
MONTREAL – Customer Standing Committee (CSC) Public Session
Monday, November 4, 2019 – 15:15 to 16:45 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, I think it's time to get started. Welcome—

AUTOMATED VOICE: This meeting is being record.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. That's a good point. Thank you. Welcome to this meeting of the Customer Standing Committee. This is our public meeting during this ICANN conference. My name is Lars-Johan Liman. I am the interim Chair of this committee. That's one of the things we have on our agenda. The agenda today is not going to be very long. Since the Customer Standing Committee is an auditing committee, as with all auditor functions, boring is good. Boring means that nothing surprising has happened, and that's the way we want it.

The agenda today will first have a bit of welcome and introduction and then a presentation by our previous chair, Byron Holland, who promised a bit of retrospect on his time on the CSC. Then there will be an update from me on the CSC and our activities and then a regular meeting with the action items performance report from the PTI. We will have a presentation on the upcoming budget here from Becky. Thank you.

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.

Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Oh, sorry. Closer to the mic. Yes, I'll try. Then we will have an update about the IANA functions review and then again [cc] chair and vice-chair nominations. That will be the start of our process. Then we will look at what other meetings happened this week that might relate to [cc] work and Any Other Business. So, if you have any other business, please let me know and we will have a look at that at Item 12.

But first I would like to start with welcoming you all to this meeting. I know that Byron will have to leave shortly, so shall we do a quick introduction of the committee since we have new members? I would like to welcome at least Alejandra Reynoso and [D-Mice] over there (Dmitry Burkov), as new members of the committee. We have of four voting members and we are now back to a full committee with the four voting members.

Shall we do just a quick round around the table? Please, from that side.

AMY CREAMER: Hi, I'm Amy Creamer. I'm with ICANN and I support the CSC.

NAELA SARRAS: I'm Naela Sarras and I'm the PTI liaison to the CSC.

ALEJENDRA REYNOSO: Alejandra Reynoso, ccNSO member.

JAMES GANNON: James Gannon. I'm the non-registry GNSO Council liaison to the CSC.

BRETT CARR: I am Brett Carr. I am one of the members of the CSC.

GAURAV VEDI: Hi. I'm Gaurav Vedi, a GNSO member.

BART BOSWINKEL: Bart Boswinkel, support.

BECKY NASH: Becky Nash, PTI treasurer and ICANN org finance.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm Lars-Johan, interim Chair and also the liaison from the Root Server System Advisory Committee.

KIM DAVIES: Kim Davies. I guess I'm just an observer today.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And there's one online.

MARILIA HIRANO: Marilia Hirano with PTI.

LISE FUHR: Lise Fuhr, Chair of PTI. I'm also here as an observer.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche from ALAC. Thank you.

DMITRY BURKOV: Dmitry Burkov, CSC member. I think that's enough.

BYRON HOLLAND: Bryon Holland, citizen.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Allan MacGillivray. I guess I'm a citizen as well.

ELAINE PRUIS: Elaine Pruis, citizen and former CSC member along with Byron.

MARIA OTANES: Ria Otones, CSC Secretariat.

KATRINA SATAKI: Katrina Sataki, audience.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you very much. With that behind us, I would like to give the word to Byron. I hope that you will give us a bit of retrospect of your time on this committee.

BYRON HOLLAND: Sure. Thank you very much. First off, let me say once again it was a real pleasure to be part of this committee and part of the founding group. There are many people in this room right now who've been along for the entire ride. So, of course, thank you to all of you who made it what I think, from my experience on many working groups, like many of us, is the most effective and probably without a doubt the most collegial one that I've had the pleasure of working with.

As I thought about why that was and if there's anything that the CSC may benefit from just my sharing, my perspective, having been here since the beginning – and even what is it about the CSC that the boarder community and other working groups might benefit from. I think there are some of those things, but I also thing there are some that are because of the particular nature of the CSC but also could be important for the CSC to consider and to carry on.

I just wanted to take a few minutes to talk about some of those things. I think it starts right at the beginning with the actual mission of the CSC. Having been on drafting teams and charter drafting teams, as people in this room, it is always remarkable how important those few words are in those initial charter drafting exercises. Sometimes they don't get the attention that they deserve, and then whatever that working group is feels that for the rest of their time. I think to me that was one of the

things that helped really make the CSC effective: it had a very clear and very specific mission. If you'll permit, I'm actually going to read it because I think it serves well some of the follow-on comments. It's not that long.

It is, as I quote, "The mission of the CSC is to ensure continued satisfactory performance of the IANA function for the direct customers of the naming services. The primary customers of the naming services are top-level domain registry operators but also include root server operators and other non-root-zone functions. The mission will be achieved through regular monitoring by the CSC of the performance of the IANA naming functions against agreed service-level targets and through mechanisms to engage with the IANA functions operator to remedy identified areas of concern." And that's it. It's very specific. It's very narrow and, I think, very clear as to what the remit of this particular committee was and is.

I think that that helped ensure that there was really never any debate about what we were doing or why we were trying to do it. That was, I think, a very critical part of what helped lead us and helped establish the path through which we were going to go down over time. As a result, it also made that path very narrow and the destination very, very clear. I think that was extremely helpful, certainly from my perspective as the chair, especially as we built out new processes. We created things over time that didn't exist, but still had a very clear idea of where we were going, even though we were bootstrapping processes from the ground up. That was the mandate.

I think the structure was also very important. Again, I give a lot of credit back to the drafting team folks as they contemplated what was required here. The structure demanded a small team. There's only four voting members. There are only six non-voting liaisons from all the other communities. The notion that the members must be registry operators I think was very important because these were the direct customers. We had many discussions about this as we tried to create this back in the mists of time. They're the direct recipients of the services of PTI.

So, essentially, we had real skin in the game. We were very focused and attentive to PTI's healthy high functioning because, for all of us as registry operators, I would imagine, certainly in my case, they're our number-one supplier. So making sure that they were healthy and high-functioning was in my own self-interest, as it was, I think, in the community's interest as well.

Another thing that was interesting and unique, I think, in terms of structure was that quorum for decision-making was 100% of the members. That is quite unusual. In fact, I don't think I've ever seen that before in any working group or council that I've been on in the ICANN forum. That took agreement and discussion at the beginning and, to some degree, I think helped set the tone for how we would conduct ourselves over time.

It also meant everybody showed up all the time, which, as all of us know, with experience in working groups, you can't say that for many working groups. But we had excellent attendance through the entire

three years that I was part of the CSC. And we had, if memory serves, over the course of three years, perhaps one cancelled meeting. So not only did everybody show every time, we kept our word on having all the meetings.

With such a small group, everybody participated. In a small group, everybody has to participate and actually do the work. I'm happy to say it was my observation that everybody actually did do heavy lifting over the course of their various tenures here.

I'll move on to the team itself. While we're individuals and we all brought something distinct, I think there are elements of the team that we need to consider going forward. The team itself included a couple folks who were part of some of the original work from the CWG Design Team A, going back again to the mists of time. That was very helpful: to have a couple of those people port over from that original founding work to then come on to the Operational Oversight Committee because they brought not only historical memory but actually deep knowledge of why we'd done some of the things that we'd done to get us to this point. That first-hand and deep knowledge I think was extremely helpful and served us well over time. Of course, Elaine was one of those people.

Also, the liaisons. That was debated over time: what the relationship should be there. I think what we ended up getting was liaisons who were both committed and highly supported from their communities. The thing that I thought was also very helpful with the liaisons is they didn't feel they had to talk. They didn't have to take up airtime, but

when they did, they were bringing very useful and relevant content to the discussion, which, as liaisons, I felt was extremely helpful to the discussions. They just brought experience that sometimes the membership itself didn't have or was well-served by hearing. So the liaisons and how we structured that and who showed up from those communities I think was very helpful to the productivity of the committee.

This sounds a little self-serving, but in terms of the chair, I'd had the benefit of significant chairing experience prior, being the chair of the ccNSO and then a number of working groups in the ccNSO. So I had the opportunity to have my stumbles and pick myself up and dust myself up from experiences that didn't go as planned and have the benefit of those sorts of experiences that I think was very useful in terms of chairing this group.

And also strong vice-chairs. That I think was very helpful. Elaine was a vice-chair, again. Very quick to volunteer to help out. I think that made it a really good partnership, not just between chair and vice-chair but also ccNSO/GNSO. That's really important. I don't think we ever experienced any stresses and strains between the fact that we came from two different communities. In fact, I think it worked exceptionally well.

PTI itself. At the beginning, I think there was probably some apprehension and some anxiety in being thrust into the new and what was this registry-driven oversight organization going to do and demand? And what would that relationship look like? But I think, over

time, the commitment that the committee had to try to assist PTI in getting to where we needed to be and that the commentary was constructive and collaborative I think is part of what helped create, I believe, a relationship that has been very strong over the last number of years. Where we have been able to assist PTI and things that they need, we have been able to do that, and PTI has been responsive to our demands and our asks and our requests for improvement or just plain work. So that respectful relationship I think was a really important part of having made this work and not feeling – hopefully this is true – like we were a body that was imposing its will on PTI.

The team of course includes ICANN. Amy was with us all along the way, helping us get things done. Given the politics of how PTI came to be as this independent entity with its own board, etc., of course there was potential contention there with ICANN as an org. But I want to say that the ICANN staff that we've dealt with – Amy and Trang and even from Sam from time to time – have all been very helpful to the cause. So even while there was potentially anxiety associated with the structure of this, between ICANN org and PTI and CSC and PTI's separate board, the interaction with ICANN staff members was very professional and respectful all the way through. So that is key part of making this successful.

Then the team itself. Our team, the CSC team, led by Bart with Ria, was extremely helpful and positive, especially, I would say, having somebody like Bart going forward, who's got a lot of experience of dealing with the overhead of setting new things up – new process, new committees. That's a specific set of skills in an organization like ICANN.

Having somebody who's been there, done that, and knows how to make it work is very helpful. From one chair to the next, just make sure you keep Bart on task. Then he's going to get your materials early.

BART BOSWINKEL: Duly noted.

BYRON HOLLAND: I say that with love, Bart. Come on. We worked together a long time. Don't be shy to lean on Bart because of the institutional knowledge and the memory. There's a huge amount of value there for this committee.

Of course, I have to call out my colleague from CIRA, Allan, who did a lot of background heavy lifting for this committee as well, without which I couldn't have done the job that I did. So thank you very much to Allan.

The problem with naming people, of course, is inevitability you end up forgetting somebody. If I've done that, my apologies. The point is the caliber of the folks who did the heavy lifting and the real work is absolutely critical. I'll come back to that in a moment.

The other thing I would like to say is, when we hear about all the reviews that we were going to be subjected to, I know there was, from time to time, a groan from this group about another review. But be in the charter review or the effectiveness review, I actually, I think, haven't gone through them. They were really quite effective and efficient, and the people on those teams made sure it was so. So whatever we can do in the future to affect the caliber and quality of the people who sit on

those teams, it is in your own self-interest to make sure you get the kind of caliber of people that I think we had on the first go-around because they tried to be efficient, they didn't try to overdo, and they knew the subject matter. I think both CSC and PTI are well-served by committees like that and to take on the board the constructive suggestions that actually came out of those reviews, which I agreed with.

I'd be remiss if I didn't call out Donna Austin personally because she was one of those people who was there from the very beginning in charter drafting who has been with us and watching out for us and watching over us as a committee the whole time. Having that kind of cradle-to-grave viewpoint from charter drafting to watching the organization to the CSC to the review process was very, very helpful because she truly understood and internalized the purpose of this organization and the potential complexities of the relationship with the various organizations as well as ensuring that we do what's required for the broader community.

So, in terms of going forward, those are some of the reasons that I think this group has been effective in discharging its responsibilities, which is really what we're here to do. Going forward, I'd say there's a couple things that I would just call out. If it ain't broke, don't try to fix it. There are a number of processes that we built over time that I think are effective. That doesn't mean we shouldn't adjust and change over time, but not just for the sake of change.

As I just said about reviews, embrace them with open arms. Make sure you get good people on them. So do what you can there. Good advice

came from them at the end, or good recommendations. So have an open mind when those reviews come back around. For the chairs/future chairs, I think it's very important to establish those relationships with the chairs of the ccNSO and the Registry Stakeholder Group – of course, the GNSO chair in general, but the Registry Stakeholder chair in particular – and the ICANN Board Technical Committee. Those are then people you're going to need if anything does go wrong but more importantly just over time for support and awareness of this organization. But again, not that anything will go wrong, but if anything ever did need to get triggered by this group, you want to make sure you have those personal relationships cemented and in good order. Don't wait until something happens to get to know those people. Certainly, keeping the Board Technical Committee well-informed and advised is I think in all of our collective interests.

I think that that brings me to really what I saw as probably the single most important thing, and that was the caliber of the people on this committee. While that sounds a bit self-congratulatory, it's not meant to be. Obviously, thanks to all the good people who did the hard work, but at the end of the day, it's the selection of those people that is so critical. Because we're pointed in different ways, it's really important for the members to go back to their communities and ensure that whoever follows them is of the caliber and commitment that this committee needs and deserves. Like this committee, the early work was done by the drafting team that set it up for success. The work done in appointee selection by our respective councils or communities is what makes, I think, the ultimate difference. That's populating this group

with the caliber of member and liaison who bring both the technical skills and awareness required to really discharge the responsibilities of this committee but I also I think the respect and congeniality that has made this group a low-drama, high-functioning group over the last number of years. So, again, it's in this committee's interest to work with those chairs of those councils and stakeholder groups to ensure that they understand the importance of taking seriously their member nominees to this committee.

So those are my observations. I hope they've been of value. A you process them and contemplate them, some of them you'll be able to take on board because I certainly believe, when I look back at the three years that I've been part of this, those are some of the key reasons and some of the key differences that I've seen vis-à-vis other working groups and areas that I've participated in in the ICANN ecosystem.

Again, I'm Canadian and I'm not trying to pat ourselves on the back. This group has worked differently than any other group that I participated in in ICANN, so I ask myself, why? I've shared with you some of what I believe to be the why. I think we'll be well-served if some of those things carried on.

Anyway, thanks for letting me part of the committee over the years, and thank you for this opportunity to share my observations.

And I'm entirely confident that it's in good hands. Thank you to Lars for jumping into the breach in this interim period.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you, Byron. Yeah, that was a bit of a surprise, but I'm happy to be here. My biggest problem is trying to step into your shoes. Even though I actually have size 12, I really don't fill more than half of your shoes. I think you didn't enough stress your own role in this. Your experience as chair was very instrumental in the success of this group. I wanted to thank you from the entire group and also from ICANN staff. We have a small gift for you that I would bring to you and say thank you very much from all of us.

Thank you for a lot of good advice for the future. I think we can now continue with the next step on the agenda, which will be the CSC chair update. I hope that Ria has a few slides for me that I can work from.

Yes, thank you. You can go for the next slide. This will be an overview and an update of the CSC. Of course, everything in this one is actually down to work that happened before I stepped in as chair, so I will not take credit for any of this. We are, as you noted, in a position where we have me as an interim chair that comes from the unfortunate situation that the we lost two members almost at the same time. So we weren't quorate and the chair and vice-chair left almost at the same time, so we needed to find an interim chair and that ended up being me. I didn't step backward quickly enough.

So we had a time gap where we didn't have full membership in the committee and, as Byron, we require that all four voting members are present to the quorate. So we had to amend the internal procedures to deal with this. We now have new procedures that allow us to proceed to handle the monthly reports from the PTI and to assess them and

issue the CSC report that always follows the PTI report and to do that on a monthly basis on our monthly call. But that's the only thing that the CSC is allowed to take decisions on if it's not fully populated. That way, we can keep the mechanics going and don't have to interrupt the auditing process, so to speak. That has been working fairly well.

The plan right now is to appoint a new chair and vice-chair by December 2019. We now have two new members. They were appointed just – was it a week ago? Two weeks ago? We will use this meeting for interactions and to get them up to speed with this committee. I will also, later in the agenda, open it up for nominations for chair and vice-chair of this committee. We will let the nomination period run. So that will take the actual decision and elect the chair and vice-chair at our next monthly telephone conference. That's the plan right now.

The membership. We have two members from the gTLD. Currently that's Gaurav and Dmitry. We have two ccTLD members, Brett and Alejandra. Then we have the four liaisons from various organizations. So we have Holly from ALAC. We have James from the GNSO non-registry, Nigel from the GAC, and myself from RSSAC. We also have a liaison from the PTI, which has a somewhat special standing, and there is actually slots for, I believe, two more liaisons, one from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) and also one from the Address Supporting Organization, if I remember correctly. They have both declined to appoint members to this committee, so there is an opportunity for them if they would like to do so.

Monitoring and reporting. We produce monthly reports based on what we receive from the PTI. We receive monthly performance reports from the PTI, and they are very boring reading, I can tell you. There's lots of numbers in there, and every square is green, typically. Of course, everything works very well. At the bottom of that report, there is a number/percentage for how well the PTI has met the service-level agreements in the contract. Then we have three degrees when we assess these. So, if it's met to 100%, we say excellent. If it's slightly less, we say satisfactory. Then we request an explanation for why it's not 100%. Then we determine from that typically that it's an issue that we understand why it's there. It's not a systematic issue. It's not a problem indicator. It's a one-time occurrence or something. In those cases, we leave it at that. But it could also be – this has, so far, never happened – that we see something that needs improvement and that it's a systematic problem. Then we can ask the PTI to look into that.

This is the historic table of all the monthly reports that we've received from the PTI. You can see that the performance level is either 100% or just below it. I can report that the October report that we just received from Naela yesterday or the day before sits at 98.4%. That will be dealt with later in the agenda today.

The reasons for metric misses here has typically been either technical limitations where the original SLAs as written in the original contract were, to use my frank phrase, a paper design. It wasn't really tested in technical operation. It has become apparent that the numbers are not well-designed. From that, we've realized that we would like to change the SLA. That was a long process, but it's now quite underway.

The other case is where the SLA is measurement of something that runs for several cycles and involves other parties than the PTI, meaning that someone else is dragging their feet and adding time to a timer where the PTI cannot really influence that, so they cannot take responsibility for that. That's also a broken design in my eyes. So that's also being changed and underway.

Of these SLA changes, we have two underway. One is – no. Sorry. We first have to change the process for changing. The SLAs were originally cast in stone in the contract between the ccNSO, GNSO, and IANA. Changing that contract is a very heavy process. The first step was to take them out of the contract and make them into a separate entity, thereby changing the contract. That also led to bylaw changes for this part of ICANN. So that an extremely complicated process. But that one was finished. Once that was finished, we could apply that new process to these SLA changes.

Not only did we need a process for this, but we also needed a process to change this process. There's always a meta level above everything. So we had to go through that as well. So it's a bit complicated but I hope it was one-time effort so that we now can make things easier in the future. These two processes have been in place since March 2019, and we are now applying them.

So we have these SLAs that we need changed, and the current status is that three technical checks are now completed and in operation. We have new SLAs for IDN tables (Internationalized Domain Names) and label generation rules for those. Depending on how big the change is,

we need to go through different processes. This one is big enough to warrant approval from the ccNSO and GNSO. I was just in their meeting earlier this afternoon and I was told it's on the agenda for this Wednesday's meeting to have that addressed and hopefully approved.

Then we have another one regarding the time for ccTLD creation or transfer. That warrants a public comment according to ICANN's normal processes. It's right now in that public comment period. If you have opinions and want to look at this, please submit your comments now because that comment period is open.

What happens if we aren't happy? Well, if the cc determines that we do see a systematic problem, we can initiate something called the remedial action plan (RAP). That's more or less an instruction to the PTI to look at the problem and come up with a solution and implement that solution. If that doesn't happen to a satisfactory level, we as the CSC can escalate this to the board of the PTI, which is the first step. If that still doesn't work, we can go to the ICANN CEO. If that still doesn't work, we can go to the ICANN Board. We have never, ever been anywhere near doing anything of this, but this is a ladder that is in place that we can use if things go really wrong.

If the RAP has been followed and the performance issue still doesn't go away or isn't resolved in a good way, the CSC has a last measure, which is to turn to the ccNSO and GNSO and ask them to initiate a special IANA functions review. That is as close to detonating a nuclear bomb as you can, but there is this last resort, if you wish, because then you probably

have to look at the entire contract and what services are provided and so on.

Byron mentioned reviews. We've undergone a couple of those. We had the first cc charter review, which I believe was in the original charter – that the operational charter should be reviewed a year later or two years later.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: In the bylaws.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Pardon?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: In the bylaws.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: In the bylaws [inaudible], yes. Thank you. That's been completed. There were some recommendations from that review which have been implemented. So that's one of the reviews that we have behind us. We had a review of the cc effectiveness. That's also been completed and the recommendations have been implemented. Then we have the periodic IANA function review (IFR). That is still pending or about to start, isn't it? Looking at Amy. Would you like to comment?

AMY CREAMER:

Yes. We have the team assembled. We're going to have an informal meeting on Wednesday with anyone who's here. We've already started to set up the first official meeting hopefully at the end of November or December. We've got to [pull out]. We're waiting for people to let us know their availability.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you. The start of this has been somewhat delayed due to unfortunate problems with finding people that fit the bill in the bylaws for how this review is supposed to be composed. They've been solved now, so it's starting its work.

In summary, the CSC is very happy with the performance from the PTI. There are some minor metrics mixed but no service/customer impact that we see and no operational problems. I would rather say the opposite. We are very happy with our interaction with PTI, and what we see from there is, with my words, just stellar work. It's very easy to be on the CSC because it's very boring, as I said.

The CSC itself has now completed our startup phase. I think the committees are working quite well. We'll see now with me as interim chair [how we're] going to downhill quickly, but right now it's actually working quite well.

Also, as Byron mentioned, one of the challenges we have is to make sure that we do receive community interest in the shape of good new members when members are rotated. Since this is such a boring job and we don't really attract a lot of attention – we don't have 200 people

listening to us behind our back here – it could happen that we receive less attention. But I would still like to hope to attract continuously the support of good members from the various constituencies.

I think that's the last slide, right? Are there any questions for me?

Yes, please?

JAMES GANNON:

Hi. Just very briefly, two quick notes. Yes, the SLA changes on the consent agenda for council at the GNSO [inaudible] this week. So that can be assumed to be of no concern. Then also just of interest maybe for the committee is that there is also some ongoing work between the GNSO and the ccNSO on the procedures around the special IANA functions review. We have Katrina here. If anybody wants to some information on that, there's been some serious heavy lifting being done in that are as well. So just as something that surrounds the work of the CSC, that's something that the committee should track as well.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you. Any more questions?

Otherwise I will move on to the next agenda item, which is the action items. Bart, would you comment on that?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yes. No problem. As you can see Action 01 and Action 03 and Action 05 have been completed. 02 – the organized chair and vice-chair elections

– is for the December meeting. The cc to inform and stimulate the [inaudible]. It's ongoing. Part of it is the presentation you just saw, which will be shared with the [inaudible] and the ccNSO as well on Tuesday and Wednesday morning. And it has been discussed this morning as well with the GNSO and the ccNSO Councils' meeting. So that's why it's an ongoing action item.

With respect to the chair and vice-chair election, you see it's also deferred to Agenda Item #9, so back to you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you. Any questions or comments?

Seeing none, I continue with the PTI performance report, which has been provided to us on extremely short notice, or with an extremely short margin, I should say. You had a bit of notice, but the PTI has done a stellar job again. We usually receive it around – what is it? – the 12th of every month, and now it came on the 2nd, just to be in time for this meeting. So I want to convey my warmest thanks to the PTI and the IANA team to Naela for doing this for us. Thank you very much, Naela.

NAELA SARRAS:

Thank you, Liman, for the kind words. As Liman indicated, this month's performance report went in on, I believe, the 2nd. Our performance for the month of October was 98.4%, which represents one metric miss out of the almost 70 that we track. It's actually one metric miss with one single request that came into the IANA. This is the technical check issue that also Liman described earlier that is very well-documented by now.

The change in technical checks took place already. It did not cover this one. In good faith, as we discussed before, we don't believe the fix is to continue to increase those metrics. We think there's some configuration issues that we could optimize in how we perform the technical checks so that these compounded times that add up when we're doing the technical check we can get around not having to be penalized for basically non-responsive name servers when we're doing the tech checks.

Other than that, you see the report in front of you. We've met all the SLAs. All the numbers are included. As of today, I don't have any escalations to report to you concerning the monthly report for October for the performance of October. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you. For the audience, I will mention that, typically, the PTI also includes if there are any escalations of the PTI IANA procedures that are ongoing and, obviously, not this time.

Any questions or comments for Naela?

Seeing none, I would like to move to the next step, which is the CSC report in response to this PTI report. Amy, would you?

AMY CREAMER:

Hi. Yes, we didn't give an explanation to the technical check just based on how we have reported out on it in the past. But if you would like to add something there, you're welcome to. The SLA metric tables did not

have any changes from last month since we're still waiting for the GNSO and ccNSO to approve the IDN tables. We are in public comment, just like we were last time, for the ccTLD SLA changes. So it was very similar to the last month. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Any questions?

Yes, Brett?

BRETT CARR: I think the mention you made of adding a little bit more to explain the context of that technical check might be worth putting on.

AMY CREAMER: It's your report, so ...

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I assume that we can actually reuse text from a previous report [inaudible] or ...

AMY CREAMER: I'll do double-check, but again, in the past reports, I do go back through a year's worth of reports. If we could [inaudible] same SLA to see how we wrote about it. I didn't find us writing anything about this because we had it on our last to make changes to. So any recommendations about what you'd like to say I'll put in there.

JAMES GANNON: It sounded like to me that, Naela, you might have some ideas about what the procedural changes internally at IANA you want to make. Is that something that could be summarized in a sentence or two to go into the report from the CSC?

NAELA SARRAS: I'm sorry. Changes in procedures to what?

AMY CREAMER: He just wants to know if you have an explanation that we can put in this report next to technical check.

NAELA SARRAS: Oh, yeah. Absolutely. We haven't been, but I can easily come up with a couple sentences.

JAMES GANNON: [inaudible]

NAELA SARRAS: Yeah, absolutely.

BART BOSWINKEL: Because it's so early, may I suggest you do it online and that we approve this one during the week online?

[JAMES GANNON]: [Yeah].

BART BOSWINKEL: That makes it easier. We have plenty of time and it's only adding the language.

[BRETT CARR]: Yeah. I think my main reason for mentioning really is we all know what it is, but other people reading it may not. So I think for other people's benefit, [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: The earlier the better because you're flying out tomorrow, aren't you? Yeah.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So this is an action item on Amy? Or you, too?

AMY CREAMER: Naela will send me some text and then we will send it to you for approval or more feedback if you want any changes. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sounds good. Thank you very much. Any other questions or comments?

If not, we move right along. Then I would to ask Becky to ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. Do you need the clicker? Yes. To give the presentation on the ICANN annual budget. Thank you.

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much. I'm going to go through a short presentation on the IANA budget planning with some additional information on the overall planning process.

Just an introduction, the finance team has several team members that I'd like to highlight. I lead the financial planning and accounting team and I also the PTI Treasurer. So I'm working very closely with the PTI management team and the Board. But we're also supported by a director of finance, Shani. Also, PTI, as an affiliate of ICANN, has oversight from the office of the CEO, Xavier Calvez.

The agenda that I'd like to cover is just the draft FY21 IANA budget, including the PTI standalone budget, the planning process overall, and the I have some time for Q&A.

This slide is a slide that we present regarding the IANA functions operating plan and budget structure. In case you haven't seen it, the green area is what we call the IANA operating plan and budget process. On the left-hand side, we have a blue outlined box, which is the PTI operating plan and budget process.

As you can see on this slide, PTI includes the core IANA services. That is what we call the IANA functions. The cost structure for PTI is made up of three types of costs. There's the direct dedicated costs, which are the wholly dedicated employees and activities within PTI. That is the group [ticking] the day-to-day operations and managing the IANA functions.

Then have costs that are called the direct-shared. These are specific allocations for staff and activities from ICANN but that are directly shared into PTI. That includes some finance and other core functions that require dedicated services to PTI, along with IT, legal, secretary, Sam Eisner. Those are some examples of the direct-shared.

Then the final type of costs that are included in PTI are the shared services. These are common communal services from ICANN and that are shared by PTI. We've listed a couple there, which would be services from comms (or communications), human resources, travel, procurement, the ombudsman – that type of shared services.

The right-hand side of the green box has what we call the ICANN-funded component of the IANA budget. This includes costs that are incurred by ICANN for the oversight of PTI and the performance of the IANA services. The types of costs that are included in this area of the budget structure relate to the root zone maintainer agreement, support for the IANA functions review, and support for the Customer Standing Committee.

On the far right, we're just highlighting that all of these boxes together then get added up with all the non-IANA related costs that are within ICANN. That's how we have the total ICANN operating plan and budget,

which, in our financial reporting, is called consolidated, including the separate legal entity, PTI.

As an update on the PTI FY21 draft operating plan and budget, we've been highlighting through various engagements that the draft 21 IANA and PTI operating plan and budget really started its development in the summer time, probably even a little bit before July. But a lot of the budget development and operating plan development occurred throughout the summer months and then concluded with a draft in September.

Then we did have a review with the PTI board, which then approved the PTI operating plan and budget to be posted for public comment. That public comment period started on the 14th of October and runs right through the 27th of November.

On this slide, we're providing a summary of the highlights of the overall IANA functions, which technically is the PTI plus the ICANN-funded IANA services. Just some of the highlights we have is that the overall IANA budget for FY21 has a funding of 10.6 million. As a reminder, the funding is solely from ICANN and is driven by the FY21 expenses. The unique nature of the relationship between ICANN and PTI is that the funding equals expenses so that the funding is always provided and that it is something that equals exactly the same amount.

The IANA functions baseline cash expenses for FY21 are also the 10.6 million. This includes a line item called contingency for .5 million. I'll explain a little bit about the contingency in the next point. This budget of 10.6 million is increased against our FY20 forecast but just very

nominally. Really, everything is steady and stable and we just have the inflationary personnel expenses that are increasing. So, year over year, activities and costs are very, very stable. The total of the 10.6 million, including the contingency fund, is just slightly over our FY20 forecast.

The IANA functions contingency. We just like to highlight that all of our budget plans include a line item call contingency. It is developed for IANA budget as approximately 10% of the direct dedicated costs, and it represents an amount of budgeted expenses that's unallocated to a specific activity at this time. The reason is that our budget process overall in ICANN is a lengthy process so that often we're talking about budgets approximately 12-15 months before the actual activity starts. So we feel it's appropriate to include a contingency just so that, if there's any unforeseen costs that arise during the actual budget year, there are funds that are available for it. We have not had any contingencies. It is just something that is very prudent to include just for the safety and security of having funds available for unforeseen costs.

Capital budgets, which is also part of our overall budget because it's based on a cash basis. We do have amounts included in the FY21 operating plan and budget. It's for some ongoing replacement and improvements for the hardware security module and the key management facilities.

At the bottom of the slide here, we just have a table highlighting the FY21 PTI line item of 10 million as compared to the FY20 forecast of 9.9.—so, again, a very small increase – and the IANA services portion,

which is quite stable at .6 in each year so that really we have the 10.6 million as compared to the 10.5.

This next slide just goes into a little bit more detail about where the costs are primarily centered. As we can see – again, this includes PTI, which has the three different cost buckets, which would be the dedicated direct, the directed shared, and the shared services. Then we also have the ICANN-funded IANA amounts in here as well. Funding is listed at the top. Again, as I have indicated, funding always equals cash expenses because the arrangement in the subcontracting and services agreement has no amounts on or above the total expenses. So it's more like cost reimbursement.

As you can see here, we have the personnel expense on a consolidated basis here, and that's where you're going to see that increase as it relates to year over year, primarily for inflation cost-of-living increases. All other cost categories are quite on par. We do have, just due to some timing, the administration area, which is mostly IT software and hardware. We have a slight decrease there, if you look across at the amounts of .9 as compared to 1.1 as our forecast in FY20. That line item right below administration is where we have the contingency. Again, unless there is any unforeseen, we would not expect any usage of that – unforeseen costs that we'd need to include in our spend. Down at the bottom of the slide, again we've just highlighted the operating expenses as compared to capital. That's just a different breakout there. In summary, on this slide we can see that things are just very steady overall for PTI and the ICANN-funded IANA budget portion.

I just have a last couple of slides just about the budget process and timeline. This slide gives dates at which we have had the PTI operating plan and budget submitted to the PTI board. Again, that date is listed as September 30th. As a reminder, as part of the transition and the work done by the working groups, the PTI operating plan and budget should be submitted at least nine months before the next fiscal year as input into the ICANN operating plan and budget per the bylaws.

The PTI and the IANA budget then were reviewed internally by the PTI president and the ICANN CEO. Then the PTI and IANA budget were submitted to ICANN and discussed as part of a Board Finance Committee for ICANN in early October. The PTI and the IANA public comment period began on the 14th of October and, as I noted, runs through the 27th of November. We typically extend it due to the fact that it crosses over the ICANN66 meeting, so that's why we have approximately 48 days: to account for some for the meeting times.

The next steps in this process are going to be the closing of the public comments. So we certainly that our communities submit public comments related to both the PTI and the IANA budget. Then the PTI and IANA staff report will be submitted to the PTI board for review in the ICANN Board Finance Committee in early December with an expected publication date of approximately the 10th of December. Then we are expecting the PTI board to hold a meeting and we will have a suggestion and a recommendation for the PTI board to adopt the PTI operating plan and budget.

The next couple of steps then is, after the PTI adopts, that goes back to ICANN, and then we expect, also in early December, the BFC to recommend the IANA budget to the ICANN Board. That date is actually subsequent to the PTI board meeting. We expect the ICANN Board to review the overall IANA budget in early January or mid-January for adoption.

These next couple of slides are just an update on the overall planning process at ICANN. I don't want to spend too much time on this. However, we do want to note that there is also an ICANN five-year operating plan and financial plan and the fiscal year operating plan and budget process, which is underway. The fiscal year 21 operating plan and budget will go out for public comment in early December. Again, this is where the overall consolidated inputs from PTI and the IANA budget then get consolidated into overall ICANN. So there's lots of opportunities for public comments.

On this slide here, we're just highlighting that, for anyone interested – we encourage participation – we have a planning and finance session here at ICANN 66 on Wednesday. We also include some of the slides on PTI and the IANA budget on the timeline.

The final thing I just wanted to mention from the PTI side is that we do have a lot of information that's published on the PTI website. We like to highlight that, in addition to annual operating plan and budget documents, we actually also have our annual audited financial statements, which were just published for PTI, again, as a separate legal entity. There is an independent audit and a separate independent audit

report that has oversight from the PTI Board Audit Committee. Those were published for our fiscal year ending in June 30th, 2019. They were published in October.

Then we also are required to have an annual tax form called Form 990, along with some other tax forms. Again, as a corporation incorporated in California, we're subject to the U.S. and California state tax returns. There's information there available on our website.

The final item I'll note is that we do publish quarterly unaudited financials for any of the community members and the public that would like to see that as part of our accountability and transparency. Those quarterly unaudited financials are posted approximately 45 days after each three months of a quarter end within our fiscal year. Those are also shared and discussed with the PTI board.

That concludes the slides that I have. I welcome any questions if there are any.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you very much for that presentation. Are there any questions or comments?

Yes, Dmitry?

DMITRY BURKOV:

Thank you for your presentation, but I still have some questions. Do you remember how many you had four years ago for the IANA function? How many full-time employees were there four years ago? Because it's

strange because when I see [FTE of] 24 [inaudible] something else, I have a question on how it was calculated.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you for your question. I do want to highlight that the FTE that are listed on these slides are going to be the total effort, including those three different types of costs that are included in PTI. I'll just go back to this slide here. FTE for the direct dedicated portion for the FY21 budget is 18. I believe that is very stable with the budgeted positions for FY20, FY19, and I don't know – Kim, if you know [inaudible] transition?

DMITRY BURKOV:

May [we simplify]? Because I have no need for a very long explanation because [inaudible] simply financially calculated equivalent of FTE, which are partly – summarize all the [inaudible] – used PTI from ICANN staff because all of us know that there are no staff inside PTI. It's fully outsourced. Yes, Kim? Now how many? Please, it's important. How many staff are hired by PTI now?

KIM DAVIES:

We moved all the direct dedicated staff you see on the left there into PTI in the last year. There's currently 15 employees of PTI directly.

DMITRY BURKOV:

[inaudible] [contract with PTI. Say they have a contract with PTI.]

KIM DAVIES: Correct.

DMITRY BURKOV: [Or still a primary contract with ICANN [inaudible]]

KIM DAVIES: With PTI directly, yes.

DMITRY BURKOV: [Oh.] Calculation.

KIM DAVIES: Yes. My paycheck says PTI.

DMITRY BURKOV: For me it was a key point and a key question for the last five years.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. James?

JAMES GANNON: I have a very brief question. It may be too much of a finance nerd question, so you want to follow up with it offline. At the time when we did the transition, there was a discussion about transitioning the KMFs as an asset to PTI. At the time, it was decided not to do it because of weird depreciation stuff. But I notice now we have capital expenditure

to do with the KMFs. Does that mean that they have been transitioned or are we just playing around with capital is?

BECKY NASH:

Thank you for your question. I'll start off, and then if Kim wants to add anything. We actually charge the depreciation as a cash expense to PTI as standalone entity and under the services agreement that is in place. So you're absolutely correct that the fixed assets were not transferred. In part, transferring assets between an affiliate and a sole member starts to get a little complicated to have many fixed asset balancing sheets, which in an accounting term. So what we do is we actually charge, as part of this financial close that we do with PTI, both depreciation on a monthly basis and the capital expenditures on a monthly basis.

JAMES GANNON:

Then just a quick follow-up because that's exactly the way I thought it worked. So then would it not be logical that the upgrades for the HSMs and the KMFs be charged as an ICANN capital expense which are then put through the shared services agreement rather than direct PTI capital expenditure?

BECKY NASH:

The process for us of reporting as part of our operating plan and budget all cash flow impacts. So we are actually transferring the cash flow impact to the affiliate. Then the asset is actually on the balance sheet of ICANN. The final, final action is a capital expenditure, but it's not

necessarily on the PTI books. For those that are interested, I think, when you look at the actual standalone audited financial statements, which have a lot of accounting type footnotes, you'll see very clearly that there are no fixed assets. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I think I will have to defer further questions directly to you in the [dearth] of time. We have 20 more minutes to use here.

I would like to move onto the next item, which is the IANA engagement survey. I would hope to get – there you are; thank you – a presentation from Marilia.

MARILIA HIRANO: Can I have the clicker?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Oh.

MARILIA HIRANO: Hello, everyone. My name is Marilia Hirano, for those of you who I haven't met yet. I'm here to talk about briefly the results of our 2019 annual engagement survey. We have been running an annual survey in IANA since 2012. Since 2013, it has been administered by the same vendor. Let me see if I just go here – okay.

Just quickly over the methodology, basically we use the same vendor. They administered everything. Some things changed this year,

however. We changed the focus of the survey to be more engagement-driven rather than request-driven. In the past, we would ask question about, how was your request process? And so forth. And we've gotten over the years a little of responses that, a year after the fact, "I don't really remember what my request was about," and a lot of those types of answers. To address that part, we created a post-ticket survey, which we've been running. We'll talk more about that in our session at 5:00.

For the annual survey, we changed the statements to be more "How are we engaging with you?" So that's what changed. That was the major change for this year. This was the first year we're running the survey this way. Respondents provided input on statements on a scale from 1 to 5. Another aspect that changed a bit was the groups. This year, we invited the ccNSO and the GNSO Councils to participate. We also invited the root server operators. These are more of the newer groups. Other groups have been receiving the survey in previous years.

One last change. Before, everybody would get a unique e-mail from the survey to respond. This year, some groups decided to have ICANN post the link to the survey into the group's mailing list. So we had different groups receiving the survey in different ways.

Just a little bit on the statistics here. The response rate of this group (the CSC). We had a 42% response rate. Thank you for providing your feedback. Then we had the ccTLD operators (12%), the ccNSO Council (15%), the gTLD operators (3%), the GNSO Council (13%), the TCRS (10%), the root DNSSEC community (5%), and then root server

operators responded at 12%. The groups with the asterisks there were the ones who got the link in a mailing list.

As a comparison, in the past years, we've received a 10% response rate for the survey overall, and the overall participation rate this year was 3% actually if you consider the other functions as well. I'm only focusing here on the naming functions, but these were sent out to the protocol parameter and the numbers functions as well.

Just a little bit on the scores. We had the statements broken down into six positive characteristics. The first one was more overall engagement, then transparency, attentiveness, fairness, responsiveness, and quality of reporting. As you can see, the overall response scores were high for 3.9.

Then in the next slides I'm going to break it down a little bit into what this means for each of the groups in the naming function. You'll see this trend going down. I highlighted the highest scores and the lowest scores by group. You'll see here an overall engagement. The CSC had the highest scores for us, and the GNSO Council at 2.6. the others stayed around the higher-end range, too, when it comes to overall engagement.

Transparency and communication. Again, the CSC with the highest score and the TCRs and then the GNSO again at the lowest. You'll start to see that coming down in the next one. Attentiveness of the IANA team. Again, the CSC with the highest, GNSO with the lowest. It's a trend. I'm going to go down and it's going to be the same here. Fairness. It's still the CSC with the highest, GNSO with the lowest, scores.

Just to continue on the trend, here's the same. Responsiveness at communicating. Here actually the ccTLDs operators were a little bit higher than the CSC but almost the same. And then the GNSO Council at 2.1. Root server operators also was pretty high on this one. On the side, you'll see some of the statements are relevant to this bucket. On the last one (the quality reporting by the IANA team), again the CSC is the highest. This is the lowest score on the GNSO Council for this group.

These were the questions only for community leadership groups. So the CSC got these questions. The ccNSO and GNSO Councils and the TCRs got these questions. Only the broader community groups did not get these three questions.

So I am pleased with the quality of the performance reporting delivered by the IANA team. I am pleased with the relationship that the IANA team has established with me and my organization, and my organization enjoys dealing with the IANA team overall.

From the CSC, we got a high score there for the three questions. Then, again, from the GNSO, we got the lower scores. The TCRs also were very high. Over the years the TCRs have been rating us really high with the satisfaction survey that we've sent them over the past years. So this is consistent.

I wanted to share this. These results were just presented to us on Thursday of last week. I just wanted to get this together for this group so we can start a discussion. The goal here is to give you that initial feel of what the trends are this year for our engagement piece. Of course after the meeting or during this week, if you have questions or

suggestions or points for discussion, I know that Kim will have other discussions with different groups as well this week to go over these results. But I'm available if you want to talk more about it and get a better sense of what the statements were if you don't remember or if you haven't gotten a chance to take the survey. I'll be happy to answer that. It's just that today I just wanted to bring this to the attention of the group.

We had some open-ended comments that I wanted to share. These are some of positive comments that we got. I like to always start with the good, so these are some examples of compliments we got in this survey. We got a lot more positive comments than the negative. I don't think the negatives are actually negative, which are here on the next slide.

A lot of the comments that we got for improvements were around the survey questions. The statements some people felt were a little confusing because we didn't have a "not applicable" or "I don't know" type answer. So we've gotten a few of those. Then we had one for the root zone management system to support two-factor authentication, which we are working on. We always take these comments and we review each one of them and we base our improvements and our two enhancements and everything based on customer feedback that we get through these surveys. So it's good that they write it down exactly (specifics) on what they would like to see improved.

These are some of the survey improvement suggestions that I mentioned: the "neutral" versus the "I don't know." This is the one about lying about how long the survey takes. I thought that was an

interesting comment. Actually, we have statistics. The median time it took to respond to the survey was 4.3 minutes. So it was not 10 minutes. However, there were some outliers. There were some people that took an hour. I like the part of keeping track of what page they are on to see the progress. These are all things that we're working with the vendor on to improve in the future. I just wanted to share that.

Most of the negative feedback were around the "I don't know," or, "I haven't had the opportunity to engage with IANA this year, so that's why I'm voting this way." So we didn't get anything horrible we need to improve on. So just to put it out there. It's more survey improvement suggestions. This is the first year we followed this approach, so we wanted to really listen and see how we can engage better with the groups.

As next steps, as I said, we just received this results last week, a couple days before we came here. We will announce the full report in December. We're working with comms now to look at the full report. That includes all of the functions. Then we'll continue to evaluate the feedback that we received so that we can come up with an action plan for improvement. In our report, when we announce, we usually have an initial draft of how we want to act on specific feedback that we got. So stay tuned for that.

I know I rushed through this a little bit. I know there are a lot of agenda items. But if you have any questions or you want to take it offline with me so you can move on to the next section, I think it's up to you. Thank you very much.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you very much for this presentation. As you mentioned, in the interest of time, I would like to defer questions until afterwards. I'm very glad you make yourself available for these questions, but we do have a few agenda items to go through. So thank you very much again.

MARILIA HIRANO: Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I will then move directly to the next one, which is the IFRT update. Nothing to [inaudible]? Okay.

AMY CREAMER: I already summed it up earlier. Thank you, though, for the opportunity.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, perfect. And thank you so much for helping that along the way. So we actually come down to the cc chair and vice-chair nominations. I have previously to this group suggested a time plan. According to that time plan, which has been approved by the members, this is the moment where I open for nominations for the chair and vice-chairs positions. The plan is to have this open so that, in time for the next telephone conference, we have a slate. I suggest that you send nominations to Bart and Ria, who can then have a look at that—

BART BOSWINKEL: [inaudible] announcement already?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, sure. Make an announcement already here if that—

BART BOSWINKEL: [inaudible] nominations for chair and vice-chair. Please start with the nominations for chair.

GAURAV VEDI: Hi. I would like to start by – obviously, Byron is not here, but Byron has done a fabulous job here the last three years. In the last couple of months, we lost both the vice-chair and chair of our committees. They have done a stupendous job over the past three years. [Disturbingly enough], both Byron and Elaine have created a vacuum in the CSC, and it was not easy to fill their shoes. But I think Lars has done a great job in filling the shoes right there. So thank you, Lars, for your continued support for us.

With that said, I would like to nominate Lars as a chair of the committee. We hope that you will continue to provide necessary support needed for the CSC. I would love to hear feedback from other team members, CSC members in general.

DMITRY BURKOV: I also support Lars and the nomination for the position. I think that [inaudible] on why we must delay for December if we will decide it already.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I understand, for a liaison to be elected to the chair, all four members have to support that. I would definitely support [that].

ALEJENDRA REYNOSO: Yes, I will definitely support that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you for your support.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'll give you my support as well.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. I was just going to come to that because, as you said, I'm a liaison and I have noted support from all voting members. But since this would be stepping aside from the procedures that I proposed, I would actually, if we're going to go this way, first like to ask for more nominations if there any and also if there are any concerns from liaisons.

DMITRY BURKOV: Lars, I want to [situate] Byron because you are a specific liaison because in fact root server operators – I am in customers, direct customers. It's very specific. Yes, you are of liaison status, but in fact you clearly defined as direct customers. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Any comment from Holly?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Naela?

NAELA SARRAS: I couldn't think of anyone who's more invested at this point, so no. You have my full support.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. I will the graciously—

BART BOSWINKEL: Nigel is online.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Nigel, sorry for missing you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Nigel?

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: Yes, hopefully you can hear me. I do not have any objection. I like the comment that was made that they are one of the customers, the direct customers, and are very well-invested in the work of the PTI. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Than you very much. Then I will graciously accept your trust and continue as chair until the regular time, which is in March, I believe.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. So we then have the next step, which is vice-chair. Are there any nominations for vice-chair?

Dmitry

DMITRY BURKOV: I want to propose [inaudible] nominate Brett. Are you ready to accept the nomination.

BRETT CARR: Thank you very much for you nomination. I would be happy to accept. I would like to hear from the other members, obviously.

GAURAV VEDI: I would like to nominate Brett, too. Thank you.

ALEJENDRA REYNOSO: I'll support his nominations.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you all. This is starting to look like a quick and easy deal, but it would also, again, like to hear comment from the liaisons. James?

JAMES GANNON: Yeah, I'd be happy to support that.

NAELA SARRAS: I support Brett as well.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Holly seems happy. And, again, Nigel on the phone?

NIGEL CASSIMIRE: Yes, I would definitely support Brett.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Well, thank you very much. I think we have now elected a chair and a vice-chair for the period to March. I think this a demonstration of the effectiveness of this committee.

DMITRY BURKOV: Lars, I think we elected for the whole of next year.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: No—

DMITRY BURKOV: Or you prefer to change in March? I want to clarify what's ...

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I would prefer to have the ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. Stay to the schedule that we normally have.

DMITRY BURKOV: Oh, okay.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So that's when we'll go through this again: in March. That should be noted in the minutes I think. And that goes for both chair and vice-chair in my interpretation. So thank you very much.

With that done, we are just onto the final announcements of meetings. I did attend the meeting, this lunch with the ccNSO and GNSO Councils, regarding the SLAs changes. That's done. We have the meeting right after this. It's the IANA [inaudible] open meeting, which I suggest you all attend. Then I will attend on this committee's behalf at the GNSO and Registry Stakeholder Group meeting on Tuesday. There Gaurav will do a report from this committee. I will be there to answer questions. Also, on Wednesday morning, the ccNSO Members Day, I will be there and do an overview and presentation. So that's what I know about meetings that directly relate to this.

Our next meeting will be a telephone conference on December 16th. We usually meet on the 15th but that's a Sunday, so it'll be the 16th this time at 6:00 P.M. UTC.

Any other business?

[BRETT CARR]: I think, with the new makeup of the group, we may want to – this can be deferred to the next meeting – discuss the times and dates for meetings.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes.

[BRETT CARR]: Because the geographical spread has changed somewhat.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. That's a valid point. I suggest that we take that an agenda point for that telephone conference.

Any other business?

Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Please don't change the times too much. Right now, it's 4:00 in the morning in Sydney. Please don't make it 3:00 or 2:00.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: We are aware of the problem.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

[BRETT CARR]: [inaudible] everybody, basically.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: [inaudible]. Naela?

NAELA SARRAS: For people that are heading to the IANA session, it's actually in Room 517-A.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. 517-A. Thank you. Going once ... going twice ... gone. Sold to the men in the yellow hat. Thank you. Thank you all for you contributions to this meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]