**Customer Standing Committee Meeting**

**15 February 2018 @ 20:00-22:00 UTC**

**ATTENDEES**

Apologies received: Kal, James Gannon

Meeting is quorate. No Liaisons present

**Action 18 2018 01: Secretariat to propose light weight procedure by 23 February.**

**To be discussed by CSC at f-2-f meeting.**

**Chair Election at f-2-f meeting.**

**Action Secretariat 18 2018 02: provide overview of sessions and ask Liaisons whether meeting appreciated.**

**AGENDA**

1. Welcome and Introduction

No adjustment of agenda

**2. Action items (only report on open items)**

* Action 17 2017 01 Jay and Kal: provide letter for CSC review to include mechanism in charter. To be  completed as soon as possible to allow CSC review team to include in draft report and draft update  of charter In Progress

To be addressed under item 6 of the agenda.

Action 17 2017 02 Include CSC chair election agenda next meeting. Completed

**3. PTI Performance January 2018**

***a. PTI report to CSC***

Naela: All thresholds are met.

Question Kal: Include Additional material on IDN tables. Response: Before including data on IDN tables in report, they will be provided per email. No SLE around these items. Could be confusing. See also email response.

***b. CSC report***

Adopted as proposed***.*** Congratulations to PTI team  to meet 100 % mark again

**4. CSC Chair Election**

No formal process

Jay: Light weight process. Should include Fixed date + reminder. Vote to decide

Elaine: Lightweight process

Include vice-chair / alternate chair.

Election March time frame, preferably at f-2-f, to allow (new) appointed members and liaisons to participate

**Action 18 2018 01: Secretariat to propose light weight procedure by 23 February.**

**To be discussed by CSC at f-2-f meeting.**

**Chair Election at f-2-f meeting.**

**5. Update from Remedial Action Procedures Working Group**

Discussion to date between CSC and PTI nearly concluded.  Discussion about procedure for adoption by CSC and PTI

ICANN/PTI: give notice within ICANN. Goal is President of PTI to agree on behalf of PTI .

CSC: According to charter. CSC to agree.

Goal is to formally agree at F-2-f meeting in San Juan

CSC review team circulated comments ( Martin Boyle) taken on board

CSC Review Team Procedural issue (Donna): CSC Interim report to be published when RAP completed ?

Byron: Suggest to coordinate the timing. How should Chronology look like?

Include in report process. Sign-off on amended charter. Current issue RAP and process to develop part of the charter. How to move forward?

Cleaner that CSC RT work is not finalised if  RAP is not finalized. Example RAP needs to stay in, with additional charter change once RAP is agreed, is removed (if process is completed) or replaced.

If there is a reason to delay CSC RT  will delay process. Core question: What will be included in the charter and CSC review final report.

**6. SLA change process update**

Kal and Jay were doing work. Allan's suggested change. In report placeholder text

What are next steps. Kal and JAy to discuss Allan's suggestion

Letter procedural changes , is reflected in placeholder.

Elaine: To clarify. Proposed language in charter is same information as internal review of CSC and captured in text

Conclusion no need a letter right now. Check on Allan's comment. Put language aside

**7. CSC Charter Review Team Update**

Donna. Only question Byron: # 7, oversight mechanism. Comfortable with observation and needs to continue.

Jay: Question around membership ccTLD & gTLD. Response: more logical to talk about representative ccTLD  or gTLD operators.

No further comments

**8. High Level overview results of IANA survey (if time permits)**

Consolidated overview.

Most responses received close to (or after) closing date. For ccTLDs zero in past (last two years) more responses. Key Findings: see slides

Question Byron: Slide 10 (gTLDs)

roll-up of two columns what is the methodology behind it. Make able to see if moving from satisfied to very satisfied or vice versa.

Question Slide 11: difference between gTLDs and ccTLD on use of RZM: 40 % (gTLD) thinks easy to use. vs 87 % (ccTLDs): any idea if because of other parts RZMS causes the difference? Not from the survey only  through comment fields

Trending slide ( 13). Trending is combined ( cc+gTLD) to make comparable with previous surveys.

Delegations and Transfers: Low response rate: statistically no story to tell not included in report. Hence included for CSC only.

Slide 18 - 20 : Comments received

Elaine: Slide 18 ccTLD world registries being sold/bought. Is .this sk reference?

This is issue from IANA perspective. ccTLD manager are able to change their providers. No policy and hence no role.

.SK was a shareholder change. Should that be reflected? Orgsanisation stays the same

Some assumptions might be affected by these type of changes.

Elaine: Is there a process  to verify accuracy? example NiC.KY, out of date.

No formal process for pro-actively checking, only informal actions. None responsiveness is an issue

Change request without agreement: particular case. None responsiveness of admin contact. person moved ot other governmental department, but government agreed.

**9. AOB**

Jay: Term ends in October need to have conversation with chair ccNSO and Byron

Next meetings: During ICANN61

**Action Secretariat 18 2018 02: provide overview of sessions and ask Liaisons whether meeting appreciated.**

**10. Adjourn at 21.30 UTC**