

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN Copenhagen
CSC Update
Sunday 12 March 2017 at 14:30 CET**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The recording and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Man: One, two, yep.

James Bladel: Okay, if we could ask councilors to please remain at the table and we'll be joined by the folks from the Customer Standing Committee.

Okay I see councilors standing up and walking away from the table. Michele, what's that all about? Okay. Our next session is an interaction with the CSC, the Customer Standing Committee. Excuse me, folks, we're going to get started. So we're going to get started now. So if we could have councilors back to the tables, if we could take conversations outside. Repetition until we start to see some resolution. Okay thank you.

I'm going to wait for my signal from the back of the room that the recordings have started. There it is. Fantastic. Okay. So welcome to the Representatives of the CSC, the Customer Standing Committee, which is part of our post - no, I'm supposed to say PTI, but it stands for something different now. It is public technical identifiers. And part of that includes a customer standing committee with the customers of the IANA functions. They are here to provide us an update and answer our questions.

So with that I will turn it over to (Erin)? Elaine, I'm sorry. Elaine or (Jay).
Elaine, go ahead.

Elaine Pruis: Good afternoon. Thanks for attending our session. Can I just ask who in the room knows what CSC is and what we do? Okay. So I'll go into some detail. I'm Elaine Pruis. I am the VP of Operations at Donuts, which is a registry operator, and I have some fellow CSC members and liaisons here. Would you guys minds introducing yourselves?

(Jay Daily): I'm (Jay Daily) from the .NZ registry.

(Elisa Lindbergh): I'm (Elisa Lindbergh), GAC liaison to the CSC.

Man: And I'm (unintelligible), and I'm the liaison from the RSAC to the CSC.

(Elise Garrett): (Elise Garrett), liaison from PTI, public technical identifiers.

Elaine Pruis: Great thank you. Okay so we'll get into the slide deck. We've introduced introduces ourselves. (Jay) and I here today as members. I don't think (Byron)'s in the room. (Cal) is on his way. He'll be participating in the RYSG session on Tuesday. We're covering the same material.

So we have several liaisons and appointed members. What is it that we do? We are responsible for monitoring the public technical identifiers' performance of the IANA naming function against the service level expectations that are in the IANA naming function contract.

James Bladel: I'm sorry, can I introduce you for a second? Can we get the slides on the screen and the projector to catch up to Elaine?

Elaine Pruis: Scroll down to slide number three.

James Bladel: Yes thank you.

Elaine Pruis: There we go. So we monitor the activity of the PTI. We inform the community of that activity and then we do some consultations and reviews. Next slide. So what is the current status of the PTI and our work? We've been working together for the last five months and overall the PTI performance is extremely good.

There've been some minor metrics missed but we haven't had any customer service impact or operational problems to deal with. And I feel like the committee has come together really well. We have a good working relationship and everyone has the same goal. So it's been a very positive experience.

In the next year the ICANN community needs to begin to play their role for the reviews. So yesterday the ccNSO and RYSG leadership got together and put together a timeline, a roadmap, to begin those reviews. Next slide. So what have we done since last October? Every month the PTI publishes a report on their adherence to the SLAs. We review those reports and we issue a summary report, which is then published out to the different constituencies and anybody who's on the mailing list that's interested.

We've approved the customer dashboard that the PTI has put together. We've reviewed their survey and discussed that. And we're also talking about what processes for PTI-related complaints we should be putting in place. And we've developed an internal procedures draft; we're on version four now.

Next slide. So how is that we work? We have a monthly teleconference meeting. We receive and discuss the report. We decide if we want to approve it and publish it out, deal with other topics. And our meetings are open. The liaisons are active participants but anybody from the public's welcome to come and listen in.

Next slide. So what are our - what's our core responsibility, which we already mentioned, which is monitoring and reporting on PTI's compliance to the SLAs. So we have 63 individual metrics, things such as lodgment time for a request, and then response time, what's the staff processing time for creating a new gTLD or retiring one. And the SLAs or SLEs were a result of work done as part of the transition CWG's Design Team A, which (Jay) was quite active in.

Next slide. So an example of when the SLE is not met, we've had a few of these, but here's an example. So the SLE for processing of a request for the creation or transfer of a gTLD is ten days, and that SLE is based on historical information, how long had the staff taken in the past to do something like this. The SLE to be considered to have been met is 90% of the time they must do this in less than ten days. And they met this metric back in December for the ten gTLD creation requests that were received. And the longest creation was 2.91 days. So they're well within the SLEs here.

Next slide. So this is an example of when the SLE has not been fully met. So one of the one tasks is a technical check for the creation or transfer of a TLD. And so in December there were 16 requests that exceeded the SLA for technical checks, meaning they didn't meet their metric. But it was explained that the reason why this happened was because the system sequentially processes these checks and can't do them concurrently. So it exposed a problem in the way of actually processing the request, which will be addressed by the PTI staff on their development roadmap.

So the CSC discussed this issue with PTI. We learned what was the underlying cause and we have a plan for addressing this going forward. Next slide. So one of the tasks that we have is to review any persistent performance issues and develop a complaint process or system. We still need to agree on what that remedial action procedure might be.

Next slide. There's also a complaint procedure for a PTI customer to complain directly to PTI, and the CSC doesn't have much of a role in this process. If we see a persistent problem that's not being dealt with or going away, then we'll move on to that - the remedial action procedure.

Next slide. So the CSC also does some consulting and informing. The PTI completed the customer survey in 2016 which showed that overall customer satisfaction was very high but we did have some discussion about the number of people or parties who responded to that survey. So one of the tasks of the CSC is to help get that response rate a little bit higher for next time.

And we also inform the community, as I said before. We have a CSC wiki working space, there were some dashboards launched, we have monthly reports, and then, like now, presentations to the community. Next slide. So our upcoming work includes community consultations with the PTI on their performances, a review of processing time for emergency requests.

We still need to continue evolving our internal procedures. As I said, we're on draft four. I don't know if that's going to be approved this week or not or if we'll have another version. And we also need to review a transition plan, which were to occur every five years. We're not quite there yet. And request a review or change of the SLEs. So as I mentioned, like the sequential technical checks have affected the performance in SLEs for PTI, so we might want to either adjust that SLE or continue to allow for some overages, considering it's a processing issue rather than like PTI just not doing their job. Any updated SLEs have to be approved by the ccNSO and GNSO.

Okay next slide. So we still need to review our charter. As I said, the ccNSO and RYSG leadership met yesterday to come up with a roadmap for that review. We also will do an SLE review, we'll look at the effectiveness of the CSC, and then an IANA function review to come.

Next slide. So - sorry this is hard to read but for me, as a user of the PTI and the root zone management portal, this part's very interesting to me. So this is the PTI roadmap. And I won't get into details but (Elise) is here and she can address anything really - if anybody has specific questions about this. But their - and I know (Maxim) you had a question about this re-architecture. So some changes to the way the system is built and the platform it's on.

Then when - the next item, the new authorization model, right now the technical and administrative contacts have to approve any changes that are requested, say for instance if you're updating your DNS records. So they're looking at a new way of authorizing those requests, which would streamline the process. Then new technical check systems and easier-to-use customer API, new process for deleting TLDs, and an internal admin interface.

Next slide. And this looks like the timeline for the PTI development roadmap is here. That's the end of the deck. Does anybody have any questions about any of this I can address?

James Bladel: Any questions about this or the CSC? Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And I don't have a question, just some compliments. I have found the reports very useful. It's great to have you guys doing this monitoring. It saves a lot of time. At the same time, we can trust that it's thoroughly being reviewed. And so I find both CSC's reports and PTI reports very helpful from a registry's perspective, so thanks. And then one last compliment, Donna, I think the CSC design team did a good job.

Elaine Pruis: Thank you, Chuck. We really appreciate that. We've all worked hard and I completely agree with you that Donna's group did a great job organizing this.

James Bladel: Kudos to Donna and that group. Rubens?

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl, Registry Stakeholder Group. One of the IANA services is adding IDN tables to the (unintelligible) tables in the group. Is that group covered today by the naming function agreement or the protocol perimeters agreement?

Elaine Pruis: Thanks, Rubens. I know what you're asking. We have 200 TLDs and 14 language tables for each one and they're not yet updated. I can't address that specifically. It's not one of the SLEs that we monitor. Maybe (Elise) could.

(Elise Garrett): So I think the registration of the tables themselves is the naming function. How the protocols perimeter group within IATS might define different ways to create those tables would be a protocol perimeter function. So it sits in both camps. And when the protocol perimeters folks finish their work, then we can register that and makes it's available both through the protocol perimeter registry to let them know that there's an RFC or whatever and then when the table is actually created, then we can post it and have it within the naming function. Does that answer your question?

Rubens Kuhl: Yes thank you.

James Bladel: Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. Donna Austin. So, Elaine and CSC, I mean compliments from me as well. I must admit that at the time that the - we were designing this team I never thought that I'd be around when it was implemented so I was surprised that it had to be put together really quickly. And I'm, you know, I think it's great to hear that the team is working really well together, because I think that was important to the success as well was to get the team right and stuff. So that's terrific and I'm really pleased about that.

Just a question on your interaction with the PTI board. I mean is that something that, I don't know that it was actually foreseen, but whether you have any interaction with the PTI board at all?

(Jay Daily): We have a discussion scheduled for this week for the first time, but otherwise there are no formal things yet set up. But it's recognized that it needs to be addressed.

James Bladel: Any other questions either from council or from the audience? Oh here comes Jonathan. I'm not going to let you off that easy.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi it's Jonathan Robinson. No, I'll just add a little bit to Donna's question. I mean what (Lisa) and I have done as the sort of community appointees to the PTI board is we've generally agreed to track every single CSC meeting. So for the most part, we're on there and keeping a close eye. And frankly I could add to Chuck's compliments. It does seem like the job is being well done.

And I don't know if you heard (Shireen) say something. One of the issues is therefore what, you know, we need to be quite - we need to think carefully about the role of the PTI board because the PTI board has to be some sort of glue in all of this but make sure that it's not interfering or doing - going beyond what it needs to. And the CSC is doing a great job at the sort of customer level, so then the board has to have a - sort of make sure that things are good from a corporate governance and compliance level.

So I think we - there's a little bit of learning as we go. And as (Jay) said, our intention is for us to meet this week for a few of us together, myself, (Elise), and possibly (Jay) and (Byron), and just make sure we are of a common mind. So I think we are both - I wouldn't like to say - to come across that we're making it up as we go along but I think we're feeling our way and making sure that, you know, there's a stable structure that (Elise) and her

team have run well for a long time. And so it's a matter of easing into the new structure, if you like. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thanks, Jonathan. Yes, Donna, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks, James. Donna Austin. So just to follow up on something that Jonathan just said, I mean this was an important aspect of the CCWG on IANA Transition and we always recognize that IANA was being done well. So I think the oversight was something that we didn't want to provide too much interference into something that was already being done well. So it's - hopefully (Elise) is comfortable with this arrangement as well and that's, you know, I don't think that these guys are interfering too much in your business. But it's good to know that we - there's been no disruption as a result of the transition with the actual IANA service. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you and thanks for that discussion. Any other final thoughts or comments from CSC.

Elaine Pruis: I just wanted to invite everyone to the public session tomorrow from 11 till 12:30. (Byron), our chair, will be leading that. We also have some smaller sessions and (Jay) will be presenting to the ccNSO and we'll be talking with the GAC, I think that's Tuesday evening. So if you're wanting to learn more about our work and how we're interacting with the community, you're welcome to attend. Thank you.

James Bladel: Thank you, Elaine, and appreciate that update. (Elise)?

(Elise Garrett): I just wanted to thank everyone for nice the compliments to our ongoing operations but also to thank the CSC for their support because we have had some very interesting discussions where they've helped us to identify areas where our implementation might be not optimal and so we are looking at that. But also tomorrow at the ccNSO meeting we've been invited - the PTI team has been invited to give a presentation.

And some of these development topics we'll go into a little more deeply, mostly - particularly the authorization model, which is being prompted through the framework of interpretation working group recommendations, and we're kind of looking for input on - to this authorization model and whether or not it is a reasonable way to go forward for all gTLDs, because it wouldn't just be necessarily for ccTLDs.

James Bladel: Thank you. Okay well let's bring this session to a close. And thank you once again to the CSC for your presentation and your time and for responding to questions. And thanks of course to PTI, IANA, whatever we call it now, for continuing your excellent performance. So let's pause the recording.

END