
SAN JUAN – Customer Standing Committee
Sunday, March 11, 2018 – 17:00 to 18:30 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Customer Standing Committee. Sunday, March 11, 2018. 5:00 PM through 6:30 PM. Meeting Room 209A.

BYRON HOLLAND: Welcome everybody to the CSC Meeting, the Sunday evening CSC Meeting. I'm not sure what I did to deserve this timeslot but thank you all for joining me here. We're going to get going. The agenda has been published previously, which you see it here. With your indulgence, I'm going to re-jig it a little bit to help out Donna and Kal in terms of some of their other scheduling commitments, and I would suggest that we move her and her teams' inputs into the number 3 position after the action items. So if that's okay or if there's any objections to that – if that's okay, we'll move their report or their update to become agenda item number 3.

Okay? We'll do that, which means we're going to get there quickly, Donna, so I hope you're ready. I just wanted to let everybody know that in terms of the members, Kal is online so

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.

we do have the full membership here, and Ria will be reading out any questions that he has. So, Kal, welcome. In terms of agenda item number 2, action items, there aren't any open items to discuss. The only one in particular is the Chair – that could have been as the Chair election, but that's on the agenda a little further down.

So we'll move to the actual PTI Performance Report. It's been circulated already and, as I'm sure you've noted, there were two missed metrics around technical checks and rechecks, which is a supplemental check. We've seen this before. This is familiar to us, but, Naela, I may pass it over to you. Is there anything you wanted to draw our attention to or any comments you wanted to make?

NAELA SARRAS:

No, nothing to add to what you said. Just we also have no escalations to send. We didn't run into any escalations to communicate for this month.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Any questions for Naela or - Kim? Welcome. Any questions for them? No? Okay. The draft CSC report has also been prepared and circulated already. As we just heard, there are no new escalations. Are there any comments on the report itself? Jay?

JAY DALEY: I just wondered if, for the benefit of anyone else here, we should explain why there are no comments on the report. Why we have nothing to say.

BYRON HOLLAND: Given this is an open meeting, yes, thank you for reminding me of that. Would you care to provide some color commentary on that just so we can make sure we're all on the same level of understanding?

JAY DALEY: Yeah, sure. So the PTI Report notes a couple of minor SLA breaches but these are ones that we are very well aware of. They have happened multiple times before. It's an issue around the design of the system and the interpretation of elements of the SLA rather than any underlying problem.

And we have provided a recommendation to change the way those tests are measured that will eliminate this and will not cause any errors or issues for any customers. And so as a result, there is nothing there for us to comment on. This is a regular thing we've seen before.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you for that, Jay. Turning back to the CSC report, our draft report that has been published. Again, given there's no escalations, are there any comments or questions on the report? Because barring any concerns here, I would like to seek agreement to publish it. Are we okay with publishing it, seeing that we heard no questions or concerns about it? Any objections? Okay, then I would ask Bart, could you please send that on our behalf?

Here's where we'll switch up the agenda and move the update from the Charter Review Team to agenda item number 3. And with that, I'll pass it over to Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Byron. Thank you for moving me up the schedule. Thanks, Ria. I have a slide deck but I don't really see much benefit in going through it because it's discussions that we've had with you previously. We had intended to publish a report prior to this ICANN meeting. We haven't made that deadline, so I just wanted to inform you it's not because we've encountered any problems but it's just I took two weeks' vacation, so it's taken a little bit of time to get back into the swing of things.

Our intent is that we will publish it within a week or two after this meeting. As I said, there's nothing in it that we haven't discussed with you before so there shouldn't be any surprises. But it's just

the intent of this update is just to let you know that we didn't publish it but we will do in a couple of weeks. So that's really all I have to update you on.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you for your vacation transparency and honesty. That said, even though it's not published yet, are there any questions for the Charter Review Team from our committee? No? Okay. Hearing none, thank you for that brief update. We look forward to the published document.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, then we'll move on to the next agenda item, which is the Remedial Action Procedures. And originally, it was titled "Approval of the RAPs." But I think right now, we're looking at more of an overview and an update on where we're at. And I'll come to the chronology after we go through the substance of this. The RAPs have been circulated to the list. The current version of the RAPs circulated to the list as recently as last week, March 5.

I'm going to ask Alan to provide an overview of them and do a walk through this deck because I think we are, from our perspective, in a final iteration of it. It's my understanding though that in terms of process, the ICANN Board has not yet addressed the issue. It was hoped that they would get to it at a meeting prior to Puerto Rico, but it looks like they'll be addressing it on the Tuesday meeting. But before we get into the pure chronology, I'd just like to turn it over to Alan to walk the committee through where we're at and what we believe is a final version. [Allen]?

[ALLEN]:

Okay, thank you Byron. I think about a week ago, I circulated to the list the latest draft of the RAPs and their text. They're about seven pages long. So we've been going back and forth for a few months. I think there was quite a bit of good interaction with ICANN and PTI. And actually, Martin provided us some comments which were very useful. So I think we're at where we thought as the Working Group.

We have approved this so we just have to move forward on them. I didn't get any comments from the list and, as Byron indicated, what I propose to do is just kind of walk you through them, structure framework, obviously questions and comments within that are welcome but, also, the draft is on the list as well.

So here we go, there we go. So just to remind everybody where we are on this, the requirement for the Remedial Action Procedures, what I'm going to call the RAPs, is in the CSC Charter. And as a consequence of that, they're also referred to in the IANA Naming Function Contract and the ICANN Bylaws, which actually came after the CSC Charter. They are to be agreed to by both the CSC and PTI, which is why we had not quite a dialogue, but we had a very good exchange with ICANN PTI on the draft, which was good.

And the whole premise of the RAPs is they can be invoked where a "performance issue" is found to exist. And a performance issue is defined in the ICANN Bylaws. I'll read it, because I know no one can read here. Any deficiency, problem, or other issue that has adversely affected PTI's performance under the IANA Naming Function Contract. So that's the premise.

So if we kind of look at the kind of overview of the RAPs, as I mentioned, they start with the finding that a performance issue exists. Then there's a requirement for PTI to develop a so-called corrective action plan. And so these first two steps do not actually involve the RAPs in and of themselves. This is just how you deal with these so-called performance issues. But it's when PTI fails to implement the corrective action plan, that's when the so-called escalations are invoked.

The proposal is that there would be three escalations: firstly to the PTI Board, secondly to the ICANN CEO, and thirdly to the ICANN Board. And I'll just mention in all of these, there's time limits to make sure there's no kind of stalling as a tactic and there's generally 10 days to move forward unless everyone says, "No, that's not enough time. Let's lengthen it, or, "Okay." So that's really in a thumbnail what the RAPs are. I'll go into it a little bit more as we go on. But as I said before, the first thing is the finding that there is a performance issue. So the CSC makes this determination, informs the PTI Liaison of its intention to undertake a review, so this is just to ensure that there is dialogue in the community.

I'm actually very pleased with all the dialogue we have but I think it's important to codify this nevertheless. And then PTI has to seek the input from the CSC in the development of this corrective action plan. And so you know what? I made a mistake on the slide. Just ignore the bottom of the slide, okay? Thank you. I sat in a meeting and overwrote an existing slide to give it the format. I apologize.

So as I said before, we have the performance issue the corrective action plan, and then PTI sends the corrective action plan to the CSC for approval or rejection, and then it proceeds to implement it. So that's the straightforward dealing with a performance issue. But then where the PTI fails to respect the corrective

action plan, this is when the escalation procedures, narrowly defined, are triggered.

So basically, it's when they don't do what they said they were going to do. And what do we mean by "don't do"? Well, if they don't call the initial meeting that's required, if they don't actually develop the corrective action, if they don't make progress reports that are required under the plan. Basically, if they miss any milestone in the plan, that creates an opportunity for an escalation. It doesn't mean that there's an automatic escalation, but it means that the CSC can escalate that to one of the three escalations.

So the first escalation is to the PTI Board itself. There is a failure, for example, they missed a milestone. It's taking longer than expected. The CSC feels that really this is an issue of concern. We have to do something to deal with it. So the CSC sends a notice triggering the escalation to the PTI Board and also informs the president of the Global Domains Division of ICANN and has to include the reasons for why the escalation is being triggered. Then the PTI Board develops a revised corrective action plan, sends it to the CSC for approval or rejection, and then they move to implement that.

And then the second escalation is basically a rinse and repeat. Same trigger, same process, but it goes to the ICANN CEO, has to

be – there's a revised plan that goes for approval and then the PTI has to implement it. And then we have the third example of rinse and repeat here, which is to the ICANN Board itself. And if the issue still remains outstanding after going through all of this process, then it's up to the GNSO and the ccNSO to decide what, if any, action they might want to take. But that can include the use of a special IFR.

So really that's – this is pretty straightforward stuff. But I would also note that the RAPs make provision for a review of them 12 months, but it's not going to be stacked on all the other reviews we have to deal with. But it's 12 months after their first dues. So if they never used this – there's no program review but 12 months after the first time they're implemented, then the RAPs require a review of their use and every subsequent time they're used 12 months after that. So that's more or less – this is what it is. So questions, comments?

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you, [Allen]. I mean this has been a work in progress for a while so we've seen much of this over time. But are there any comments or questions?

ELAINE PRUIS: Thanks, Byron. So one of the questions that came out of the Charter Review Team was, is the RAP intended to be included as a full document within the Charter or just referenced? And it was my understanding it was meant to just be referenced. I just want to make sure that's everybody's understanding.

BYRON HOLLAND: Well, we have, just in time, a Charter Review team member to ask that very question. Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Byron. The current and, I expect, final consensus of the group is that the RAP is an operational part of the CSC. In other words, it's one of the things that it has responsibility for and for maintaining because this is its own tool for correcting serious deficiencies, serious problems that have arisen. So the idea we have is not to include it in the Charter, which then meets the point that [Allen] made and, once again, something that we did recognize as being important of having a review mechanism for the mechanism. And again, if we built into the Charter, that would then start constraining what you could actually do with the review mechanism for the RAP. So that, in our mind, was actually quite an important thing to avoid us freezing something that becomes something very much more operational, although I

think everybody is quite keen to make sure that the RAP never needs to be used.

And so that fundamental thing, the RAP is directly an agreement between the CSC and the PTI or any possible successor to the PTI. Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Martin. Any other questions? Go ahead.

LISA FUHR: I see 10 days. I guess that's not 10 working days, it's 10 calendar days. And it's at 10 all the time, so you have 10 days and then if we fail, the revised plan is 10 days, so it's multiple.

BYRON HOLLAND: [Allen]?

[ALLEN]: And actually, in the longer text it says 10 business days. Yeah.

MARTIN BOYLE: Well, over the Christmas and the New Year, that's long.

BYRON HOLLAND: Elaine?

ELAINE PRUIS: Thanks. So we did have considerable discussion about 10 days and how fast it is, but the RAP shouldn't ever get kicked off until we've had plenty of discussion beforehand, so it shouldn't be a shock and everyone should be well prepared to fix whatever is so broken.

BYRON HOLLAND: Trang?

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you, Byron. And to add, I think there's language in the RAPs as well for contingency language that says basically if the 10 business days is not doable, that it could be extended if both parties agree. So I think we do have that additional language, if I'm not mistaken.

[ALLEN]: I mean, I'll add that one of the things we tried to balance in looking at this is the obvious structure that is in the CSC Charter of an escalation, like of steps and measures. So the challenge became the more you have, it's more gradual but the length of the process just gets longer and longer. So three kind of balances the need for escalation but without making it too lengthy

because if it is a real problem, then the timing of the escalation steps can be used to prolong issues. So it's a compromise, actually.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Any further comments or questions on the RAPs? So in terms of chronology, it had been hoped that the ICANN board would have been able to cast their eyes on this at a meeting prior to Puerto Rico. Unfortunately, they were not able to do that but it's my understanding that they will be doing it on Tuesday of this coming week. Sorry, PTI Board, not ICANN Board. PTI Board, Tuesday of this coming week. And at that point, I think we want – because we all have to be comfortable with this language, it's my take that we should not approve this formally at the CSC at this moment in time.

We would want to see what PTI does with it and says. And assuming that they are comfortable with it, then at a further meeting we can approve it formally. So that's the chronology and the why that we're here. I'm encouraged to see that there are no objections or no real issues, which shouldn't be a surprise given how much time we spent on it thus far. And it is certainly my hope and expectation that it will be the same at PTI. But from a process and chronology perspective, no pressure. At least from

a process and chronology perspective, that's the way it's going to work.

Okay. So we'll move on from that and the next agenda item is around procedural item 4, selecting a Chair and a Vice-Chair. And at the previous meeting, we had tasked Bart with putting forward a proposal as to how we actually enshrine this process. And with that, I'm going to ask Bart to walk us through it. But then we also have to have some discussion about, with this process, what are we going to do now? So with that, Bart, could you just walk us through the proposed process?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yeah. It's basically based on the discussion you had about a month ago. As the CSC, you wanted to have a very lightweight procedure in place including the, say, the possibility to appoint a Vice-Chair to ensure continuity in case the Chair itself is not available during a meeting. So really as a kind of fallback position. So there's no – that's one. The term of the Vice-Chair, again, it's annual. That's based on the – I think the Charter and the – yeah, the Charter.

Based on the discussions as well is the February/March timeframe, so this meeting. The reason is around October, there will be new members and liaisons over time, so the election of members and liaisons ends with new appointments in the

October timeframe. To allow the new members, if any, to get familiar with the work of the CSC itself, the discussion reached a point that say this is probably the best meeting to select the new Chair, Vice-Chair, so the new members could participate with an understanding of what the role of a Chair and Vice-Chair is and cast their opinion, maybe even participate or get nominated.

So that's the timeframe. Chair and Vice-Chair, that's clear as well. Then the election of the Chair, it's as lightweight as possible as I could think of. So if you scroll down a little bit, if there is one candidate, it's by show of hands by the full memberships, excluding the PTI Liaison – that should be included – who'll appoint the nominee. The nominee needs to accept beforehand whether he or she is willing to take up the role as Chair. If you have two candidates, then there will be a secret vote. And with the Vice-Chair, you have a similar kind of very lightweight procedure. And that's it.

LARS LIMAN:

Two questions. No, it actually falls down to one. This means that you can actually happen to accept the Chair that doesn't have majority support. If you have three candidates, and one receives 40% of the votes, and then 30% and 30%, the winning will be the 40% one but it doesn't have majority, only has 40% support. I don't know if that's important to you, just pointing it out.

BART BOSWINKEL: Probably there are other scenarios that you could apply and as soon as you start applying it and you want to address it in a lightweight procedure, it is not a lightweight procedure anymore.

LARS LIMAN: As long as you're aware of the tradeoff.

BYRON HOLLAND: Three applicants for Chair of the CSC. That would be – those would be exciting times.

LARS LIMAN: It's quite okay. As long as you accept the tradeoff.

BART BOSWINKEL: Especially if you're aware that the Chair needs to preferably be a member of the CSC.

BYRON HOLLAND: So it's a very fair point, and we just – I think your point is we just need to be intentional about it and appreciate the math. Bart, could I ask – could we just scroll down a little bit, just in terms of the timing and the language on the timing? Sorry, scroll up rather. Further up because sorry, if the term of the Chair and

Vice-Chair, if we go to that paragraph, they will be elected in the first meeting of the calendar year, which would be now, this meeting. And take their seat up at the first calendar meeting of the next year, which would be this meeting. So I just want to be clear on would they be elected at that meeting, okay, and take their seat up and until – so they essentially it's at the election, unlike council elections or other elections where you're elected in one meeting and you take your seat at the end of the next meeting. Question from Kal or comment from Kal, what is it?

KAL FEHER:

Does full CSC equal liaisons or just the four members?

BART BOSWINKEL:

My suggestion would be, as you did in, I think, the first time, because you got the member or the CSC Chair is a member that the full CSC includes members and liaisons. That's as because they are chaired by that same person.

BYRON HOLLAND:

So that's an important question for the group, both members and liaisons. The idea had been that the Chair should be, that's an important word, not a must be, should be a member but that a Chair is elected by all members of the CSC, liaisons and members alike. That's the proposal. Elaine and Jay?

ELAINE PRUIS: I thought we had a statement somewhere that only the CSC members voted.

LARS LIMAN: I was actually also under that impression. This would create a situation where the liaisons would vote in this one specific situation but not in the other, so it seems somewhat unbalanced. I don't have a strong opinion either way. I just again point out the facts of the situation.

BYRON HOLLAND: Elise and then Jay.

ELISE LINDEBERG: Thank you. I agree. I think it's a bit strange to vote as a liaison. At the same time, it's a very small group. So to vote amongst yourselves as members is going to also be a bit strange. I don't know. I think the most correct way is that observer don't vote.

BYRON HOLLAND: And then we probably wouldn't run into the problem of having three people running for it. Yes. Jay?

JAY DALEY: I also don't mind either way. I just think we need to do what the Charter tells us to do in this regard. So it's not – you're sure you're not being clever in terms of the interpretation of it?

BYRON HOLLAND: Ria?

KAL FEHER: If I recall, it was only the four members that voted initially.

BYRON HOLLAND: And I think that's the rub here. That is the way we did it the first time but the words are not really specific and that's in part why we had a discussion about it the first time.

JAY DALEY: Sorry, it's really clear in the Charter. And this is just what it says: Liaisons shall not be members of or entitled to vote on the CSC. And it doesn't say vote what about, I think it must mean vote everything.

BYRON HOLLAND: So from what I hear, I think it's safe to say that even all the liaisons that have spoken and the members here are comfortable with it being a member-only vote. That fair, no objection to that?

Okay, so we can reflect that accordingly in the proposal. Sorry, Jay, go ahead.

JAY DALEY: It's also clear. It goes on, ideally the Chair will be a direct customer of the IANA Naming Function. Ideally, that's a stronger – yeah. I think that means a less – you know.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah, it's not a must but it's a one degree off of strongly, highly, highly encouraged. Okay. So, Bart, you'll reflect that voting will be done by members and should be a member. Any other comments on this? And I have – I got greater clarity on the language and this is my own fault probably just because I was thinking of the general election cycles of being voted in at one and taking your seat in the next face-to-face meeting. But it's actually a vote and become Chair literally at that time and have the seat until the next February/March meeting. Elaine?

ELAINE PRUIS: So just to clarify, the Chairmanship is only for a one-year term?

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes. So with the change discussed, is everybody okay with this or are there any comments or suggested edits? Okay, seeing none,

then we will proceed accordingly, which then brings to the point where we are to have an election. We have all the members here, virtually or in person. And one of the requirements is that the Chair hand this over to somebody else to run the Chair election. So I know we haven't discussed this yet. Elaine?

ELAINE PRUIS: Can I nominate that the Vice-Chair run the election for the Chair?
Or I could do it if you –

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes. Jay, would you like to take this role upon yourself?

JAY DALEY: Okay, sure. We haven't talked about time periods though, have we, properly?

BYRON HOLLAND: Well, that's why I was trying to make the clarification. And like I said, it was my mistake because I had the sort of traditional ICANN election cycles in mind. But I think the wording is clear here that the election is at the first face-to-face meeting of the calendar year and the Chair takes its seat at that point until the next face-to-face, first of the year face-to-face meeting.

JAY DALEY: Okay. So assuming then that this is going to be a full year and continue a full year, okay. Well, I nominate Byron to be the Chair. Do I have a seconder?

ELAINE PRUIS: I second that.

JAY DALEY: Great. And could I ask Kal whether he intends to stand as the Chair?

KAL FEHER: Kal supports Byron.

JAY DALEY: Great. So a quick show of hands. Thank you. Kal's put his hand up. That's done with, thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. I accept. Thank you very much and obviously thanks to the members and the liaisons for all the support in the past year a half, roughly. We certainly made very good progress. Now on to the Vice-Chair election. So you're going to hand the meeting back to me. Okay. I'll take it as received then. So given we know there is going to be some flux in the membership over

the coming year, I would like to nominate Kal, if he would be willing.

KAL FEHER: Kal accepts.

BYRON HOLLAND: Excellent. Thank you. Could I ask for a vote on Kal being Vice-Chair. Members? Unanimous decision. Thank you, Kal. Okay.

KAL FEHER: Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: So with that, we will move on to the next agenda item, which is around changes to the SLE. And before we get an update from Jay and Kal, I wanted to, just since we have Martin right here with us, I just wanted to ask Martin where things stand specifically as it relates to the discussion we've been having about changes to the SLE and in particular minor changes and what we might expect in the final version of your report.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Byron. Yes, we haven't got final wording on this because we had been sitting, waiting for proposals, the final proposal

from you. However, the agreement is that we should mandate CSC to discuss and agree minor changes of the SLE according to agreed and published change procedures. So in other words, it would be supporting the line that you're seeking for addressing minor changes. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Martin. Any questions for Martin or comments? If none, then I'm going to ask Jay, having heard that, how are we going to proceed from here?

JAY DALEY: I don't think there's anything else for us to do there then. The Charter has that. It's simply a question of asking then agreeing with the procedures then afterwards internally to respond that. Is that correct?

MARTIN BOYLE: I think we are expecting to see a proposal from you that is the final version and that essentially is why we have delayed because until we see the final version, we won't have very much idea as to exactly how much detail we should be putting into the Charter Review Team Report. Thanks.

JAY DALEY: I'm just going back. Kal drafted something – it hasn't been sent, right. Okay. That's the problem, right. But it did get our agreement to be sent or not. Was there an –

BYRON HOLLAND: My understanding was that you and Kal were on the brink of sending it and then [Allen] had a small comment and then it got in limbo because you were on holidays and it was in the January timeframe.

JAY DALEY: Apologies. So we just need to tidy up [Allen's] point, which is probably irrelevant, and then send it. Yeah, okay, good.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, so once those edits are done, we will have to circulate it to the list to make sure we're comfortable with it and then we'll forward it on to the Charter Review Team. So everybody here, members and liaisons can expect to see the fine-tuned version of it coming back around on the list. And I'll make sure everybody sees that before we take the next step. Okay.

Any other comments, concerns, questions on that? No? Okay, then we'll move on to upcoming work items. And I know that Trang and Bart have started preparation on some of the things

that we should be thinking about. We also as a group, or certainly as members, have to bring back any potential issues back to the ccNSO and GNSO Council. In terms of membership, I don't know, maybe I could ask Bart, do you have any comments on this?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yes. Let me say that the upcoming selection, maybe Trang you want to speak to it because this is ICANN org driven. So we've been discussing it because the next selection process is we'll start sometimes around a – before or after, that's one of the questions.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Thanks, Bart. Yes, Byron, we've been doing some thinking about this. I know there are a couple members whose terms are going to come up this October, and I believe a few liaisons as well. Our preliminary thinking and what we'd like to propose is that we would follow the same process that was followed when we seated the CSC initially. And that process essentially was for ICANN to initiate a process contacting the SOs and ACs that would be making the appointments and asking them to initiate their own internal processes to appoint members and liaisons and then communicate that information back to ICANN org, and then ICANN org would then ask the ccNSO and GNSO Council to

bless the final slate, which is basically the same process that we used last time.

So that's our preliminary thinking and that's what we like to propose. We're trying to nail down the timelines of this. The last time we initiated the process, I believe in June for an October 1 sort of seating of the CSC, and unless we have any objections, you know, from any of the SO/ACs, I think that probably is the right timing for us to initiate this next election cycle.

BYRON HOLLAND: Elise?

ELISE LINDEBERG: Just a question. So I don't remember, but you sent this to the Chair of the SOs right because we need that to be done. Not to the whole list, to the Chair, right?

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Any other feedback on that? Elaine?

ELAINE PRUIS: Thanks. I have a question, maybe somebody can remind me. So the members who are appointed, myself and Kal and Byron and Jay, we set that up as a three-year or two-year terms, so I think

Kal's was two years which means in October that would be up or we'll meet the one-year mark in October.

BYRON HOLLAND: No, it's been so much fun. It's actually going to be two years, it went so fast.

ELAINE PRUIS: So what does that mean for his Vice-Chairmanship? Yeah.

MARTIN BOYLE: Of course he could be reappointed. Yeah. But it's really to check – we need to check – you decided at one point who is on the two-year slate and who is in the three-year slate. The same is true for the liaisons. And so the people who are on a three-year slate, you can still swap if you want of course.

BYRON HOLLAND: And it's a good point and given the timing of those two things are on opposite sides of the calendar, that is something that can and will happen based on timing. And I think that the bottom line would just at that point, we would have to address. But given those two things, yeah, our spring and fall, or fall and spring, depending where you live. That's going to be an ongoing issue or potentially an ongoing issue

ELAINE PRUIS: So there aren't term limits for members, so Kal could be re-elected and then carried from there, yeah? Good. Okay.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah. Okay. So moving on to item number 2, just preparing for the Effectiveness Review, and then back to number 1.

JAY DALEY: Yes, that's right, sorry. We need to clarify for everybody else that we established that I was definitely the two-year term, you were the three-year term because I'm stepping down because of me having left .nz. Okay. Because we haven't really clarified that properly beforehand. Yeah.

BYRON HOLLAND: In this group, formally and publicly, no, so, yes, two and three years. I'm the two years, right, and you're the three? Okay. Yes, so just to make sure it's completely out there in the public domain. Jay was the two-year term, I'm the three-year term. Now we'll move on to number 2, which is around the Effectiveness survey. And I guess my question, and maybe others have questions here, in terms of any formal role for the CSC, should we – do we need to be appointing a liaison?

MARTIN BOYLE: I think one of the – what should be included in this list as well is the IANA Functions Review. There you definitely, on basis of the Bylaw, need to appoint a liaison, so that’s the IFR. One of the issues right now is the overlap in timing and potential scope of the Effectiveness Review. And the IFR, the CSC Charter Review Team will notice this and there is a discussion ongoing within ICANN org as well, with respect how to manage this, so that’s upcoming. The Effectiveness Review itself is not defined, not in the Bylaws nor in the Charter. It’s mentioned. My assumption would be, and especially for the CSC, that it will be structured in a similar fashion as the Charter Review if it takes off and when. So there might be a role for a liaison, because I think Elaine’s role with respect to the CSC Charter Review Team was very helpful and effective.

BYRON HOLLAND: So I guess that’s my point. I mean the IFR Review is clear, we must. But the CSC Effectiveness Review is unclear. We have some precedent and I guess we’ll wait ‘til we have greater clarity on how that’s going to come to be so it’s just a –

MARTIN BOYLE: It’s a matter of the terms of reference of the –

BYRON HOLLAND: Wait and observe. Okay.

MARTIN BOYLE: In terms of reference of the Effectiveness Review.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you for that clarity. Certainly for me at least. Moving on to number 3. I mean, we know that we will have to appoint a liaison. I'm just wondering where ICANN org is at with the planning for this. Maybe, Trang, can you give us any insight or, again, are we in just a holding pattern right now? At least from the CSC's perspective.

TRANG NGUYEN: Yeah, thanks, Byron. We anticipate that the Board will take action to initiate the IANA Naming Function Review October 1. And essentially, once the Board does that, we'll go through a process to contact the SOs and ACs that are supposed to be appointing members and liaisons to the review team, to ask them to again initiate their own internal processes to appoint review team members. So I think at that point, the CSC will be contacted to appoint a liaison to this review, but as of right now, there's no action required on the CSC part.

BYRON HOLLAND: All right, thank you. So that will be – we should expect something in Q4 of this year though, calendar Q4 at least. Okay, thank you. Any other comments or observations on agenda item number 8? Then we'll move to any other business, number 9. Does anybody have any other business? Elise?

ELISE LINDEBERG: Thank you, Byron. I just want to introduce our new Board member on the PTI, Wei Wang. And I would like – well, if you want to give a short presentation of yourself for CSC, Wei?

WEI WANG: Thanks. I'm new to PTI Board. I think I'm also new to everyone, most of you. I was just nominated last year and appointed by the ICANN Board the end of December. I'm new to the community because mostly I'm actually kind of an engineer focused on the IDN area and I work with the Korean and Japanese expert focusing on the DNS IDN application and repertoire, something like that. It is really my honor to join the PTI Board. Currently, I'm serving in the new gTLD registry and before that, I was serving for – I used serve for CNNIC, the ccTLD.

So I helped import it, server mirrors in [inaudible] to corporate eye. And we also have – personally I have pretty good

relationship with some ccTLD like the .ee and .kr, something like that. As a member of PTI, I [cooperate] with these to [travel past it] to reach a goal of the PTI. We know that the community will review the PTI to see if PTI admit the [quota] of the IANA position and our work, keep working with all of you to meet that goal. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Well, thank you. Welcome and thank you for willing to serve here. Elise? Okay.

ELISE LINDEBERG: Sorry again. I just forgot, I don't know if you've seen that the PTI Board has constituted itself. I'm the new Chair of PTI. Sam Eisner is the Secretary and Becky Nash is our Treasurer. So we're all a new Board.

BYRON HOLLAND: Congratulations, I think. No, and much deserved. Obviously you, of all people, have been involved in this since the very, very beginning so it's actually great to have somebody who's got that consistent thread right through the very earliest days of the transition and through the forming of PTI, forming of the PTI Board, all the work around that, obviously participating here and now into what I hope is sort of the more normalized functioning

of PTI. So thank you for your contribution and your willingness to see it through literally from start to completion. Okay. Still on any other business. Jay?

JAY DALEY:

I had a question for Martin. You were at some point concerned about the review after review after review. I was wondering if you'd had any further progress or anything to report on whether we're still going to get those or if there'll be any consolidation.

MARTIN BOYLE:

I don't think it's within our gift to do anything apart from making it clear in our report that this is a potential problem. And I forget exactly the wording, but essentially what we're saying is that there ought to be some thought given to making sure that you're not reviewing the same thing over and over again, but there is some thought to how to structure the reviews and which review will deal with which bits to feed into this overall matrix so that you wouldn't end up with the CSC being interviewed several times and with reports coming out that had slightly different interpretations of what was said because there is no exchange within them and being a burden on the time of the volunteers on the CSC.

So we're sympathetic to it. We recognize that we cannot say, "This must be done," because it's not actually a part of the Charter. It just recognizes that we shouldn't just be doing the same thing over and over and over again. But actually somebody needs to step back and think about what it is that you're trying to achieve from these various reviews. Does that fully answer your question?

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you, Martin. Any other business? Okay, well, I know we had two hours allocated for this meeting and I'm sure that you'll be sorry to be missing the final 55 minutes of it. But given it is Sunday evening and there's no further business, I'd like to bring the meeting to a close. Thank you very much, everybody and enjoy the rest of your ICANN meeting. Thanks, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]