Meeting CSC

Public session @ ICANNN 58

**Action -82017-01: Trang & Bart update CSC report**

Completed

**Action 082017-02 Trang/Bart By May CSC meeting: process description change of SLE.**

**Action 082017 03: Kal and Jay meet off-line with Elise G to provide clarification on suggestions**

**Action 08 2017 04 Byron: Re-iterate on work item overview on list before next meeting**

**Action 08 2017 05 Secretariat: Use re-iterated list to propose agenda April and May**

**Public meeting**

Presentation by Byron Holland chair

**Regular meeting**

**1. Welcome & Roll call**

All member present: meeting is quorate

All liaisons present, with exception ALAC liaisons

PTI staff: Naela Sarras, Kim Davies

**2. Notes and Actions Items**

Pending Action items: Doodle polls to be send after CPH meetings

**3. Monthly Reporting**

**3.a PTI report February 2017**

Report is drafted from SLE dashboard.

Exceptions

Two(2) manual lodgment. By email

Principle not waiting for clarifications

Email did not have sufficient info.

Exception Validation and review:

Manual validation time takes longer than SLE.

What time is reasonable? What is aspirational?

Exceed 60 days. Review process. Time gets attributed

Strive to reach 60 days, have not done for the two received requests

Why does it take longer?

Naela (on IDN ccTLD request). For IDN ccTLD they go to GDD first, long list of checks need to be done first.

Full documentation to meet request on website. Unfortunately, some requests are well documented, some are not.

Collecting data and reviewing is bulk of process. Report is sent to Board for review

In specific case PTI time affected by possible changed role of the Board post the transition.

Question: Does staff collect information and then send to the board?

Response: Board confirms that processes have been followed.

Question: Stewardship Transition work is that significant?

Team was stalled, significant impact

Questions: Is time waiting for applicant accounted for? Is process Board counted (not in target)?

PTI response: Board is considered third party processing time.

What should target be? Better target would 90 days be

Not messy, close to 60 days, if messy takes considerable time. Messy is messy at customer end.

Question: If % drops would that work?

Response: Rarely more than one per month. Threshold is immaterial

Both topics come up later. These are regular issues surfacing from reporting.

**3b CSC report**

Draft included in pack dated 12 March

Comments:

Jay: specific text to be included

This is such low volume. We need to wait for considerable time (over 6 months) to make a reasonable assessment

Also note one time significant effort

**Action -82017-01: Trang & Bart update CSC report**

Completed

Where to insert comment?

Include in section Metric comment

**4. Adoption Internal Procedures**

Comments Members vote: High bar, however as agreed to be revisited

Member vote

Jay: moves

Kal: seconds

**Decision: Members unanimous adopt internal Procedures**

**5. Triage of work items**

Prioritization of list

Discussion of priorities of work items not about substance:

simple criteria Urgency and Importance

***Roadmap***

Elise G: From PTI perspective understand implementation, need to meet requirements and procedures,

**Action 082017 03: Kal and Jay meet off-line with Elise G to provide clarification on suggestions**

Potential review and roadmap of RZMS

What do you want?

Sense of timing of re-architecture: anticipated duration is multi-year project

What are milestones for CSC?

Over past few meetings: Get a sense of what CSC is suggesting, before PTI moves forward, additional feed-back. Getting clarity over the next few moths.

Jay: as a matter of principle CSC is only making suggestions. SLE is normative document

Manual lodgment, clarification issue, no additional explanation needed. Understand what is suggested.

Kal: referring to technical checking, high importance, not urgent

***Review SLE, fast process***

Should initiate now attend to it. Whether heavy handed process, need to be found out.

Kal: Agree credibility element.

Lars: Benefits, hack out process, credibility

Trang: Conversations with Legal. No bylaw change required

**Action 082017-02 Trang/Bart By May CSC meeting: process description change of SLE.**

***Remedial Action Procedure***

High Importance/ relative high urgency.

***Survey***

Survey is logistical. Not important/ relative urgent (May 10)

Kal (observation): Approaching parallel important work-items

Dividing work, parallel activity

Byron: survey spearhead

SLE: Bart and Trang

Next steps:

Articulate next steps

**Action 08 2017 04 Byron: Re-iterate work item overview on list before next meeting**

**Action 08 2017 05 Secretariat: Use re-iterated list to propose agenda April and May**

**6. Agenda item covered under 5**

**7: AOB**

Jay: If a change request in progress, is CSC informed before completion?

PTI interprets SLE only on basis of completed tickets.

Would heads-up be appropriate. If extraordinary long period to complete change request?

Observation: Not critical to be informed, would be useful. Not anyone instance

Verbal update in best judgement of PTI.

Any other observations?

Jay: Technical changes and features, processes not a role for CSC, but clarity

Provide some background on CSC. Re-assure why CSC was created.

There is no other route for changes. Gap between RZERC and CSC.

Kim Davies: If CSC needs to relate to IANA team (informal) to provide feed-back etc. Use: IANA@IANA.ORG