BYRON HOLLAND: Let’s get going, call the meeting to order, thank you very much. Welcome everybody. For those of us in northern climes, welcome in the dog days of August. Thank you for joining us. We have a pretty full agenda today because some of the working groups have been chugging away and there’s definitely some discussion to be had about what’s happened in some of our sub groups.

So, let’s just jump right in. Everybody sees the agenda on the screen. Are there any issues with the agenda or anything anybody would like to add or comment on, just from an agenda perspective? Seeing none, we’ll take the agenda as acceptable to the group and move into item number 2, the action items.

Action item number one was the new methodology for the reports, starting for the June report, and that has been completed. Number two, Bart was going to come up with some potential scenarios for the SLE change procedure. We won’t go into them right now because agenda item number 5 will speak to that issue in a more substantive way, so we’ll park that for the moment. As we will do with action item number three around the logistics for the ccNSO and GNSO Council approval of any changes to the SLE. Again, we’ll bring that back in agenda item number 5.

Action item number four, Elaine was to circulate to our group, to the CSC, the proposed changes to the Charter, and that has been completed. We will have some further discussion on that item later too. And action item number five, a little more logistical around what we’re going to do in terms of the annual report and annual reporting as we move toward the Abu Dhabi meeting. And again, we have that in a more fulsome item in agenda item number 6, so we’ll park that for now until we come to it in agenda item number 6. That’s where we are on the action items. Any questions or comments on the action items? Given, most of them are coming back around later in the agenda.

Seeing or hearing none, we will move on to the standard substance of this call which is around the PTI Report to the CSC, which again, this month met the 100% mark for the SLA thresholds for the July reporting period. But Elise, it’s almost anti-climactic now, is there anything you’d like to draw our attention to in the 100% report?

ELISE GERICH: Well, I would like to mention the addendum, because we are continuing to add the information related to the IDN Table Processing and there were no root zone replications or root server changes. But we also added the information that we had some difficulty with our collection tool this month, and at one point we had to do some activity to restore some of the data that we normally collect in the collection tool.

So we have a couple paragraphs that explain what we did and how we recreated the data—we didn’t recreate it, we covered it, didn’t make it up—and how we are continuing to work on remediating and identifying the underlying issue of why we had a problem with the data capture. But we happily had the help of (inaudible) Mohamedy and Kim Davies and Naela and they managed to restore the data so that we were able to meet the 100%.

BYRON HOLLAND: And you’re confident that, ‘cause I think I read in there somewhere there’s about a 90 hour period in question?

ELISE GERICH: Yes, and Ella, would you like to speak to that specifically, because you were mostly involved in this? Naela, are you on mute or not on the call? Okay, if she’s not speaking, I will. So, yes, there was a short period of time and the categories affected were the acceptance recognition time, the email dispatch time, recognition of confirmation time, notification of completion time, credential recovery time, and credential change time. Those are things that are in the seconds, at best, and they’re mostly automated, so we felt that…

Okay, just a second. Amy Creamer’s just come in and she can’t get on so she’s asking me to put mine on speaker so she can hear us. Anyway, so we’re confident that there were no anomalous activities during that by going through and looking at the tickets and the time stamps for tickets. But we couldn’t recreate the data in the SLE dashboard for that period of time for just those categories. So, are there any other questions about that?

BYRON HOLLAND: Any questions by any of the CSC members or observers?

BART BOSWINKEL: Byron, Kal had his hand up.

BYRON HOLLAND: Go ahead, Kal.

KAL FEHER: Thanks, Byron. My comment was actually on IDN Table information. It would be useful, not on this call, but perhaps offline, if Kim could perhaps give us an idea of the processes involved so that we could start to move to an effective SLA or a useful SLA for those. Just so we can understand what the mechanics of what’s happening and what’s involved.

Because I noted that one of the required some revisions by the submitter and it would be useful to know how that breaks down, whether most of the time is spent waiting for the submitter or most of it’s spent analyzing the table. So, before we can come up with a useful SLA it’s definitely important to understand what a reasonable process actually looks like.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks for the question, Kal. Elise, do you have a comment on that?

ELISE GERICH: I was just going to ask, would this be an action for us to follow up, Kal, with you, after sometime between this meeting and the next meeting? Or how would you like to proceed? Just so I can understand clearly what the request is.

KAL FEHER: Yes, I just replied in chat but I realized you weren’t on the chat. Yes, a follow up is fine.

ELISE GERICH: Okay, thank you. I have Amy Creamer with me, just for the record, because I guess she can’t get into the Adobe Connect room. Oh, she couldn’t get into the audio, I guess she got into the Adobe Connect. So, I have phone and she has Adobe Connect.

BYRON HOLLAND: Alright, well, between you you’ve got both. And Kal, your hand is still up. Do you have another question or is that just an old hand?

KAL FEHER: That’s an old hand. According to my side it’s down so I don’t know what’s going on.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, and you’ll follow up with Elise. Thank you. Elise, just on the issue that you had, do you understand what the underlying problem was and is there a fix? Was this a onetime thing that’s behind us and do you clearly understand what happened and have a resolution?

ELISE GERICH: No, we don’t clearly understand at this time exactly what happened. We’re still investigating. We hope it’s a onetime thing. But I see from Amy’s chat that Naela’s back online now, and so, Naela, I don’t know if you want to speak to the data collection issue we had and whether or not there’s any further information? My last update was we’re still investigating.

NAELA SARRAS: Yeah, thank you. And sorry about earlier, I think I got dropped off somehow. So, what the issue was, the way the system works is that it collects the data and creates events and then stores those events in the place where the events get stored, and the the dashboard goes and collects these events. The events come from the root zone automation system and then the dashboard goes out and collects these events.

We pretty much know that the 90 hour period, just to the earlier question, it was only the micro-second measurements that we could not restore, because we have other places where we restore these measurements, but not these specific measurements. So, we know what the issue was, the issue is that we restore these measurements in a place for about two weeks and then they get dropped off because more events are getting written, while the dashboard is consuming the stuff that has already been written to this place.

We’ve instrumented something to make the dashboard alert us if these events aren’t coming in for a period of six hours, because it is very unusual for that many events not to come to us in a six hour period. So, we know going forward we shouldn’t see this happen again because we’ve added alarms to alert us right away if nothing is coming in. We are still investigating on why, for whatever reason, those events did not get stored in the stable where we expect to find them.

And I’d like to take a little bit more time, maybe an action item, to give you a fuller report in the next meeting when we finish that investigation. We feel very confident that we shouldn’t have that problem again. We’ve added alerts and bells, like I said. But we’re not 100% sure yet why we didn’t know that those events weren’t getting logged during that 90 hour period.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, thank you very much. So, let’s take that as an action item them for reporting back at our next meeting and getting an understanding of whatever you discovered in the interim. Thanks.

For me, the agenda has disappeared off the Adobe Connect screen, or whatever is supposed to be there right now.

STAFF: The PTI Report was up but I put the agenda back on. Can you see it?

BYRON HOLLAND: No.

ELISE GERICH: It says CSC Report, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. For whatever reason that’s not presenting for me. I have everything around it but not the actual document itself. We did a major firewall upgrade here in our shop and it is wreaking a little havoc with some applications and certainly with Adobe Connect so I apologize for that.

Okay, we’ll move on then to agenda item 3B which is the CSC Report, which at this point is relatively standard. I only have one question around it but before I ask my question, are there any comments or questions that people would like to raise on the CSC Report? Okay, seeing no other hands up, I’m just curious or perhaps have a comment around the proposed wording on escalations, which if we could just skip to that.

So, to date PTI has notified CSC of two escalations. CSC took note of the escalations and has asked that PTI inform the CSC should be additional activity related to the resolutions. I think here the one suggestion I’d make is that kind of leaves it outstanding, it doesn't feel closed, and I wouldn’t want to keep having to have something like this here, so my question is really, do we want to have some way to just clearly identify that these are closed?

Something to the effect that PTI has informed the CSC that no new escalations were received, assuming of course that to be true, and that the two existing ones have been resolved or closed. Again, if that’s absolutely correct. Just something that puts some finality to anything outstanding. Because if there’s isn’t some final statement, I would feel that we would have to continue to have it reflected in some way, shape or form?

ELISE GERICH: This is Elise. I like that suggestion.

BYRON HOLLAND: It’s a suggestion, thank you for that, Elise. But anybody else on CSC membership or observers want to make a comment on that. But again I just feel if they’ve been resolved then we need to state that and then they don’t come back again, unless of course something happens. Otherwise it just feels like there’s an overhang, that this isn’t having been cleared up. Any objection? Elaine, I do hear you but you’re somewhat faint, so please speak up as much as you can.

ELAINE PRUIS: Okay. Yeah, I was going to raise that too. I thought it might be worthwhile to put the dates of the escalations in there, or somehow indicate that this isn’t every month we have the same two escalations, because this text is repeating itself. So, either put the dates of the escalations in, that they’re no longer an issue, or do we want to even remove those paragraphs since this is a monthly report.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah, exactly. So, I mean, I tend to like the date idea, that that puts greater specificity and clarity to the fact that it’s resolved and when. Maybe I would ask Elise and team to just reflect on the comments you’ve heard and what I’ve suggested and I think what we’re suggesting is just, well actually I guess, just being the CSC Report.

ELISE GERICH: Byron, Amy’s typed some text. She tried to capture the text you had said which was, "No new escalations have been received, and the past two escalations have been closed." We could insert dates too. Would you like Amy to try and propose some text?

BYRON HOLLAND: Sure, that would be good. And again, I’m going to apologize, it seems like my firewall’s slowing down. I don’t actually have that. The last thing I have is from James Gannon and I have nothing from Amy. But based on what you just said, yes, something like that. And I think the date, I like Elaine’s suggestion, because that puts greater specificity to the resolution timing. So, yeah, based on what I heard from Amy, and then a date, that sounds good.

AMY CREAMER: Yeah, I’ll send out the changes after the meeting like I normally do.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Any objections to that from CSC? Otherwise we’ll go forward with that. Thank you.

So, let’s move on to agenda item number 4, and that’s the update from the Remedial Action Procedures Working Group, of which I am a member of that so I’m going to provide the update on that. In fact we just met earlier today after having a number of back and forths on email over the past month.

So, first off, it’s still a work in progress. We’ve had continued discussions around the straw man proposal for the Remedial Action Procedures. And we went through some edits. James had put forward some suggestions as well as some ongoing dialogue over the course of the month. And based on the discussions this morning we’re going to turn around a new iteration of that, which is committed to be ready for no later than Tuesday, but I think work has already been done there.

And Elise and team had put together a proposed flow chart that, to their best understanding, mapped to the narrative document that we’ve been working on. I think it’s close, once we fine tune the narrative version, they’re going to take another crack at the process flow. So people can both read the words on the page but also then see a process flow. And that process flow update will happen subsequent to the next iteration of the narrative document being put forward. Again, that’ll be happening next week.

So we’ll have another working group meeting some time later this month, August, and be able to bring it to the full CSC in our September meeting. That’s the status of the RAP Working Group. Unless any of my colleagues on the working group would like to add anything? And/or any questions from the broader CSC?

Okay, seeing none, we will move on to agenda item number 5 around an update on the procedure for the SLE. So, I am going to ask Bart to provide a run through on that and a status update on that.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, thank you, Byron. I’ve shared it, (inaudible) can you share the narrative document? They have used the work flow document which was discussed, I believe, two sessions ago. It was complicated, you asked for, say, a resourcing. Not this one, and then going to the other document. This was just to recap what we discussed. The question was to come up with a scenario to use the Abu Dhabi meeting for all the SLE changes that were suggested.

What I’ve included in the document that I shared with you this afternoon, is say, a description of the work flow, so, a narrative matching the CSC procedure. And the interesting bit is, I hope you can see it, is the table at the end of the document around the schedule for using the Abu Dhabi meeting, so, ICANN 60, to inform and discuss potential SLE changes with the community. As you can see the critical thing, because there is a consultation process which includes a public forum, that is 55 days, so it needs to start and kick off before the Abu Dhabi meeting to use the Abu Dhabi meeting for consultations with specific groups.

And then you can go into the ccNSO and GNSO approval processes, etcetera. In order to meet the date before Abu Dhabi, maybe proposed changes, reports or suggested changes to the SLE need to be ready by, I would say, the 5th of October to open the public forum around the 9th of October. And if you would follow this type of schedule or scenario, the ccNSO and GNSO approval processes by the end of the year or the meetings by the end of the year could be used. So, this is based on consultations with Marika Koning and knowing the ccNSO Council process and procedures, and that’s in the document itself.

So, this is more or less a scenario timeline and the minimal duration of the periods, if you want to use the Abu Dhabi meeting. And I would say the critical date is that the proposed changes to the service levels with a kind of reporting, or any type of report needs to be ready by the 9th of October and signed off by the PTI and CSC and from there then you can use the Abu Dhabi meeting. That’s it, Byron. Any questions?

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Bart. Any questions or comments for Bart? Has Jay shown up yet? No, okay. So, I guess the long and the sort.

STAFF: Jay is on the call.

BYRON HOLLAND: Jay’s on the call? Okay.

STAFF: I think he may have dropped out because he couldn’t hear earlier so he might be dialing back in.

BART BOSWINKEL: And Elaine has raised her hand.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, thank you. Elaine, please go ahead.

ELAINE PRUIS: Thanks, I’m just wondering, is this change proposal meant to be for material changes to the SLE, or will it also apply to, it seems like, the two exclusion procedures we’ve noted where on the SLE doesn’t seem to be the right amount of time for the actual function?

BART BOSWINKEL: I didn’t hear you quite well, Elaine. Byron, could you repeat the question, or Elaine, could you speak up a little?

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes, I would ask if Elaine could repeat it and to try to speak louder.

ELAINE PRUIS: Okay, can you hear me better now? I’m wondering if this process is intended for only material changes to the SLE or would it apply to minor changes as well?

BART BOSWINKEL: The way I understand it this is for all changes to the SLE. So, material changes, if you go down that path it’s defined in the IANA contract itself and the SLE is not part of it, as far as I understand it. But this means any change of the statement of work, or any changes of Section 2 of Annex A to the IANA Contract. That’s with the current wording of the CSC Charter and the IANA Contract.

ELAINE PRUIS: Okay, thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Hopefully that answers your question, Elaine, and it does certainly highlight the fact that it is an onerous and lengthy process which certainly would appear to be required for literally any change. So it’s not something that we want to do very often. That’s an assumption of mine, I guess, but it would seem to be to be something that we would not want to do very often and therefore if we’re going to undertake it we want to make sure we’ve captured everything we can think of at any given point in time. Kal, I can see you’ve got your hand up, go ahead.

KAL FEHER: Thanks, Byron. I just wanted to follow up quickly on that comment from Bart. Does that mean that adding any SLE for the IDN submission and publication is going to be even more onerous than the process before us?

BART BOSWINKEL: I don’t think so but that’s me. I probably need to check with someone more qualified. But my sense is, in understanding the documentation, that’s not the case. This is your basic procedure, and no matter how, say, it will put more weight on the first phases, on defining the scope, but you have to follow this process and these procedures for whatever change suggested between the CSC and PTI.

So if there is a change following another mechanism, so, which is also foreseen, yes, there is another procedure. But this is the basic process for the CSC/PTI changes. And the real issue and what makes it lengthy is the public consultation. Byron, James has his hand up. And Jay is on the call as well.

BYRON HOLLAND: Welcome back, Jay. James, go ahead.

JAMES GANNON: Thanks. I have no substantive comment on what we are doing here, this makes sense to me and it fits with my understanding of what the process has to be. So I’m just going to throw out here that this is essentially a three and a half month process, end to end, so as Bart says, this is something that we very likely will not want to do very often.

So we should have a strong think about whether we want to do this in line with the next ICANN meeting, or whether we want to undertake an exercise ourselves to really go in deep and make sure that we have pulled together absolutely everything we may want to change before we kick off this process. Because even if we identify something small after we’ve started this we’re back into another three plus months process to start again. So, let’s have a think about whether this is the right timing for when we want to kick off this very lengthy process.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, James. Alan has a comment. Alan, go ahead.

ALLAN MACGILLVRAY: Thank you, Byron. Just following along that comment. We might want to consider the first time we go down the road of amending the contract, we may wish to see if there’s an opportunity for putting in a more streamlined process for smaller changes. In other words, rather than have to deal with this lengthy process any time there’s any change, see if there’s an opportunity the first time we do, for example, changes to the SLEs would probably fall in the category of less material than changes to the contract itself. So that’s what we need to consider as well.

BYRON HOLLAND: Bart, your hand’s up.

BART BOSWINKEL: I understand the concern but if you look at it, what really takes up a lot of time is the consultation process in the ccNSO Approval Process. The consultation process is as long because you need to go through a public forum. And if you look at, I assume as the ccNSO and GNSO Councils are involved, which is currently the requirement, then you need to use their consultation process. So, in other words, what we effectively are saying or suggesting, or Allan is suggesting, if you want to make it a lightweight a process then you take out the ccNSO and GNSO Council’s approvals. And the question is, under which and when that is warranted. Who will decide which is lightweight and which isn’t?

BYRON HOLLAND: Right. Which is a 55 day process.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, the consultation process. What determines it is the public forum, with a minimal time of 40 days, you open a public forum where people can comment on, say, the proposed changes. It doesn’t mean that there is any work involved. It could be but you need to go through the motions. And it’s part of the requirement, I would say, especially on the GNSO approval process. And this is what we’re suggesting as well. Jay?

JAY DALEY: Hi. So, it is what it is, and I think that the response is rather than to change that is to look at the nature of the contract and to see what elements of it we think might ever need a more rapid change without that level of consultation. Whether that should be in some form of appendix or side document that can be changed independently without going through the main process. And that that should be limited to some things that we can perhaps consult on initially as, is it okay if we move these into a side document that can be changed more quickly. But if we can’t identify them (inaudible) go into that, then we just have to live with the length of this process.

BART BOSWINKEL: Jay, I understand and I agree, but this is based on the CSC Charter. The CSC Charter provides that the ccNSO and the GNSO need to approve changes to the SLEs before it even goes up to the change of the contract, which is between ICANN and PTI. So it could be, and maybe that’s a good question as well going into the next item, whether and under which circumstances this is needed, and whether that should change in the CSC Charter.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah, and that’s a fair point, and then we get into the timing and logistics of it and whether that discussion can be had in a meaningful way, such that we can actually meet, regardless of the outcome of the conversation, that we can meet the dates required for this potential change to the SLE. James, go ahead.

JAMES GANNON: Yeah, just a quick comment following on from that. I think changing that within the CSC Charter is probably the easier of the two hurdles we would have there. How we’d then reflect that into the IANA Functions Contract, which is also governed by the fundamental Bylaws and everything else, that would be the much bigger hurdle for us to get over to get community support for changing that side of it I think. You know, the CSC Charter piece, I think, will be the easier of those two hurdles to get over if we want to go down that road.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah, so maybe that may in fact be the case and this may be a two stepper, in that we do something on the CSC Charter which provides for the future possibility of creating a change whereby we ask some small sub section relatively, I’m not sure I want to use trivial, but non material issues can be addressed through the SLEs without having to go through the full process. Or maybe that’s two separate steps.

Right now, during the Charter review, we take that first step which provides for that space, and the next time we do a change to the SLEs, that we include these additional powers for the CSC.

BART BOSWINKEL: Byron, may I make one more comment with respect to this table. Was it not included here, and I have no idea how long this will take and I haven’t looked into it, but this is leading up to, as you will see in the document, to ICANN org and PTI org approval process. How long that will take, I haven’t looked into, but that could be substantial, again depending on the process, and I would imagine that the more is done in, say, the first four phases, especially the more in-depth consultation, the easier this type of process will go between ICANN org and PTI org.

As I said, I haven’t looked into this. I have no idea how this would work out. And I can follow up and check with Sam and others, but it’s not included. But that needs to happen as well, as you said, that’s the second phase.

BYRON HOLLAND: Right, okay. Thanks for reminding us of that. I just want to draw people’s attention to Kal’s comment which I think is probably correct. And that’s noting the fact that potential changes to the SLE are likely to be something that this particular group or iteration of the CSC is going to be more likely to have to deal with perhaps then future iterations of the CSC, just by virtue of the fact that this is all new to the community and therefore changes made are more likely to be soon, you know, the need for changes is more likely to become apparent sooner rather than after it’s a well oiled machine. I can’t say for sure that that will be the case but I think that intuitively it does make sense.

So, in terms of where we go from here perhaps I can suggest that let’s just look at the logistics of this and are there any challenges or comments to the table and the timing as Bart has laid it out? Or essentially, we are basically in agreement that this reflects the course of action that we’ve got to take and the associated timing. So, I’ll assume we agree with that then, hearing nothing.

And then if we look at it from a timing perspective vis-à-vis the Abu Dhabi meeting, then by early October, October 9th, we would have to begin the consultation process, which of course means that we would have had to agree on what it is that we would like to put forward, in advance of that. Which, given this is late August, that surprisingly is not that far away and doesn’t give us that much time to actually work on it. But I think we have enough time but certainly not an abundance of time.

So, we have, what would seem to me, general agreement on the process that Bart has outlined. Now we’ll have to think about the process for developing the actual substantive changes to the SLEs, based on everything that we’ve talked about over the last 10 months. And I know that Jay and Kal had agreed to do some of the heavy lifting on this to think about any of those proposed changes. But I think it‘s also important that the rest of the group also reflect on anything that we’ve thought about over the course of the past 10 months, and also staff too. Jay, Kal, did you want to jump in here in terms of any thoughts on the process for how we could actually put pen to paper on creating a list of items that we may want to include in this process?

JAY DALEY: Shall I go first, Kal? So, I’ve been very lax in this process, so ultimately I have a list of things written down personally that need to go into it and it’s simply a matter of arranging a meeting with Kal for us to discuss those things. So now that we have a deadline, that’s a missing motivational element to ensure that I’ll do my part. But otherwise I haven’t done anything so far.

BYRON HOLLAND: There’s nothing like a deadline to sharpen one’s focus and I can certainly appreciate that. So we would have I think have a pretty clear idea of where going by the September meeting of this group, if we’re going to make the early October date. So, I think that speaks to a required date. Kal, have you got your hand up? Go ahead.

KAL FEHER: I was just going to note that I think we have a good idea of the actual SLEs that we want changed and what those values should be and the rough justifications that we would have around those, although we may need to sharpen those justifications. My concern is that the IDN changes are probably much further away. We have a much poorer understanding of what a good would be and a lot less information to back that up, and my concern is that in the face of scrutiny it would be hard to argue one way or the other.

So I think during the consultation process we might be found out with the IDN process in particular. My concern though is if we don’t add it to this list of updates, we’re kicking the can down the road, and we’ll have to justify a second iteration of changes in the future, or simply just the IDN changes. I don’t know how we can change that problem, given a lack of knowledge of the IDN processes.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Kal. Any further discussion? So, what do we do with that, Kal? Because I mean, I take your point and I’m certainly not as close to the IDN issue as you are. But do we take what we have and run with it, recognizing that the IDN are likely just something to require more and take longer and will have to be worked on at another point, on another day?

KAL FEHER: I think certainly members of the Registry Stakeholder Group were keen to have the IDN submission SLEs present. They were not so concerned about the actual value for those submissions, just that they were present and keeping track. So we could come up with a generous SLE and submit that. My concern is that any kind of scrutiny during the consultation process where someone asks why we came up with a particular value, our answer is going to be mostly guess work. I don’t know if that’s a problem or if that will be perceived as a shortcoming of the CSC. I guess it’s an open question if we go forward with a little information or we go forward later with a lot more information.

BYRON HOLLAND: Can I ask Elise, what’s your take on that?

ELISE GERICH: I agree that the IDN table is going to be an issue and I think that we’re going to need more time to discuss in detail what kind of SLAs they are. We’ve been putting together a table which provides information but I don’t think we’ve had any conversations with anybody on the CSC or elsewhere about how that would be interpreted to become an SLA. So, I don’t feel confident, I guess, that we could come up with an SLA by October, or with an agreed upon an SLA.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, thanks. Jay, go ahead.

JAY DALEY: Thank you. So, this goes back to my previous point about what needs to go through a consultation process and what doesn’t. Is there a case to be made that actual values as assigned next to SLA items, perhaps do not need to go through a full consultation. It is the structure of the SLA, it is what is measured that is more important, and that some tweaking of values or resetting of values can be delegated to CSC without going through a consultation process.

BYRON HOLLAND: That’s a good question. I guess the challenge is, is that something we can even entertain and address in this round, or is it something that’s going to have to wait for the next… maybe you weren’t on the phone earlier, and we talked briefly about what can be accomplished in this round versus what may have to be accomplished the next time we go through this process, which could include actually changing the process. James, you’ve got your hand up, please go ahead.

JAMES GANNON: So I was basically going to make the same point that you had so you’ve covered what I was going to say.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. So, in terms of how we get to resolution on IDN, so, let me just back this up. Kal and Jay, you’ve got a list of things that were developed over time. Certainly I think most of the things that are probably going to be on that list, we’ve discussed at some point over the last 10 months. So, part of it will just be simply going through the notes of each of the meetings to make sure they’re captured. And also I would ask certainly staff to help validate that in any way, shape or form possible.

While certainly work, I think that is a relatively understood and straight forward action item, and we have a time for that, by the next meeting. As far as the IDNs go, you know, do we do it in a sense the way we experience the Design Team A working group work, where the SLEs actually came into being. And certainly some of them were not, I would say, crisply understood what the actual ranges should be. But nevertheless, the item was included and a best guesstimate by educated and informed participants was put forward.

And in part that’s why we’re discussing changing these SLEs because over time we’ve come to recognize that the ranges put forward were not crisp enough for us. So perhaps, what does the group think about doing what Kal had suggested, which is just recognizing that this is a metric that needs to be identified and measured in the SLEs? And that we put forward some very generous or wide range, and just be transparent about it, that this is a marker, we are going to measure this, we’ve put forward a very wide range until we understand better what the average ranges are more likely to be, and at some future SLE adjustment we will narrow them down.

And I mean, I think it was to Kal’s point, how do we justify, on closer scrutiny to a consultation process with the much broader community and to my mind it is just simply being transparent. Transparent and consistent. So it would be consistent with the work done previously by Design Team A, and I think it’s also reasonable, and from that perspective I think we could be successful with it in a consultation.

ELISE GERICH: May I pop in, Byron. I’m going to have to get out at the airport soon.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes, please go ahead, and then Jay after that.

ELISE GERICH: My concern with that approach is that at least with the Design Team A we had discussions about what could be measured and we understood how to measure it. I don’t even think we know what we can measure well. We’ve been providing tables but just picking a number out of the air, not just out of the air, but without discussing what we have proposed in the tables for the last three months and how they would translate into measurements, I think is a discussion we haven’t even entered into.

So we’re not quite at the stage of being able to assume a number, in my opinion, but maybe others on my team feel differently, but we haven’t had that kind of conversation and we haven’t had it with the CSC members either. Go ahead whoever’s next.

BYRON HOLLAND: Jay, go ahead.

JAY DALEY: Thank you. So, I agree with Elise here. I think that there are two things that we should be doing here. One of them is that we should be developing a light weight process, or a process, as to how a new SLA line item is introduced, which has a definition period process, and a measurement period for PTI to be able to understand what the implications of that, then other periods afterwards until we end up with a final figure and a final defined line item. Which is, as Elise said, roughly what took place through Design Team A processes.

And I’m willing to draw that up and put that out as a standard process around those things. The second point is, assuming that we are able to do some of that and for this round of consultation have a reasonably agreed definition in there, I really would not like to go through another round of consultations simply to agree what the figure should be that goes in there. I don’t believe that the figure is something that needs to be consulted on more widely.

I think that it is something that is reasonable to be delegated to us as representatives of the community to decide. So, I’m also willing, as part of the work that Kal and I do, to draw up some form of wording that goes through this consultation that changes whatever bit’s necessary, that allows us to then work on that basis in future, if of course the rest of you agree that that’s a reasonable way forward.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Jay. Naela and then James.

NAEALLA SARRAS: Thanks, Byron. Just about what Elise and Jay said, what we’ve been providing is basically a start date and an end date because we haven’t been told what measurements are valuable to the community the want us to measure. So what might be helpful is for us to present at the next meeting, maybe a bit of a high level of what does this process include, what processing steps we do. Because it’s actually a fairly simple process, we’re given an IDN table that we then publish.

So, do you want us to track in the process is what we don’t have instrumented right now, we can take these measurements and report on them, but we don’t know what’s important for this community for us to report on. That’s why you’ve only seen a start and an end date, because literally, if you go into our ticket those are the things that you can find out.

If you want us to track to Kal’s point, how long it takes us to do clarifications and what type of clarifications are being asked, that’s totally fair, we just need to know what those measurements are, and start instrumenting the measurements and start measuring against them. I’m also not concerned about the number, it’s what it is that we need to measure going forward. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. James, go ahead.

JAMES GANNON: I just wanted to come back to Kal’s point about, you know, potentially changing the process during this consultation. So, first of all, I agree that there should be a process for the CSC to agree on, not insubstantial changes, but whatever wording we come up with, on changes that are tweaked rather than material changes within our remit without having to go through a full consultation process. However, we do need to realize that that is a pretty big change to the way that the charter envisions us and they way that the IANA function contract envisions us.

So if we’re going to go down that route of asking for that to be changed, let’s try and get that done as quickly as possible so we can start circulating that and preparing people for the questions that will come on, why are we changing, what was agreed during the transition process immediately and what our justifications are for that, and we will need to have that really, really flushed out rather than being just an initial set of our thoughts. So if we’re going to go try and get that done during this consultation, we need to start working on that really quickly because we need to have that ready by essentially the end of next month.

BYRON HOLLAND: Right, so that goes back to one of the earlier points that Bart made in terms of requiring changes to the charter before we could even really entertain this, so you do have something of a chronology issue as well, I believe. I’d have to map it our but it certainly strikes me as that would be the case. Kal, go ahead.

KAL FEHER: I just wanted to point out that the comment I made earlier in the meeting regarding getting some offline updates regarding the ID process was exactly with this in mind, so I think it would be great if we could pursue that offline; understand the process in more detail and then we might understand how big the problem is. It might turn out to not be big at all and we can [inaudible] up at the next meeting or it might be too big and we’d have to accept defeat [inaudible] out of this phase.

BYRON HOLLAND: Could you repeat the last couple of sentences there, Kal? You faded away, on me at least.

KAL FEHER: Okay, sorry. I was saying that based on whether -- after we’ll receive the offline update to the IDM submission process we could probably make an assessment before the next meeting whether or not it’s reasonable to pursue, including that in the group of SLE’s to be updated or added. So we should have an answer one way or another before the next meeting. I don’t think we need to wait.

I just see Naela’s comment that says [inaudible] provide that update. So that’s what I’m hoping for, that we can learn the intricacies of the process and understand whether or not it’s a reasonable thing to do in the timeframe that we’ve given ourselves. And if it’s not, then by the next meeting we should know that.

BYRON HOLLAND: Alright, good, thank you. That sounds reasonable. So, just trying to bring that to ground, from a process perspective we have Bart’s table where we have agreement that that is it. We have a timeline for the understood changes to the SLE that we want to make and then we have one overhanging issue which is related to our broader capacity to actually make changes without going through the full consultation exercise; and that’s going to require some changes to the CSC Charter before we can do that.

Perhaps that is a good segway to agenda item number six which now becomes very much a related item and that is an update on the CSC Charter Review. So if there’s no objection, we’ll move on to agenda item number six and go with what I know was intended there, but then also add to the discussion what we have just been reflecting on in terms of our ability to make minor changes without going through a full consultation process.

So Elaine, I know you’ve been working on the Charter Review and circulated a draft to the CSC. Could I ask you to step us through that or at least kick us off for discussion?

ELAINE PRUIS: Sure, yes, I can do that. Hopefully everyone had a chance to review that email on the documents included. Is it possible to just put the proposed changes to the charter in the display? There we go. [AUDIO BREAK]

So we can go through these one by one; several of them have a similar discussion. The first one is just to add the date for when the transfer of responsibilities took place. The next item is, we’re considering changing the title of the IANA functions operator to the Public Technical Identifier or PTI, given that the PTI has been contracted to perform this work.

James Gannon raised an issue on email which I think we should probably discuss that the charter might not want to specifically name the contracted party, but just say whoever it is that’s doing that function. So I’d like to have a chance to talk about that and in that discussion consider that I think there should be some consistency; so if we’re going to name it IANA Functions Operator in the charter it should probably be that as well in the [inaudible] action procedure. Does anybody have any thoughts on keeping IFO in there? I asked James because he --

JAMES GANNON: Yup, I`ll jump in. This was something that we discussed during a lot of the CWG work and it was a chosen distinction that we made to refer in documents such as this to the IANA Functions Operator; not just in the CSC Charter, but across a number of different construction documents that we drafted at the time. The reason being that, you know, okay in reality we all know that PTI is hopefully going to be performing this for a very long time to come and that everything will go great, but one of the big outcomes of the transition process was that we now, as a community, have an ability to change the IANA Functions Operator from PTI to someone else if we need to in the future, and that was a very important I suppose almost political distinction that we made.

I would like to just see that reflected in the documentation as much as we can that the CSC’s roles is currently to oversee PTI, but that may not be the case forever. We may be overseeing another IANA Functions Operator as some stage in the next 20 years. Hopefully we won’t, but I would just like us to consider not moving to the specific contracted party but rather just refer generically to whoever is performing the IANA Functions Operator at the time.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, James. Any objections to James’s suggestion? No? Okay, thank you. Elaine, carry on.

ELAINE PRUIS: Thanks. So along that line note, can we make sure that we’re consistent with and the other documents? I think the meeting action procedure mentioned PTI specifically and not the IFO. Where is there a reason to name PTI in some documents and IFO in others?

BYRON HOLLAND: James, go ahead.

JAMES GANNON: Yeah, I’ll just add, and Kal put in the same. I think that should be the same as well, but we should refer to the IANA Functions Operator in those as well. I don’t see any issue with that.

ELAINE PRUIS: All right. So then the next one is changing the phrase “poor performance” to “performance issues”, and removing the reference to the procedures within the Annex. [AUDIO BREAK]

Any comments on that one? Is everybody okay with that? [AUDIO BREAK]

BYRON HOLLAND: I think if you hear silence, you have consensus and carry on.

ELAINE PRUIS: The next one is just, again, the IANA Functions Operator being changed to PTI, that we can strike that change, so we’re keeping the IFO there. The next item it just rephrases that the CSC can escalate to the ccNSO and GNSO instead to know the CSC can raise these issues via the remedial action procedure, so just clarifying that the CSC wouldn’t go directly to ccNSO and GNSO.

Okay, five seconds of silence on that, I will move on. So next is making sure that there is consistency with the Naming Function Contract, let’s make it clear that the CSC action is only in respect to individual complaints if there is a performance issue identified. So the CSC would not go directly to the PTI board as the original text seems to indicate.

Okay, the next box is again IANA Functions Operator PTI, we’ll strike that as suggested change, so PTI will be removed and IFO stays the same.

Then the next box, the text that’s rather lengthy here, the interesting part is at the end where we have a statement that says any recommended change that does not require a change to the IANA Functions Contract must be approved by ccNSO and RySG.

BYRON HOLLAND: Can you explain that one, Elaine?

ELAINE PRUIS: Over in the third box is an explanation. The new language is meant to make it clear that if an improvement involve will change the contract, the process is more complex and it involves more than the ccNSO and RySG’s approval.

JAY DALEY: Okay.

ELAINE PRUIS: It reads [CROSSTALK] inverse, but that’s the intention.

BYRON HOLLAND: But it doesn’t say what it changed to the IANA naming function contract must involve.

ELAINE PRUIS: So I don’t know if that’s covered somewhere else in the charter, but I believe that’s a lengthy and onerous process that we’ve just discussed, where it goes out to public comment.

BYRON HOLLAND: That’s actually two points further on down, I think, isn’t it? So that’s okay. I’m okay with that.

ELAINE PRUIS: Any other comments on this box? Next one is just changing the IFO to PTI, which we will strike that change. Then we’ve got a new text, it says, “The CSC will develop with the PTI and ICANN a process for amending the IANA Naming Functions Contract in order to implement any change in the provision of the IANA Operational Services or change to service level targets.”

As we discussed, we don’t yet have a process for that, it has to be agreed upon by the committee. So this paragraph has been inserted into the charter to make it clearer that a change process is needed and a consultation should be undertaken.

Okay, next box is just clarifying that the CSC will provide a liaison to the CSC Charter Review Team. I just renamed the IANA Function Review Team to CSC Charter Review Team. James, I don’t know if you have a comment on that, if there’s a concern since this is changing the title. And I see, Kal, you have your hand up. Kal, do you want to go first?

KAL FEHER: Thanks, Elaine. I just wanted to, actually it was on the earlier point I was a bit slow putting my hand up. I just wanted to clarify that that new text, that doesn’t just cover SLE additions and modifications. Is that the intention or is that we plan on having a whole contract update process?

ELAINE PRUIS: Allan, will you be able to address that question? I think this is your text and I can’t recall the [inaudible].

ALLAN MACGILLIVARY: Sure, Elaine, thank you. The idea here is this actually goes back to the previous discussion we were having, that is to say about the need for a more streamlined process for changing the lesser important aspects of the contract. So the intention here is to flag this issue to the CSC Review Team, the CSC Charter Review Team.

Now, in light of the discussion we just had, perhaps the words IANA Operational Services might be a bit of a bridge to far, so we might wanna fiddle with the language here just to make it more general, to be consistent with what we talked about, is to say on the need for a more fast track process for changes to the contract that may be necessary and that are small in nature. So maybe the words would have to be revisited on this in light of our previous discussion. But I guess the question is: does everyone agree with flagging this to the CSC Charter Team? [AUDIO BREAK]

ELAINE PRUIS: Okay, we have Kal thinks it’s a good idea. I agree with that too, so we’ll leave it in there, and maybe, Allan, you and I can work on some --

ALLAN MACGILLIVARY: Yeah, some more neutral language.

ELAINE PRUIS: Yeah, okay. Does anyone have any concerns with changing the following text where it says, “Provide a liaison to the IANA Function Review Team instead?” Instead have that, “Provide a liaison to the CSC Charter Review Team?”

JAMES GANNON: No, I’m good with that.

ELAINE PRUIS: Okay, and then the next box, “The CSC will provide regular updates no less than three per year to the direct customers of the IANA Naming Function.” And it says, “The updates will be provided through the registry stakeholder group and ccNSO during ICANN meetings.” The suggested change is that we would only provide those updates or have a minimum of twice a year, at least twice a year. And that’s to accommodate the new ICANN structure where one of the meetings is the policy forum and it’s significantly shorter than the others, and it’s difficult to get in front of the ccNSO and RySG during that timeframe.

Okay, no objections noted, so we’ll keep that in there. Next text, “Any remedial action will also be reported by the CSC.” Suggested text just clarifies who we would report that to. In the event that CSC invokes the Remedial Action procedure, it will provide regular updates to the RySG and ccNSO of the status of the process. So we’re not just randomly reporting out to the world, we would report to the customers.

BYRON HOLLAND: I’m happy that the specifically named people don’t get it. The wording gives the potentially that somebody could only update those and not make it more public. Is that the intention, that there’s a possibility for private update there or not?

ELAINE PRUIS: I don’t think that was the intention. I think the intention was that be a directive to the CSC so we would know who we were supposed to be reporting remedial action to. If you want we could include a sentence or a comment that says that we will also post it on our publically available website.

JAY DALEY: Or just regular public updates. That’s just one word would do. I think we should avoid that possibility.

ELAINE PRUIS: Okay, so insert public in-between regular and updates.

BYRON HOLLAND: I agree with that.

JAMES GANNON: I would also like to change the RySG to the GNSO as a whole; I think it’s just more reflective if we’re in the remedial action situation. You guys as the members will obviously be briefing the RySG specifically, most interested parties, but I would like to see, you know, potentially could we use the wording, “Will provide regular updates to at minimum the GSNO and ccNSO of the status of the progress,” something like that?

ELAINE PRUIS: Okay, so I saw your note in the email thread and I was curious about the distinction between the RySG and GNSO in some cases over others. So, are you saying that in the case of Remedial Action Procedure it would be broader and to the entire GNSO, whereas every other indication is just to the IANA Function customers which would be the RySG?

JAMES GANNON: Exactly, so the feedback that I’ve got the non RySG side of the GNSO is that essentially what they’re interested in is when things are not going well, as opposed to, you know, the more day to day running of the IANA functions which, your RySGs, they have a vested interest in. But the broader group is interested in, okay, when it’s not working, what are we as the CSC doing to oversee that and what is PTI doing to remediate it?

So, it’s specifically why I’ve called out this one, as we’re in a remedial action situation, something is happening, that is the point when the broader GNSO is actually interested in what we’re doing. Because the day to day management of it is not the focus.

ELAINE PRUIS: Okay, that makes sense to me. Does anybody have any objections to that request? I think we should also review other texts around the Remedial Action Procedure and make sure it includes GNSO and not just RySG. Bart or Ria, would you take that as an action item?

ALLAN MACGILLVRAY: I will, Elaine. It’s Allan here.

ELAINE PRUIS: Okay, great, thank you. So then the next box says that ICANN will provide secretariat support instead of the IANA Functions operator providing secretariat support. We’ll strike the change for the PTI instead of the IFO. And that’s just to reflect the situation we have right now as well as the requirements in the Bylaws. No concerns there?

So then the last item is to remove the text around the proposed Remedial Action Procedures. That was just meant to be an outline or a framework for what we are working on right now. So we’d like to remove that proposed text and put in whatever it is the Remedial Action Procedure group comes up with, or not even put it in there, just reference it as a separate document.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, thank you very much, Elaine. That’s great. Any final comments or questions on that? Okay, well hopefully, Elaine, are you going to Abu Dhabi?

ELAINE PRUIS: If I can get funding from ICANN I will be there.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Well, hopefully you’ll be able to do the same basic presentation to the CSC Charter Review Committee while in Abu Dhabi. We’ll work on that as that date draws closer and your future in Abu Dhabi becomes clearer. Maybe I could just ask Bart, do you have any sense of timing around the Charter Review Team’s meetings in Abu Dhabi?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, we do, and we have some proposed timing for you as well that we’re working on. Ria, could you change the… put it into a sheet. Just for your information, both the RySG and the ccNSO and the have adopted the Terms of Reference. The group is convening and will want to have an informal conversation with you prior to the Abu Dhabi meeting. So probably around mid of October, in order to prepare.

Now, what we’ve done as staff, and unfortunately it doesn’t fit the full screen, but you will see we will propose to the CSC Charter Review to have an informal meeting on Sunday, very early. A CSC face to face public session on Sunday as well during block 3. And the afterwards, back to back, a public session with the CSC, including a public consultation with you on the Charter Review. On day 4, so that’s on Tuesday, a update from you to the RySG, if they need, so that’s tentative. And to the ccNSO which has already been scheduled, or tentatively scheduled, as well as a consultation of CSC Review Team of the ccNSO, ccTLD managers present, and of the RySG.

And then moving forward, as you suggested, we need to figure out whether the CSC Review wants to have a wrap up meeting on Wednesday morning. And a wrap up meeting for you which you wanted to have, tentatively, will be on Thursday during lunch. Lunch hopefully will be provided by the team, by us, by staff. That’s more or less the overall proposed schedule for you and for the CSC Review Team, and we’re working on setting up a meeting, most likely back to back, or during your meeting in October with the CSC Review Team members. That’s it.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, Bart, thank you. That was very fulsome and I think you’ve taken care of 7B for us as well. Any comments or questions on the schedule?

ELAINE PRUIS: Would it be possible to get a copy of that, Bart? Could you send that around?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, no problem. And I think Maria already circulated it today. But it will be on the Wiki so it has been circulated, but we’ll circulate it again. If you’re comfortable then we can put this in a more definite form. I will check with the CSC Review Team as well.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah, it’s pretty hot off the press, Elaine, but I did see it in email just recently. Thanks, Bart, that’s very helpful. One thing I would just ask, assuming we’re done with agenda item 6, we’ll jump right into agenda item 7 which is the actual Abu Dhabi meeting, which to some degree we’ve covered a good chunk of it right here. Just beyond this, what about meetings with other constituents, constituencies? Be it the Board or ALAC or others, how are we doing on that front? Or GAC.

BART BOSWINKEL: I haven’t arranged this yet, say, one of the things is, I will reach out to them. Most likely, I guess with ALAC and others, could be on Tuesday but we’ll use the liaisons to check whether they want to meet with the CSC or not. So, that’s the way we’ve done it, say, about half a year ago, probably that’s the best way. So we haven’t done that yet. This was more a format for the CSC itself and we’ll fill it in after this call, and the next week or two, with the other constituencies.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, that’s fine. So we can take it up again at our next meeting in September, but certainly as an action item, and knowing how ICANN schedules fill up, you’ll want to get on that sooner rather than later. Thank you.

I think the other thing that we talked about as we hit the one year mark for this group is an annual update, and we discussed it at our last meeting. There should be a draft of it. Can we put the draft up? At least of the framework, of the outline?

So, I put forward a draft of a proposed annual update. Given we are currently already running late in our meeting here, we’re past the half hour, I’m not going to walk through this in any detail. It was part of your package. It is a proposed outline for an annual report to the community that we could present in Abu Dhabi. It’s relatively fulsome but I think it’s going to be important for this first anniversary of this new committee. And as such, as you can see from the outline, it does cover a fair amount of ground.

Like I said, given the time I’m not going to walk us through it, but I would encourage everybody to provide me, but the broader list, any comments or suggestions you might have to either add or subtract from this proposed framework. But I’m going to ask that we take that to the list as opposed to discuss it in the here and now. Anyway, take a look at that, see if I’ve missed anything, or if I’m being redundant and covering things repeatedly or too much, and like I said, post that on the list.

Other than that I don’t see any requirements for more materials for the Abu Dhabi meeting, be it the annual report and anything to do with the Charter review and the material required for the consultation, which, between them all is certainly a fairly considerable amount of work. But as I see Abu Dhabi shaping up, that’s I think what we need for. Any other thoughts or comments? Have we missed anything? Seeing none, okay. Then that’s what we’re going to work towards, and like I say, I look forward to any comments you have on the proposed annual report framework.

I will move to agenda item number 8, which is Any Other Business. Is there any other business that anyone would like to raise? Kal, go ahead.

KAL FEHER: Thanks, Byron. This goes to what Elaine was saying. I’ve actually circulated an email directly just to the CSC members but I thought it’s appropriate to raise it now. I think travel support for the CSC might be something we want to consider. I know that as a commercial entity, my organization is unwilling to fly me to ICANN surely for CSC meetings, and my priorities lie elsewhere when it comes to travel. It’s mostly technical. So, I don’t know how we go about obtaining travel support but I think it might be something that we want to pursue.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Let me look into that. I’ll provide some feedback on that in the coming weeks. Okay, any other business? Okay, seeing none, we’ll adjourn this meeting. Thank you very much, everybody, we covered a lot of ground there. So, thank you very much. I’ll see you on the list over the course of the month and talk again in September. Thanks everybody, bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**