recommendation.

The current recommendation that they are giving is they recommend that the board do one of three things, that they put basically their review on hold until all of the appointing entities either agree to the ccNSO's proposal, which was to elect on a temporary basis a ccNSO member until a non-ccNSO member volunteer, who qualified, was found. Or, to work on changing the

---

ICANN bylaws which would be a lengthy process, and that would hold the IFR in a hold-stay, as well. Or actually just to again hold it until the ccNSO finds that member.

So, those are the three options, get all the appointed organizations to agree to the current slate, and we'll wait it out until the ccNSO finds a non-ccNSO member or work on the bylaws. And the latter two I think would be very time consuming because the ccNSO has seemed to have made every effort possible, and according to the things that we had discussed in earlier meetings, it looks unlikely that a non-member will come forth. So, this is going to be voted on in the board meeting this week, and then we will notify all of the appointing organizations of what the board has determined.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Okay, thank you for the update. Any comments or questions for Amy on that? Okay, thank you. Then we'll go back to 5A. So, and we have already talked about this, or in previous meetings had talked about the effectiveness review recommendations, and fundamentally they left us with what I would consider four basic recommendations.

One is that we publish procedures on how we would deal with complaints if we received an individual one because while individual complaints are clearly not our remit, community

---

members still bring them to us, and there's been a bit of an ad-hoc informal essentially a passing-on of that complaint or information to PTI in some way, shape, or form and that while we are certainly not going to be in the business of taking on individual complaints, we will at least provide a transparent mechanism by which we essentially just forward them on to PTI. So, that was the one recommendation.

I would say that the others are more administrative in nature. One is around attendance because, as we all know around this table, we do have attendance requirements, and if we as individual liaisons or members fail to meet them, the effectiveness review team is recommending that there be some kind of mechanism by which the respective bodies are notified and they can take action in terms of dealing with their absent liaison or member. So, that's the second one.

The third one is, as this group has matured and evolved, and as our terms come up and the new people come on, identifying what the skills matrix of the people on this committee look like and what the prospective candidates should look like in order to fill any potential gaps.

And then the fourth was providing some sort of onboarding program for new members so that we can get our new members up to speed as quickly as possible.

---

So, those were, as far as I'm concerned, really, at a high level the four fundamental recommendations. Did anybody have any feedback or commentary on them, support for them, objection to them? This is a preliminary conversation. It's probably a little early right now to think about how we're going to work on these and what specifically we might do, but just in terms of high-level subject matter, any objections to them? Seem reasonable?

BRETT CARR:

I think they all sound reasonable. I'm interested to know any background about the non-attendance comment. Has this been a problem in the past?

BYRON HOLLAND:

We had one individual, one of the liaisons whose attendance record was a little shaky, and we weren't being given forward notice of his inability to attend meetings, and it was not being communicated back to that individual's community that this was happening, and I think the community was somewhat surprised when they did find out his attendance record. So, that, and I mean I don't know 100%, but that's my understanding of what the effectiveness review team, or what sparked the review team's interest in this particular topic.

---

**BART BOSWINKEL:** Maybe just for the record as support staff to the effectiveness, they looked at the attendance records of the CSC itself, which is publicly available and they've noticed this, and maybe you've seen the email from one of your liaisons as well to that effect.

The second thing related around the attendance, the recommendation was slightly amended that the CSC chair is requested to inform the respective organizations, the appointing organizations, at or by May of each year, at least, in order to inform them prior to the election or selection of new members so that they know what is going on, and to inform them.

**BYRON HOLLAND:** Elaine?

**ELAINE PRUIS:** Thank you, so Brett, the charter is really clear about attendance requirements and so I think that's why there's a focus on it in the review. The other thing I wanted to say, Byron, is that if reappointments are happening in October, it might not be too early to think about dealing with the qualifications document or how we want to deal with that, come up with those.

**BYRON HOLLAND:** Thank you. Bart?

**BART BOSWINKEL:** Related, if you go back for the first year and this year, or last year, and probably this year, around June – May or June – ICANN Org will send out the letters to the appointing organizations to select liaisons and members for the new slate starting in October.

**BYRON HOLLAND:** Thank you. And maybe just also for Brett, I mean, especially from a voting perspective, we have a very small group. There are only four voting members and that's one of the key reasons why attendance is so critical to this particular committee is because in order to have a quorum and to be able to have an effective vote we really need high attendance levels, certainly from the members, and then we also expect it from the liaisons who are reporting back to their communities.

**BRETT CARR:** Yeah, I think my question was really focused on the fact that, certainly, since I've been here, there's been a very good attendance, from my perspective, and so I just wondered if there was background to it, and you've explained that that us, Byron. Thank you.



---

BYRON HOLLAND: And Elaine, I take your point, while we do have some time, we don't have a lot of time, so as an action item let's make sure that we have that as an action item for the next CSC meeting where we work towards whatever process we are going to use to determine that and have that first discussion. Sorry, I said Naela, didn't I? I'm sorry, I meant [Ria] because that's a CSC responsibility and clearly not a PTI responsibility. Alan?

[ALAN]: I'd just like to ask Elaine [inaudible] a question. When the registry stakeholders look for members, in the past, have you put a set of, I'll call them requirements, but needs or whatever, and if you have that around I think that would be worth circulating just to get the process started because, Bart, I believe the ccNSO does that. Don't we put out some kind of... This kind of person would be desirable?

BART BOSWINKEL: I think the ccNSO does it in the sense of it that they use the basic skillset that is included in the ICANN Org announcement. I don't know where the RSIG does it. I think if you really look at it, and that's because of the cohesiveness and the quality of the people on the CSC itself right now, it might be very good to specify it a little bit more in detail for what you as a CSC think is relevant as a kind of skillset.

---

It's very clear, say, to the first CSC that had people like Jay and Byron from the ccNSO community with different skillsets, and Elaine and Cal, and now with Elaine and Gaurav as well, with the different type of skillsets. And that's what this effectiveness review was looking for to ensure this, and that's included, and that wasn't included in the ccNSO search, initially, and it isn't included in the ICANN org selection criteria. So, it definitely needs to come from the CSC what you are looking for.

ELAINE PRUIS:

So, Alan, it's been almost three years, so it's hard for me to remember exactly what the document was, but I do recall that there were specific requests for people with first-hand experience with the IANA function, so there is something there, but I think we definitely need to be a little bit more thorough.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Amy?

AMY CREAMER:

Because I assisted with the election materials for the last election the CSC, you do have your own candidate qualification requirement document and it does specify the commitment in terms of meeting a minimum of nine meetings in a one-year period and must not be absent for more than two consecutive

---

meetings, but I will note that this is at least a two-page document and that is buried within a paragraph, so it's something that could be easily overlooked. That requirement was not mentioned on ICANN's letters to the [appointing] organization to begin the election, and the [appointing] organizations would have probably just clipped this PDF on to the email that you sent out. So, it might be a good idea to bring it more to the forefront.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: I think only because I think it will happen anyway, as an action item, that I just feel that these, I will say, the covenant requirements, say, from the previous or the first and then the last selection processes, and use that as a basis for a matrix and so you can fit it in and get back to you in April.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Bart, that's very forward thinking. Please take that as an action item. Ria?

[RIA OTANES]: Nigel commented in the chat that GAC did ask me for a sort of CV before appointing me last October.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Okay. Thanks, Nigel. Any other very initial commentary or feedback on the four items here? So, we are going to take these on board, or this set of recommendations on board as an agenda item for our April meeting and Bart has some homework to do in the meantime.

Okay. With that, we'll move on to agenda Item number 6 which is essentially just the balance of the week. On March 12<sup>th</sup> both the ccNSO and RYSG have meetings where our respective members will be presenting what's going on with the CSC, and then something a little bit different than has happened in the past is that on March 13<sup>th</sup> we will be having a meeting with the board's technical committee.

So, that will be a first for us, and presumably for them as well And correct me if I'm wrong, but have we circulated the deck? The deck has been circulated internally that we expect to walk them through. Given it's a first time and it's unclear exactly how familiar all of them will be with this committee, the work that we've done and the things that we're currently doing, that we will take the opportunity to try to sort of ramp them up from scratch and bring them up to where we're at today. And that's at 3:00 on the 13<sup>th</sup>. The next meeting is April 15<sup>th</sup>. Oh, hands up all over, okay.

---

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN: Just asking for what level of participation you expect from this because this clashes straight head-on with the public RSSAC meeting in my case, for instance, the 3:00 on Thursday, and so I ...

BYRON HOLLAND: Wasn't the board meeting on the 13<sup>th</sup>.

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN: Sorry, then I might be at this meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Obviously, Lars isn't worried about his attendance record.

LARS STEVEN: Yes, sorry, Wednesday, the RSSAC meeting is on the Wednesday, yeah. I do have a strong conflict, yes.

BYRON HOLLAND: So, having tried to make the schedule work for this meeting, I'm pretty confident that board tech committee, that is not a movable meeting. I will strongly encourage all liaisons to participate where they can. I mean, I recognize, like everybody here, it's an ICANN meeting and conflicts happen.

---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I will check with RSSAC. It could be that I can leave ... No, sorry, that's the [inaudible], no, that would not be possible. I have to attend the RSSAC meeting. I'm sorry, that's the formal part of it.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, thank you for the notice, though. Naela?

NAELA SARRAS: I have similar things. First, I wanted to know from Elaine when the RySG one is, so somebody from the PTI can attend, or at least we listen in. Do you have a time for that one?

ELAINE PRUIS: Yes, it's Tuesday, and I'm pretty sure that I'm on the agenda for 12:30 PM. I will let you know if it's not 12:30.

NAELA SARRAS: And then I have the same problem as Liman because I also sit as a liaison to the RSSAC and that's the formal meeting, and so I think I should attend that one, and my colleagues will cover for me in CSC and so I won't be there. My apologies.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, thank you for that notice. In terms of the members, though, the two of you can make the board member, right? Okay.

---

GAURAV VEDI: I'll be heading back, so I'll miss the meeting, but I'll try to dial in from the airport, so I am [inaudible]. I will be here.

BYRON HOLLAND: Great, thank you. Okay, I think we have the timing straightened out and who can be where and when for the rest of this week, at least, and the next meeting is April 15<sup>th</sup> of which we have some to dos for that. Any comments on that?

We'll move to agenda Item 8, AOB. Does anybody have any other business? I have one item. No? Just a notice that the ALAC liaison is going to be stepping down, so we will expect a new ALAC liaison in the near term, and more to follow when I hear from that community. Okay, going, going gone, any other business? That's it, alright, well, we'll adjourn the meeting. Thank you very much, everybody, and thank you to PTI on all of the work on all of the reports, and those two reports I thought were very helpful. Thank you very much.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**