
ICANN75 | AGM – Customer Standing Committee (CSC)
Sunday, September 18, 2022 – 13:15 to 14:30 KUL

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Hello and welcome to the ccNSO Customer Standing Committee. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I am the remote participation manager for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put in the proper forum, as noted in the chat. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak, and should leave their Zoom microphones disconnected.

For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Lars-Johan Liman. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you, Claudia. Hello, everyone. And welcome to this meeting with the Customer Standing Committee. My name is Lars Johan Liman, and I'm the current chair of the CSC. And we have a not too extensive

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.

agenda to go through today. But before we get to the agenda, I would like to ask Claudia, to begin with, if we have quorum today.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: One moment.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: We have Brett. We have Gaurav. We have ...

GAURAV VEDI: Glad to meet you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Dima is there as well.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. Excellent.

BART BOSWINKEL: And I don't see Brett or Frederico.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Frederico.

BART BOSWINKEL: Is he in the room? Because I can't see his ...

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Frederico is not in the room as far as I can see.

BRETT CARR: Yeah, he's not here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And he's not on the roster. Is he? For Zoom.

BART BOSWINKEL: Somebody is connecting.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. For the time being, I will note that we do not have quorum to make decisions. Which is an interesting thing that we will comment on later in this meeting.

Since this is a physical meeting and we rarely have those, I would like everyone around the table to introduce themselves and say what relationship you have to the CSC and your affiliation and so on. So, can we please start at the far right?

DAVID CAKE: I'm David Cake of the ...

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Affiliated with ...

DAVID CAKE: GNSO, NCSG.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, thanks. James.

JAMES GANNON: Hi. James Gannon, current PTI Board member and former CSC member.

KIM DAVIES: Kim Davies, head of IANA, PTI board member.

LISE FUHR: Lise Fuhr, chair of PTI Board.

MARILIA HIRANO: Marilia Hirano, Director of Strategic Programs for IANA, PTI staff.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Jennifer Bryce, ICANN Org representative on the CSC.

AMY CREAMER: Amy Creamer, Director of Operations, IANA; IANA liaison to the CSC.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And again, Lars-Johan Liman, chair the CSC.

BRETT CARR: Brett Carr, currently vice-chair of the CSC.

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard, Army Research Lab. I'll be the liaison from our RSSAC.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche, CSC [inaudible].

GAURAV VEDI: Gaurav Vedi, member of CSC and representing Registries Stakeholder Group and GNSO.

SEAN COPELAND: Sean Copeland, nic.vi and ccNSO.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. We have an agenda. You have it on the screen. I received a request to change the order on the agenda a bit: since the PTI Board members have a time conflict, that we move point 6 here which is reflection of chairs PTI Board on the CC on evolution or relation. Let me see. Would it be possible ... We have two things. We will have 5 and 6, and we want to do them in the order.

So Marilia, would it be possible to move you ... I guess you're reporting on the customer feedback thing. Can we move that to after point 6? Is that okay?

MARILIA HIRANO: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Then we will do so. So the customer feedback section, point #4 will be moved to after point 6. Otherwise, things will be kept in order here, I think.

So, we have one action item from the last meeting that was for the secretariat to circulate the findings report from the last meeting. And that has been completed. So with that, we step into the report for August.

So Amy, would you like to speak to that?

AMY CREAMER: Yes. Claudia, are you able to pull the performance report up? Well, we met PTI. IANA met 100% over SLAs for the month of August. And that's pretty much all there is to say. So, great news.

We might want to just move straight on to Jennifer. So you could actually just move right on to the CSC report. You don't really need to pull up the PTI performance report, if you'd like. That's my pass-off to Jennifer.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Before we do, Jennifer, is there anyone who has any comments or questions for Amy regarding this report? I would imagine no, but I will give you the chance, at least. Seeing and hearing none.

Sorry, I don't see the Zoom room, so if someone can keep track of the hands—

BRETT CARR: [inaudible].

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thank you, Brett.

BRETT CARR: Bart has it hand up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Bart has it hand up, but that's okay. Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. Just for the record, Frederico is in the room so you are quorate. As I believe Dmitry is also not in the room, but he's in the session. Thanks.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. And welcome, Fred. Jennifer, please.

JENNIFER BRYCE: Thank you. So you'll see in the Zoom room the redline report that I circulated to the CSC list via e-mails a couple of weeks ago. So this is the report for September redlined against the August one. So you can

see as, Amy said, overall findings. CSC completed the review of the August 2022 IANA report. PTI performance over August was 100%. PTI met all 64 of the currently detailed thresholds.

So those are the only changes apart from the change of the date to August. So with that, I will hand it back to you, Lars.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you very much for that. So, again, the question to the room is are there any questions or comments? James?

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks. Just out of my own interest because I haven't been following as closely as I used to, has the trend of essentially 100% every month continued for the last year, let's say?

AMY CREAMER:

No. We had a system hiccup in May where the system was not sending out external e-mails for about a week. It was sending the e-mails into an internal address that we didn't catch, so our SLAs went down for the month of May and June to 98.7%. We caught it within the week, but we [inaudible].

The way we do SLAs is based on when the order closes, so some of those orders within that month of May did not close until June. So it carried over into two months even though it all just occurred within one week. So May and June were harmed by that one issue.

Other than that, that was the only issue that we've had for quite a long time.

JAMES GANNON: Excellent. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Any other questions? So then I will ask is there anyone of the voting members who is opposed to adopting this as our report? And can you keep an eye on the Zoom, please? I hear no such dissent, so I declare that this will be our report for the August timeframe. And thank you very much to the PTI and to Jennifer for generating the reports. And thank you for very good work—I must add, as usual.

So that takes us to the next agenda item which will now be comments on the initial report from the CSC Effectiveness Review. So Brett, would you like to say something about that? Or do you want me to [lead this]?

BRETT CARR: I'm happy to. I haven't prepared anything so, obviously, the CSC Effectiveness Review Team ... I was a liaison to it, and they've done a lot of great work and have produced a good report which was, in the whole, very positive but with a few recommendations which ... I can't remember them off the top of my head, but I think they were all fair.

My opinion would be that the CSC should submit a report as part of the public comment period because I think it's important we acknowledge the importance of that review and how well it was done. And I don't

know if you want to provide any direct comment on the specifics, but certainly I think we should have a discussion about that—probably on the mailing list rather than here [inaudible].

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you. I agree that we should produce a response and acknowledge, as you say, the good and hard work produced by this Review Team. And I agree with you that the comments that we have received are fair. I will ...

There were a couple of them that relate to, for instance, attendance at these meetings. We have very high requirements for attendance, and in some cases they have not been met fully. We have tried to address that by having rotating meeting times and other things, but it's still difficult.

However, the Review Team has, I would argue, a good remedy for that. They recommend that alternate representatives be appointed for the voting members and also for the liaisons so that there's someone else who can step in if the regular member is not able to attend the meeting. And that sounds to me like a very good solution to that problem.

Let me see ... Yes, there were a couple of comments regarding our monthly reports that pertain mostly to archiving, I would say. We do produce them and we do send them out, but the archiving function has been possibly slightly lacking. And that's something that's probably easy to fix.

Yes, there are also comments about complaints tracking. We don't have many complaints coming in to the CSC, thanks to the outstanding work

of the PTI. But it's noted that if we change the frequency of meetings, which was one idea that was suggested, that the complaints tracking may have to be adjusted to take that into account.

Now in another comment, the video team suggests that we do not change our frequency of meetings. So I guess that's kind of a moot comment, then.

What else? Yes, a comment that we should continue our consultation with the PTI and ICANN, and we do. And it was also suggested that we produce an annual report. And that could be a basis for these annual meetings to have something to discuss around. So I think that's also a good idea.

There were also comments about setting the expectations right for the members who are appointed by the various constituencies so that they have the right competence profile when they get into this group; and also to set expectations right, both so that the appointing groups appoint the right member, but also for the appointee. So that they know what they're getting into when they join this group. And we can probably slightly improve the interaction we have with primarily the GNSO and the ccNSO.

There was also talk about extending the scope for the CSC. And, again, the committee arrived at that was not a good idea because one of the reasons that this group actually functions rather well is that we have a very narrow scope and that we can focus on that and do one thing well instead of trying to do many things half baked.

I think these were the major parts of the review. But as I said, I agree with that. We should create a response. I suggest that you and I, Brett, take upon us to create a draft response and circulate that to the group and—

BRETT CARR: For discussion.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: —for discussion and for your input. And once we have that, we will then finalize the report and submit it as a public comment from the CSC. How's that as a plan?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yep.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So, could ... Yes, please.

BART BOSWINKEL: Liman ...

CLAUDIA RUIZ: We have a hand up by Bart, also.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Hang on, Bart. Just a minute. Sorry. Yes, Bart, please.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. Just one more additional point. And I think that it took quite some time from your meeting time with the Review Team as well, is whether or not there should be a role for the CSC together with PTI on reviewing the SL A's on a regular basis. That's addressed as well. So that was, I think, noting the time you spend on the topic together with the Review Team should be mentioned as well. Thanks.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. Thank you, Bart. Thanks for reminding me. Yes, the CSC works with SLA metrics and it's been discussed to do a general overhaul of all of these metrics and if so, who should do the job. And the Review Team suggests and recommends that the CSC undertake this work in cooperation with the PTI so that we can do an overhaul and see if all of the metrics are still relevant or if we need to add new ones or if we need to modify anything; and that this be a regular event that happens with some frequency yet to be defined. And that, to me, sounds like a good idea, too.

But Claudia, can you please record an action item on me and Brett to generate a draft or strawman for comment to this review?

So, are there any comments or questions regarding this?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, please.

RICK WILHELM: Thanks. Rick Wilhelm, Registries. So from a process standpoint, would this public comment ... This is a public comment on the initial report. Then the final report is going to be issued. And then what happens after the final report? Does the CSC have to take that final report, do something with it, and then issue a document in response to the final report? Because I'm trying to think about ...

The kinds of things that we would want to put in this public comment versus the kind of things that the CSC would want to put in a possible response to the final report. So I just don't know exactly how that's going to work because we haven't seen their final recommendations. Right? And so are we trying to influence their final recommendations or are we trying to respond to what the thing is going to ... Or will we have to finally respond to the final report? I just don't know how that works. Thank you.

BRETT CARR: I don't think we're trying to influence it. I think we're just trying to acknowledge it and agree. But I don't know the answer to your second question. [But maybe you ... Maybe he does].

RICK WILHELM: Yeah, if I could, because I think that if it's ... If we're trying to respond, then I think we should ... If we're going to put in a public comment ... When we put in a public comment to try and influence, if we're thinking

about responding then that would seem to come a step later. But again, I don't know what the process is for the Review Team and about what the CSC has to do with this Review Team response or with the Review Team output. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

So, thank you. My take on this is that what we want to do in this first step with the public review is to acknowledge and actually, from my personal standpoint, support the work that they've done. And once the final report is out, it will contain a number of recommendations. And if they remain as they are in the initial report, I think they're all quite valid and good recommendations.

So we would probably issue a document saying, “Yes, we have received your recommendations. We will implement them as they stand going forward.” And then we will record in minutes and so on as we do implement these recommendations. And the next Review Team will look at what we did and deem whether we actually have implemented these recommendations or not. That’s my take.

BRETT CARR:

Yeah. As I understand it, when we get the recommendations from the Review Team, there isn't anything to check we've done them until the next review.

BART BOSWINKEL:

There is no mechanism in place to deal with that issue. So there is an Effectiveness Review [of the report]. The final report will go from the

Review Team to the ccNSO and GNSO Councils for adoption. And they will inform the CSC itself as well. So there is no real mechanism to force the CSC to implement it.

But, yeah, as Liman and Brett said, afterwards there will be, say, there will be a third review in three years. So there is a regular review and there is consultation, etc., as well. So in that sense, it's not as strictly defined as in other areas. Thanks.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you, Bart. Are there any more comments or questions regarding this topic? I see none in the room.

So then we will move to the next agenda item which is numbered 6 in the agenda, which is reflection from the chairs of the PTI Board and the CSC on what's been achieved and Evolution of Relation. Do you want to start that, Lise?

LISE FUHR:

Happy to do so. Actually, I was just sitting, thinking, listening to these evaluations. We have so little to actually change. It's a luxury that things have been going so well and all of the reports have been well. So I just want to underline that I think this has been a very good committee here.

Just to start, because I wrote, as I said, 200 pages. I just have a short recap of the last six years, and I think it's important to remember the past and also remember why we did the things we did back in the days when we were looking into the IANA Transition.

As one of the co-chairs—and Jonathan Robinson was the other co-chair—we worked hard with the group, and everyone worked very hard. And I think one important change was the CSC that came out where now the direct customers within the naming community have got a vehicle to have those conversations with PTI and to flag if there's anything at a very early stage.

We have been extremely lucky. And you've said it yourself, Lars-Johan, boring is good. And it has been some boring years, also, in the PTI Board. We haven't had big issues, but I think it's important we have the vehicle if things go the wrong way.

So it took us all some time to set up the governance, both of the CSC where Byron Holland was driving a lot of that work, and now our outgoing chair, Lars-Johan Liman. Both of you have done excellent work in the CSC.

The PTI Board, we're also working on our governance and ... We're not working on governance anymore, but now we're more working on our internal processes on how to make this a smooth organization. And the issues are [inaudible] any of the places. And I think it's also a sign that we have a solid organization. PTI is a well-functioning organization.

We have looked into, when we evaluated ... We just had a strategic seminar in June, and we looked into what are there to change from our side—Not as much against or towards CSC, but more towards our sole parent, ICANN—where we think we need to align a bit more there. I think we have flagged it before. We have a four-year strategic [life cycle] where ICANN has a five-year. And it makes sense to combine these.

Also, our Operating Plan and Budget needs to be a bit tighter than it is today because we start planning too far out in the future for something where when we get to the budget, it's more than ... It's nine months. It's a thing that could be more efficient.

So from my side looking at PTI, I think it's important to look at the resilience of the organization. The staff is the most important, and there I think PTI Board needs to look at where do we make sure that, if someone leaves, that we're not in trouble because of good knowledge leaving the organization. It's not a big issue today, but it's something we need to plan for because workforces and competencies that are needed for the PTI organization are difficult to get and there is hard competition in the area.

I think communication is important for us, and I think the CSC ... We're doing a presentation together at the ccNSO meeting. We haven't done this for a while. It's good to keep doing these things even though we don't have any [inaudible] to report. But I think we need to be visible, both the PTI Board and also the CSC.

And I also think it's important that we seem aligned so we're not seen as two different parties. Of course, we should not look as too married because you guys are doing the oversight of what we do. But it's also good to be sure that there is a good communication.

We look at PTI ... And now I'm, of course, stepping down after this ICANN meeting. But how should our communication be also with the other communities with the numbering and the protocol? And I noticed Kim and his colleagues are doing a great job with this communication, but

we have also talked about should the PTI Board talk to the leaderships of the others once in a while.

We shouldn't over engineer it. That's the bottom line. But it's something that I think it's important to test what is the interest in the different communities because PTI is, of course, both something that is needed for the naming but also for the other communities.

And if I look at our collaboration with the CSC, I think the yearly meetings are good. It's also good that, again, we don't have any big issues. But as I always like to say, if you know each other when trouble comes, then it's much easier to solve them fast. So it's important to do these touch-bases once in a while.

So with that, I'm also going to thank you all for the good collaboration we've had. And I've been very fortunate to have an excellent PTI Board, but also an excellent cooperation with the CSC. Over to you, Lars-Johan.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you very much for the kind words. And I can only—what's it called—I can only say back to you that we have a very good working relationship with the PTI and also with the PTI Board. I feel a lot of openness, and that's one of my views in life. People don't worry about things they can see in front of them. They worry about the things that they can't see. So by having openness and transparency, there's a lot less to worry about.

And even as reviewers or auditors, we see very few and small problems. And the rare occasions when we do, we've always had a very good cooperation with the PTI about having them fixed. And that has happened promptly and in a good way.

I agree that continuing these regular meetings, yearly meetings is a good idea. And as I mentioned before, it might be a good idea for the CSC to generate an annual report so that we get an overview of what's been going on for the last year. And that, I would argue, could be a very good starting point for these yearly meetings. So when that recommendation comes in from the Review Team, I will suggest that we start doing that.

Are there any comments or questions from anyone in the audience? I have not actually managed to find the Zoom page for this, so I can't watch the [inaudible].

BRETT CARR:

I think I would just agree with everything that you and Lise have said. I think we've got a great relationship with the PTI—between the PTI and the CSC—and long may it continue. And I think part of it continuing is making sure we regularly get together and we know each other so if troubled waters ever do come our way—which hopefully they won't—they're much easier to deal with if we know everybody and we get on well with everybody.

LISE FUHR:

I think there are two sides to why the cooperation is good. And one is, of course, I think the PTI team worked very well also with the team dealing with CSC. So I think there's all of the things ... I just got the notion from when you talked about what we can't see because all of what we can't see is also the good collaboration of ICANN and PTI teams on making these reports happening.

And then I have one thing to report because we have discussed reports in PTI a lot. Also because we do generate a lot of reports, but there should be a use of the report. So if people would like to read them, fine. And they use them. But don't make long reports if people don't read them. So it's important to find a balance of how much we report.

And I know also, in the name of transparency, we try to unfold it and make it as visible and tell whatever we do to everyone. But we also need to find a balance where people can get the most important parts in a short writing or/and understanding.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you. I will say amen to that because I strongly share your view there. Thank you.

James.

JAMES GANNON:

Thanks. One other point of thought, let's say. And this is possibly being a bit selfish, given my history with the CSC. There's another key area where the CSC and the PTI Board overlap, which is in the RAPs, the Remedial Action Processes. Thankfully, it's something we've never

actually had to go through as a process. But that also means that process has been sitting there for three years and has never actually really been tested.

So it's also another thing that we could also consider at some point in the future—certainly not something that is urgent—to essentially do a tabletop exercise of the RAPs because ever since we wrote them back in 2019, we've never had calls to actually go through that process. And processes can stale quite quickly, and it might be an idea to work out a lean and not heavy way to just do that as a tabletop exercise and see how that works out.

BRETT CARR:

I think that's a great idea. I think, like you said, we've never done it before. So we might find that something doesn't quite work. Or we might find ways we can streamline and improve it. So, yeah, definitely.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you very much for that proposal. That was a good idea. Any more comments or questions? Yes. Kim, please.

KIM DAVIES:

I just want to make an observation that with your departure from the CSC and with Lise's departure from the PTI Board, that actually represents the first complete turnover of membership of both of those organizations. So I think, in a sense, it's kind of an end of an era. The first five-ish years of both the PTI Board and the CSC was really an operationalization phase. We had the IANA Transition. These structures

were written down on paper, but [inaudible] realized into something that was functional. And it was the CSC throughout the last five, six years that took that notion in the Bylaws and converted it into something that is highly effective and operational.

And similarly on the PTI Board—and Lise has been chair for the bulk of it—taking the PTI Board and making sure it operates effectively. So I think, my observation is, we're in a really good position. We're here today and there's really nothing to complain about from either side. It's all working as best as anyone could hope.

But just the recognition that it's through no small part that the pioneers on both—the original PTI Board, the original CSC, and some of our predecessors that are no longer on the Board or on the committee—but the last remaining two, both of you. So an acknowledgement and a thank you as well for being so constructive in getting us to where we are today.

LISE FUHR: Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. Thank you for very kind words. I will note, however, that I'm not the first chair of this CSC. That was Byron Holland, from whom I inherited an already well-working organization. So, much kudos should go to him. And I start to feel like I should wear the badge that my marketing manager back at Netnod once gave me which was ... I was the Netnod dinosaur.

But nevertheless, I am glad that this construct from the IANA Transition turns out to work well because that was the hope when that was all created. And we were all part of creating this structure that we have today.

So I think it's time to move to the next agenda point. And if I get things right in order here, I would like to turn to Marilia.

MARILIA HIRANO:

Thank you. Hello, everyone. My name is Marilia Hirano. I'm the Director of IANA's Strategic Programs. I will give an update today on our customer surveys. And we usually talk about the results of our survey early in the year when the report comes out. We did this earlier for 2021. But I wanted to give an update on what we've done with the feedback that we received and also what's coming. And I also included here our post-interaction survey.

So we'll talk a little bit about the background of our survey culture and how we evolved, then the post-ticket survey and the engagement survey. Go ahead, next slide.

Just for the background, I know we haven't touched on this for a while, but the survey is a requirement in the IANA Naming Functions contract. And I just put it in here that we are required to conduct an annual survey and publicly post the report to the IANA website. And this is done in collaboration with this group, the CSC. Next slide.

The survey evolution. So just a background because I know not everybody has been involved in this from the beginning. In 2012 we

launched our first annual survey, and that was also a requirement in the NTIA contract. And that survey was self-administered, and we used SurveyMonkey. That was the first one.

In 2013 we engaged a third-party vendor to administer our annual survey. And the survey at the time was a customer service satisfaction survey. Every year we would ask our customers how they thought their requests were processed by the IANA staff. And we proceeded with that approach from 2013 all the way through 2018.

In 2016 after the IANA Transition, PTI was formed. And that's when we began engaging with the CSC talking about the survey results and going more in detail for the naming functions. And the CSC helped reshape a little bit of the survey and has been, over the years, providing feedback that has been really helpful to get the survey to where we are today.

In 2018, we launched the post-interaction survey which was an improvement that, over the years, we always got responses that, “I don't remember who you guys are. We processed one protocol parameter request in January. It's October and ...”

The feedback wasn't timely, so it was very hard for us to act on something. And it was hard for the respondents, too, to come back to us with feedback on something that they did a while back. So we developed this tool that will send a survey to the customer right after their request resolves.

And then from that, once that was launched, we changed the approach of our annual survey to be engagement driven rather than request driven.

And then in 2019, we had our first, what we call now, annual engagement survey. And I put the link there to the page where all of those survey reports are published in the iana.org website. Next slide.

So the How Did We Do, as I said, measures satisfaction with a specific request. And I put an example there of what happens once your request resolves. The requester will get an e-mail like this. And it's straightforward. It's, yes, you were satisfied or, no, you were not satisfied. And you submit.

There is ... It's very small. You can't see it, but all of the way in the bottom, it says that we will not send the same requester a survey for more than ... You have to wait a period of 60 days to get another one so that we don't flood you with surveys, especially for those TLD operators that manage multiple TLDs.

And then that survey allows us to provide a timely response when we get a complaint. If the request took too long or somebody requested a .int and it didn't meet the qualifications, then they will give us feedback. And there's a variety of different types of complaints we get. And we are able to respond very quickly to those types of feedback. So it helped us a lot to trend what types of feedback we were getting and respond quickly. You can go on to the next slide, Claudia. Thanks.

So this is the response rate and satisfaction rate of the How Did We Do. I picked the last three months here to share. This is also shared in the IANA website as part of our performance page. So we've had high participation in this survey. It's been a great tool for us to use to do quality management. And the satisfaction has been also really high. You

see July/August. This is for the domain name. We had 100%. It's very rare that we get under a month that we would go below 90% satisfaction. Next slide.

So then we go to the engagement survey that most of you are familiar with. So this is sent to all of the groups listed here. The CSC being one of them. Then we have ccTLD operators and also the GNSO and ccNSO Councils. And then TRs, the trusted community representatives. And then the DNSSEC community and root server operators. This is for the naming functions. We also send it to the IETF leadership RIRs for protocols and naming and numbers.

So that's just a snapshot of what was the participation rate for each of those groups. And we always try to improve those numbers. So this was last year and then a comparison to percentage to the previous years.

And I'll talk a little bit about what we're going to do this year differently because if you look at Segment 7 there, we didn't get any responses. And that's a trend. It's very low, so we're making a few changes to the survey. Next slide.

We talked about this earlier this year. I just wanted to highlight the highest-rated statements from the survey. They relate to credibility. The customers seem very confident about our team's skills and ability to accomplish our objectives and that we have established ourselves as credible, and we have proven to be successful in our work.

And then the lowest-rated statements. It's about innovation. The IANA team is innovative and forward looking. That was rated at 3.7 out of 5 from the naming functions. And then IANA acknowledges when we've

made a mistake as it relates to the customers and stakeholder groups. So those are the two lowest.

And 3.7/3.8 is not considered low, but when compared to the other statements, those are the two where we scored the lowest. And then we keep that and take that into consideration when we're working on prioritization and planning for the next year. Next slide.

Okay so now, from the survey, we identified a few trends based on the open-ended comments that the respondents made. And I listed them here. And also, what are some of the mitigation that we're taking? Or what are we doing to try to monitor the trends? So alternative DNS resolution technologies was one. We are closely monitoring. We collaborate with experts within ICANN and the industry to monitor this trend. It's being discussed here. It's being discussed in many places. So we are always present in trying to stay tuned to what's going on there.

Cybersecurity threats and mitigation was a big one in our survey last year and the year before. We do conduct information security audits. We have tabletop exercises for our business continuity and disaster recovery plans. And we have an open position for an information security expert within the PTI team. So if you know anyone, that position is open.

Data privacy concerns was another one. So we do follow ICANN Org's guidelines for data privacy. We work in close collaboration with the legal department. We have updated the website data privacy policies and all of that to keep up with latest regulations. And we continue to monitor those.

And then lastly—and this is something that we're going to track this year—is the engagement to continue remote or hybrid. Last year's survey, we were asking if people were ready to come back to face-to-face, if they preferred remote engagement or a hybrid. And 50% of the respondents said that they wanted remote. They wanted to continue to have remote meetings. And then 41% said hybrid. And only 17% wanted to go back to face-to-face.

So we're going to continue to allow opportunities for remote participation through webinars, and ICANN is also having our meetings in a hybrid fashion. But we are monitoring this closely as we plan for engagement in the future to see if, this year, we will see a shift; now that everybody has started to travel and participate and engage face to face, if that trend will shift for this year's responses. Next slide.

These were the priorities that were suggested. We asked the trusted community representatives and the DNSSEC community what are projects we should be prioritizing in this area. So CBO, the Cryptographic Business Operations, is what we call that team. So their suggested priorities were to set up a disaster recovery site for key management facilities with the same security levels.

And we're currently being evaluated as part of the SSR2 Review. Part of this presentation that I just saw that ... The SSR2 Review recommendations are now closing and it's going to Board resolution, and we're monitoring this. Part of the recommendations talk about building disaster recovery sites, so we're working on that as part of those recommendations.

Consider rebuilding the KMF and installing significantly more cameras so every step can be viewed from multiple angles. I don't know if anybody here has been following recent KSK ceremonies, but that has happened. There were upgrades to the cameras in both key management facilities. And now if you're participating remotely, you can watch simultaneously, from multiple angles, what's going on in the room.

And KSK algorithm rollover. That was big 2020/2021 priorities, and we are happy to say that there is a project to conduct a study on potential approaches to the algorithm study. It's in progress and we should have this study completed by June of 2023. Next slide.

So for the 2022 survey, we're launching the annual engagement survey where you will all be invited to participate in October. We always wait for the ICANN meeting and run it after.

What's new in the survey? As I said earlier, we will no longer include mailing list recipients. So everybody who will be invited to the survey will receive an individual e-mail invite unique links. We'll not have the general URLs like we used to for the IETF community and the DNSSEC community. Over the past three years we've monitored, and the participation is very low.

The IETF community has over two 3,000 members and the DNSSEC, over 700. So that brings our participation, the invite, to close to 5,000. Whereas, they never respond. So statistically, it's a very complicated ... It's not statistically relevant and it skews the results when we have so many participants and the percent rates of respondents change so

much because of that. And because they haven't participated really in the past three years, we decided that we're going to keep ...

From the IETF standpoint, we have experts and area directors that are part of the IETF leadership. So they will continue to be invited to take the survey. And on the DNSSEC community, we will continue to send it to the TCRs that will provide that input that we need on engagement.

So, trends to look out for. As I said, engagement preferences. We are monitoring to see if people are still going to have that strong preference for continuing remote or if it will shift again to a preference of hybrid and face-to-face as we plan our next travel and our next conferences to speak at.

So please take the time to participate. You will see it in your inbox early October, and we will send reminders. And we can put it in the mailing list when it when it's ready to go out so you it's fresh in your mind.

And that's, I believe, all I had for today. If anybody has any questions.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you, Marilia, for a very thorough report. And thank you again for doing such a great job here.

Just out of my personal curiosity, you mentioned the percentage numbers in the responses to transactions in the early part. So roughly, how many transactions do you process per month, for instance? Are we talking hundreds? Are we talking thousands? Are we talking tens?

MARILIA HIRANO: You mean for the post-interaction survey?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes.

MARILIA HIRANO: So I will tell you. I have it ...

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm just looking for a rough number.

MARILIA HIRANO: Yeah. So for the past quarter, it was about 1,500 transactions.

AMY CREAMER: For a quarter, for three months. [inaudible].

MARILIA HIRANO: For three months, yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: On the order of 500 per month.

MARILIA HIRANO: Per month. Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It will take a lot. Okay.

MARILIA HIRANO: Yes. And then some of them, if they are a bulk request, then it's the same requester. Then they will get one survey. They're not going to get ... Otherwise, the big registries would get a lot.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Otherwise, the first one will be good in the following 200 will be bad.

MARILIA HIRANO: Yeah, exactly. So they get just one.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Right. Thank you. So do we have any questions or comments from the group or from [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Please, Brett.

BRETT CARR: I'll just ask a question which I think I've asked before, but I've got a terrible memory. If I'm a ccTLD operator and gTLD operator, do I get two surveys? They have two different admin and tech contacts on them.

MARILIA HIRANO: If you have two different e-mails affiliated with it, then you [will] because it's by e-mail. It's a unique e-mail address. So if your ccTLD is one e-mail address and your gTLD is the gTLD operator to contact [your] have another, then you would get two.

BRETT CARR: Two.

MARILIA HIRANO: But what I—

BRETT CARR: And if every gTLD has got the same e-mail, we'd just get one for all of them—

MARILIA HIRANO: Just one, yes.

BRETT CARR: —and one for the ccTLD.

MARILIA HIRANO: Yes. It's just one. Unless if you have a preference, then I know that Dmitry has asked to do one e-mail only. So when I see ... He's in several different groups, so I just use that one e-mail so that ... You will get the different questions because the survey is segmented. The questions

that he'll get for the TCR is not the same question he'll get for CSC. So he will get one survey, but he'll just have more questions.

BRETT CARR: My preference is to get one a CSC member, one as a gTLD operator, and one as a ccTLD operator. But I think from what you've just said, that's what would happen anyway.

MARILIA HIRANO: If you have different e-mails, yes.

BRETT CARR: If I've got different e-mails, yes.

MARILIA HIRANO: But then the over overall questions ... There's the generic questions that everybody has, and then you would have to fill out that three times.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you very much. Is there any way that the CSC can contribute and help you with the future work of this?

MARILIA HIRANO: Yeah. You said in the future ...

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Both in the future of the service themselves, but also in the aftermath of a survey with the work that you undertake to react to the survey.

MARILIA HIRANO: That's an interesting point because we like to take the results, especially the open-ended ones, and we compare it to other feedback mechanisms that we have, like during engagement sessions. And we compile it and look at where the trends are coming from. And also with ICANN's feedback mechanisms, too, to see if there's a match to what's going on and what's the hot topic, what are the trends.

So when I do the results with you guys, I can add a piece where we discuss the open-ended and potential areas to work on and get the CSC input from there. In the presentation that I usually do in January, that would be helpful because then we would look at open-ended and see where the trends are. And then the CSC can help provide input and give us feedback on where do you think the trends that we should be working on and on the priorities and provide ... That would be an additional input that we would get to help us prioritize.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. I would argue that. Just please bring that to the CSC. And preferably as items that are clearly stated so that we can discuss them and it'll help them, either as questions or as discussion points or something. I guess that the CSC will be interested in helping you doing that, but the more clear the issue is formulated, the easier it is to discuss it and bring something back to you.

MARILIA HIRANO: Yes. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you very much. Yes, please.

BRETT CARR: I've got one other question. Your response rate, taking the DNSSEC community and IETF community out because obviously their response to it was zero ... And I think I fully support you removing them because there's no point in asking people who won't respond.

But if you take the other response rates, what are your thoughts on the level of responses you're getting? I don't think they look particularly high, but I'm wondering what your thoughts are and whether you've thought about ways you can drive it up. I think the response rate from the CSC was the highest one out of all of them, but I was still disappointed that it was only 56%, to be totally honest with you.

MARILIA HIRANO: Yeah. So when we removed the one person who responded in the IETF community and the 0 in the DNSSEC, when we removed those numbers, it was 2% response rate. It went to 8% response rate one year, a 10% response rate another year. So it does really make a difference in sending those ...

We tried it for three years and we're not getting that those responses. And a lot of the people who click on the link and try to respond, they

already got the unique link anyway. So we're basically engaging with the same people. So we're trying to use this meeting as a way to remind people that we're going to send the survey.

I think in the past before the pandemic where we would be more in people's mindsets. Now that we're here, we have that session in the ccNSO where we're going to ... I'm prepared to remind them that they're going to get the invite and see if they have any questions. As we see the folks in the GNSO, the staff support, we're engaging them to help us send those reminders for them to participate.

So we're hopeful, now that we're here, that we're actually talking to people and saying, hey, and sharing what we've done with the responses—that we are listening and we do take that the feedback into consideration—that will help generate the interest in get them to get this response rate a little bit higher.

I will say that based on our survey vendor feedback, annual surveys like this usually have a 3% response rate. So the fact that we've gotten 12% at the highest, I believe, from all of those years. And then the lowest was 8%. So we're higher than the industry of this type of survey and really high on the How Did We Do, too, because we usually get 30%. The average is about 30% response rate on the How Did We Do.

And people tend to respond when they're unhappy. Right? If you're unhappy about something, you complain. You go and click on it. And when you're happier, you're like, "I'll do it later." And the fact that we have such a high satisfaction rate and it's a high response rate, I'm really happy with Amy and the team for keeping customers satisfied.

BRETT CARR: Well, it's good to hear that 12%, even though it looks low, it's actually high [inaudible].

MARILIA HIRANO: Yeah, it's high. Yes. So it's ...

BRETT CARR: If there's anything we can do to help bolster response rates, we're happy to help.

MARILIA HIRANO: Thank you.

JAMES GANNON: Sorry. I'm going to take some liberty here. This is just my personal opinion. The other thing I was particularly disappointed to see was a response rate from Council and Registry chair of 1 out of 7. Particularly for the GNSO Registry members that are on the CSC, that is very strong feedback I would take back to your stakeholder groups. It's one survey one time a year. It takes about seven or eight minutes but gives PTI in the IANA Team real insights.

So for our councilors ... Well, sorry, I have to stop saying “our.” For GNSO councilors, particularly from the Registries and the CPH, please take that feedback back to your communities and say, “Look, it's 10 minutes

one time a year. It's really valuable to PTI in the IANA Team to get that feedback.”

BRETT CARR:

And especially like you say, give the feedback whether you're happy or unhappy.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you. I think it's time to move on to the next agenda item, somewhat in the interest of time. We have an interesting item in front of us, which is to elect a new chair and vice-chair. I will be stepping down as chair. And that is mostly due to limits of my tenure. I've been on this committee long enough, the Charter says. So it's time for me to step down and we need to elect a new chair.

And we have had a round of nominations on the mailing list. I am aware of only one nomination, and that is Brett Carr. And I have also seen you accept the nomination. So I will ask here and now if there are any other nominations for a new chair for the CSC. And I should mention that this is an interim chair until March where the regular chair election happens, if I remember correctly.

BRETT CARR:

[That, sir, is] actually an opportunity for me to do a terrible job between here and March. But hopefully, I won't.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Right. So I've been thinking about how to conduct this election. There are a couple of options. One is to do it by acclamation, so to speak, here in the room. Another one is to do it on the mailing list. And a third one is to do it as a secret ballot. But I am sure that Bart has something to say about this. So Bart, please.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, I do. Claudia, can you pull up the appointment so we do have a procedure for this? If there is only one nominee, you can do it by acclamation and by the members of the CSC. So that's the ccNSO- and RySG-appointed people on the CSC.

Secondly, if there are two candidates ... Or with the vice-chair, you follow the same procedure. If there are two candidates, then there will be a secret ballot. In this case, send an e-mail either to ... I would suggest, again by the members, and they send it to Claudia either this meeting or next week or during the week. So by the end of the week we know.

So that's according to the procedure. If you scroll down please, Claudia. This is where it's stated. Thanks.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you, Bart. So that actually takes care of that. As far as I know, we have only one candidate for the chair position. We however have two candidates for the vice-chair position. And we will go one by one.

So now we have only one nominee for the chair position, which means that we can do it by acclamation. So I will ask the voting members to

show your support for Brett Carr, who is the nominee for the chair position going forward. Will you support him?

I see yes from Gaurav. Let me see who else is a voting member in here.

DMITRY BURKOV: I support it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you, Dima.

BRETT CARR: Frederico's got his hand up. [Or clapping]. So I think that means he [inaudible].

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Frederico, would you indicate your support, please?

FREDERICO NEVES: Hi, Liman. I support Brett as well.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. And ...

BART BOSWINKEL: Brett is the final—

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Brett, you are the [inaudible].

BRETT CARR: I support myself.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. Thank you. So I find that we have elected a new chair in Brett Carr. Thank you so much for taking over this job.

BRETT CARR: Thank you all for your support.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And I will be stepping down after this meeting. And I will also be stepping back as the Root Server System Advisory Committee liaison to this group, again, because of timeouts in my tenure. And you will have Ken Renard here to my left as my replacement.

For the candidates for vice-chair, we have two. We have Holly Raiche, who has accepted her nomination. And we also have Frederico Neves, who is with us on Zoom. And since we do have two ... And also, I should ask for any more nominees during the meeting here. Is there anyone else who would like to step up or nominate someone for vice-chair? I see none. That means that we have these two candidates.

So I will ask, again, the voting members to send an e-mail message to Claudia indicating which nominee you support. And we will, hopefully, at the end of the week know who will be the vice-chair for this group.

Any questions or comments regarding that? Yes, Gaurav. Please.

GAURAV VEDI:

Hi. Liman, so I'm not sure but I think I vaguely remember that CSC has a procedure and, I think, guidelines. When we initially onboarded a chair and vice-chair a few years back, there was a procedure established that we will have one person, a chair or a vice-chair, coming from ccNSO versus GNSO. So I just wanted to bring it up because if Frederico is ... Because he [inaudible] ccNSO [inaudible]. Brett also represents ccNSO. So I see some sort of conflict there with the procedure. And Bart, since you're there on the call, maybe you can enlighten us with the procedure that we have established.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Can we scroll up, please, Claudia, to the first paragraph? Scroll up. So now you can see the preferences. And this is taken from the Charter. The preference is to have a chair and vice-chairs from the members. So there is no clear preference for either. That they have to come from either the ccNSO. One from the ccNSO, the other from the RySG.

So because of the word “preference,” that was the reason why you see “elected preferably” at first. So that was the reason why, for example, Liman was preferred chair because nobody else would step up as chair.

But going to your question, so there is no clear preference for, say, that they have to come from different groups. But that's something according to the procedure. But the other thing is whether you want

this to happen, that they're both from the same group. That's the choice you have to make. Thanks.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks, Bart. Any more questions or comments? I see none. So I ask the voting members to send their support indication to Claudia in an e-mail. Shall we set the timeline for that? We are now on Sunday. So would you please do that at Wednesday evening?

BART BOSWINKEL: Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes.

BART BOSWINKEL: May I suggest that I or Claudia send an e-mail to the members individually so they can respond to Claudia with the deadline, as you set, by Wednesday to ensure everybody's got the same message and everything else with the deadline? And so before the 1st of October when everybody's [inaudible]. And then we'll inform the full CSC on the result.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That sounds to me. Anyone opposed to that procedure? Seeing none, then I will ask Claudia and Bart to work that out to make sure that happens. And we will hopefully know who will be vice-chair by October 1st.

With that, we move on to the next agenda item which is next meetings. And we will hold a ccNSO general public session together with the PTI and PTI Board on Tuesday. This is in the time slot of 0700 UTC, which ... I'm trying to do the calculation. That's plus 2, so that's 9. So that's 3:00 in the afternoon, I believe. You should check me.

And then we have our regular meeting which will be a Zoom meeting which will be on October 19th at 1000 UTC according to our rotating scheme.

So we have now reached Any Other Business. Does anyone have any other business?

BRETT CARR:

Yes, I have two Any Other Businesses. The first one is, I think, with the new set of members that we've got now, and liaisons, we should probably look again at the geographical spread of the members and look at how we rotate the meetings. I don't think we should do that now, but I think we need to give it some thought over the next few weeks and months so that we don't unnecessarily have people waking up at 3:00 in the morning to do a meeting. Because we may not need to now that the membership has changed. That's my first Any Other Business.

And I'll pause there to see if anybody's got any comments before I move on to my second one. I will take silence as violent agreement.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Brett, that's the reason why you only see the 19th of October.

BRETT CARR: Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: So may I suggest that we do it, say ... We'll figure this out. So do an overview of the geographic spread of the new membership, circulate this online. And that's on the 19th of October. We can set the meeting times for the next couple of meetings up to ICANN76. So that will be an agenda item for the 19th of October meeting.

BRETT CARR: Okay. Thanks, Bart. That was perfect.

FREDERICO NEVES: Brett, I guess it's unavoidable because having myself and Holly Raiche in the committee, we will be basically 12 hours away from each other. So once in a while, one of us will have to be at 2 AM in the morning making the meeting.

BRETT CARR: I'm not suggesting that there won't need to be a rotation. It just might not need to be as severe a rotation as it was before. I think we'll definitely still need to rotate. But it just might be different. Okay, thank you.

And my final Any Other Business is that I want to thank my chair for the sterling service he's given the CSC over the last ... six years?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Something like that.

BRETT CARR: Six years or whatever it is, I think Liman has done a fantastic job. And I think you get a round of applause. Thank you, Liman. And, sorry, we've got a comment.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I was just going to say thank you for your kind words. It's been a very good journey, very much due to the colleagues in the group. And I think we're doing a great job. I think the PTI is doing a great job, and it's a well-working committee. I usually hold it out as the example of ICANN's best working committee. Thanks to all of you.

BRETT CARR: And then lastly, obviously, thanks to Gaurav who's also leaving us today as a member of the CSC. Thanks for all of your work over the last however many years it is. Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL: And Laxmi as well.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes.

BART BOSWINKEL: Laxmi is the GAC representative.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. That was going to be my last words. Thank you all for having me around and enduring my leadership. And thank you to all committee members who are now stepping down. And welcome to all replacements stepping in.

BART BOSWINKEL: Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes.

BART BOSWINKEL: May I have a few minutes? I want to thank you as well for the last couple of years, especially together with Claudia, was really ... We appreciate working with you from our perspective. And Brett as well, as vice-chair. Claudia, can you go up? We do have a little gift for you. And if you really want to see our little gift, just add “.it” at the end of it on the brand and you'll see what it's about.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Yes, I just received a small gift from Claudia. So, thank you very much.

BART BOSWINKEL: You're welcome.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And likewise, I really appreciated working with you two in particular, and ICANN staff in general. It's a breeze. And one with many laughs, which I appreciate.

So thank you, all. I now deem this meeting adjourned. Thank you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you. You can stop the recording.

BART BOSWINKEL: Bye, all.

[BRETT CARR]: Bye-bye.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Bye, Bart. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]