

**Draft Initial Report
Customer Standing Committee
Effectiveness Review**

**May 2022
Version 3**

Prepared by the Customer Standing Committee Effectiveness Review Team

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	3
2. Background	4
3. Purpose, Scope and Method of the Review	5
4. Summary of Effectiveness Review Team Findings	6
5. Conclusions and Recommendations	9
ANNEX A - Detailed Findings CSC effectiveness	8
ANNEX B – Comparison Outcome 2nd and 1st review	
ANNEX C - TEMPLATE CSC EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW	11
Annex D - Membership Effectiveness Review Team	16
ANNEX E - CSC Charter	17
ANNEX F - Process and Schedule	23
ANNEX F – Summary Public Comments	24

Executive Summary

The Customer Standing Committee (“CSC”) was established on 1 October 2016. It performs the operational oversight, which was previously performed by the United States Department of Commerce’s National Telecommunications and Information Administration (“NTIA”), related to performance monitoring of the Internet Assigned Names Authority (“IANA”) naming functions. The mission of the CSC is to ensure the continued satisfactory performance of the IANA functions for the direct customers of the naming services.

In accordance with Section 17 of the ICANN Bylaws and the CSC Charter, the effectiveness of the CSC is to be reviewed two years after its first meeting, using a method determined by the ccNSO and GNSO. In September 2018, the ccNSO and GNSO Councils adopted a Template for the Effectiveness Review and appointed two representatives of their respective SOs to conduct the review (hereafter referred to as the Effectiveness Review Team or RT).

In conducting its review, the RT recognized the findings contained in the Final Report of the CSC Charter Review that indicate that the CSC has been effective in both performing its mission and meeting the obligations of the Charter through the development of operating procedures and additional documents to support its operations. The RT sought not to duplicate elements of the CSC Charter Review and used these findings as a baseline for the effectiveness review.

Consistent with the findings of the CSC Charter Review, the RT found that the CSC is operating effectively. The RT identified 14 metrics to measure the effectiveness of the CSC, and the RT observed the following: nine of the identified metrics were achieved; three were considered not applicable because circumstances had not yet arisen to test the effectiveness; one was partially achieved; and one was not achieved. The RT believes that these metrics that were not achieved can be easily remedied and, accordingly, have recommended actions to be taken by the CSC to address the issues.

Similar to the CSC Charter Review, the RT believes that much of the CSC’s effectiveness is primarily related to the caliber of the inaugural CSC members and liaisons. It is evident to the RT that, in large part, the CSC is a cohesive team that has worked well together to establish the necessary processes and procedures to conduct its work, and the RT is concerned that as new members and liaisons join the team this cohesion may be lost, and the effectiveness of the CSC may deteriorate. To mitigate this potential risk, the RT has recommended that a skills assessment be conducted and shared with the appointing organizations ahead of selection processes and that all new members undergo an induction program to be developed by the CSC.

1. Introduction

The Customer Standing Committee (“CSC”) was established as one of the post IANA Transition entities, and it conducted its first meeting on 6 October 2016. It performs the operational oversight, which was previously performed by the U.S. Department of Commerce’s National Telecommunications and Information Administration, related to the monitoring of the performance of the IANA naming functions, which are currently performed by Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) under contract with ICANN. The CSC’s mission is to ensure the continued satisfactory performance of the IANA naming function for the direct customers of the naming services.

According to the CSC Charter and Section 17.3(b) of the ICANN Bylaws:

(b) The effectiveness of the CSC shall be reviewed two years after the first meeting of the CSC; and then every three years thereafter. The method of review will be determined by the ccNSO and GNSO and the findings of the review will be published on the Website.

In August 2021, the ccNSO and GNSO Councils adopted the Terms of Reference for the second CSC Effectiveness Review (included in Annex B). The Councils agreed that the most practical and efficient path forward was for the ccNSO and GNSO to:

1. Follow the same methodology for the second review as was developed and used for the first review to consider the effectiveness of the CSC in performing its responsibilities as outlined in the CSC Charter;¹ and
2. Appoint two members each to conduct the CSC Effectiveness Review.

In September 2021, Donna Austin, Jonathan Robinson, Maarten Simon, and Jens Petur Jensen (the “Team”) were appointed by the GNSO and ccNSO, respectively. In January 2022, Jens Petur Jensen was replaced by Sean Copeland.

In addition, the CSC appointed Brett Carr as a liaison to the RT, and ICANN org provided staff support for the RT. Additional expert advisors from both PTI and ICANN org assisted in the work of this RT by providing necessary factual background and information. The list of members, liaison, and expert advisors is included in Annex C.

While conducting its review, the Team identified additional topics for review and discussions and added to the list of topics to discuss.

ICANN Support Staff created an email list and wiki space for the RT, which can be found here: <https://community.icann.org/display/ER>.

2. Purpose, Scope, and Method of the Review

Purpose

¹ The first review was considered by all interested parties to be successful in terms of methodology, duration, and results. In addition using the same methodology would allow for a longitudinal comparison of the effectiveness of the CSC.

The CSC Review Team is tasked to consider the effectiveness of the CSC in carrying out its mission as defined in its charter.

Scope of the Review

The scope of the review was initially restricted to measuring the effectiveness of the CSC against requirements in the CSC Charter, using the method developed by the Review Team that conducted the first review. In addition, for the second review, the RT was tasked to assess whether the recommendations from the first Effectiveness Review were implemented. Finally, the Team added seven (7) topics which in the view of the RT are directly related to the future effectiveness of the CSC. These additional were result of the conversations with the CSC and PTI.

Out of Scope of the Review

According to the Template if, in the course of its review, the RT identifies issues that should be considered out of scope of the CSC Effectiveness Review, but could be relevant for the proper functioning of the CSC, the RT is expected to inform the ccNSO and GNSO Councils. To date, the RT has not identified these additional issues.

Method of Review

The CSC Charter, or other potentially relevant documentation, does not specify how to measure “effectiveness”; however, the Charter of the CSC does define the mission of the CSC and identifies how the CSC should conduct its work. In addition, the Charter places certain requirements on the membership of the CSC and sets requirements for its reporting to the community.

The first review team developed a structured approach (method) to assess the effectiveness based on its analysis of the template and charter. Through this process, the first review team identified performance indicators and related metrics in the CSC charter that underpin the CSC’s effectiveness. These indicators and metrics reflect both the CSC’s mission and the scope of its responsibilities; the first review team examined the work of the CSC based on how these requirements for oversight and reporting had been achieved. Using this outcome-based assessment, the first review team developed an objective, verifiable, and lightweight method to review the effectiveness of the CSC; in creating this template, the first review team also recommended that future effectiveness review teams use the same template. Accordingly, the RT agreed to conduct its work using the same template.

In order to inform its assessment of the CSC’s effectiveness, the RT met with representatives from the CSC, PTI, and ICANN org, and reviewed documentation available on the CSC website, the Final Report of the CSC Charter Review, the first CSC Effectiveness Review, and the first IANA Naming Function Review. The notes from these consultations and meetings as well as the template used by the RT are available on the RT’s wiki:

<https://community.icann.org/display/CRT>.

The RT is publishing its Initial Report for public comment to seek feedback and input from the broader community. Following the public comment period, the RT will publish the summary of public comments, and the summary will be included in RT’s Final Report, which

will be submitted to both the ccNSO and GNSO Councils for their consideration.

3. Summary of Effectiveness RT Findings

The outcome of the review are presented in the following tables:

- Table 1: Overview of Metrics 2nd Effectiveness Review.
- Table 2: Overview of observations of RT on additional topics

The findings and observations of the RT with respect to all items are presented in Annex A, Detailed Findings CSC effectiveness.

In addition, and to present the evolution of the effectiveness of CSC, the results of the first and second review are included in Annex B, Comparison Outcome 2nd and 1st review

Table 1: Overview of Metrics 2nd Effectiveness Review

	Metric	2nd Review Outcome
1.	CSC monitors the performance of the IANA naming function against agreed service level targets on a regular basis	Achieved
2.	CSC analyzes monthly reports provided by PTI and publishes their findings	Achieved
3.	CSC follows up where required on any performance issues identified and agrees on a plan for resolution with PTI and ICANN	Achieved
4.	Where appropriate, the CSC requests a review or change of a service level agreement.	Achieved
5.	Where appropriate, the CSC undertakes remedial action to address poor performance in accordance with the Remedial Action Procedures	N/A
6.	When appropriate, if remedial action by the CSC has not resolved the poor performance, CSC is authorized to escalate the performance issues to the ccNSO and GNSO for consideration	N/A
7.	CSC has an effective process for tracking complaints that has been escalated to PTI Management (Escalations), and CSC Members can be directly informed of individual complaints by email.	Achieved (For future to be reconsidered in context of frequency of meetings)
8.	CSC will conduct, at least annually, a consultation with PTI and ICANN, the primary customers of the naming services, and the ICANN community regarding the performance of PTI	Not achieved (impact of pandemic)
9.	CSC, in consultation with the registry operators, is authorized to discuss with ICANN and PTI ways to enhance the provision of IANA's operational services	Achieved
10.	Where ICANN and PTI have been responsible for implementing recommended changes to operational services or the Service Level Agreements, the CSC is confident that has been completed appropriately	Achieved
11.	CSC is providing a liaison to the IANA Functions Review Team	Achieved
12.	CSC is providing a liaison to a Separation Cross Community Working Group	N/A
13.	Meeting attendance of CSC Members	Not achieved, discuss appointment of alternates

	Metric	2nd Review Outcome
14.	Meeting attendance of CSC liaisons excluding PTI Liaison	Not achieved, discuss appointment of alternates
15.	Implementation of the four 1 st Effectiveness Review Recommendations	<p>Recommendation 1: Achieved/Fully Implemented</p> <p>Recommendation 2: Not Achieved/ Not fully implemented</p> <p>Recommendation 3: Achieved/Fully Implemented</p> <p>Recommendation 4: Achieved/Fully Implemented</p>

Table 2: Overview of findings of RT on additional topics

	Topic	Additional action required
1.	Chair & Vice-chair Election: Should the Chair be a member of the CSC?	N/A
2.	Frequency of meetings in light of the workload: Are monthly meetings of the CSC still required?	(Area for reconsideration)
3.	Attracting new and adequate volunteers: Will the CSC keep attracting capable volunteers?	Achieved to date, however concern for the future, topic for further consideration by RT and consultation with community)
4.	Scope of CSC: Is the scope of activities still beneficial to the effectiveness of the CSC?	Concern for the future, topic for further consideration by RT and consultation with community)
5.	<p>1. Is there an expectation that the SLAs would be reviewed periodically?</p> <p>2. If so, should this be done as part of the IANA Function Review or through the CSC?</p>	Concern for the future effectiveness CSC. Topic for further consideration by RT

		and consultation with community. Specifically, is there an expectation that the CSC reviews the SLAs on a regular basis, whilst keeping the direct customers involved?
6.	Appointment of Alternate Members, to accommodate various timezones, meeting frequency and ordinary role of CSC	
7.	Appointment of Alternate Liaisons, to accommodate various timezones, meeting frequency and ordinary role of CSC	

4. Conclusions and recommendations

Based on its assessment, the RT has concluded that the CSC is operating effectively. Of the 14 metrics identified for the first Effectiveness Review, the RT concluded that eight (8) were achieved, three (3) were not applicable, and two (2) were partially achieved. With respect to the implementation of the recommendations of the first review, the RT concluded three (3) of the recommendations were fully implemented, and one (1), although was not.

Specifically, the RT found that the CSC partially achieved Metric 7, “ha[ving] an effective process for tracking complaints that has been escalated to PTI Management and CSC Members can be directly informed of individual complaints by email”. While the CSC has a documented process for tracking complaints escalated to PTI Management, the RT notes that to improve upon this metric in the future, the RT recommends that the CSC documents and publishes its procedure for how it intends to deal with complaints received from individual PTI customers.

The RT found that the CSC did not achieve Metric 13 and 14, the **Meeting attendance of the CSC members and liaisons excluding PTI Liaison.**

In order to address this, the RT recommends that the CSC regularly informs the relevant appointing organizations about the meeting attendance of their appointed members and liaisons. In circumstances where a member or liaison of the CSC is not meeting the minimum attendance requirement, the Chair of the CSC should formally and promptly notify the appointing organization. In addition, the RT recommends that appointing organizations consider and communicate their expectations of appointees, both in terms of active participation on the CSC and reporting requirements. Appointing organizations are expected to use the means provided in the charter to ensure their expectations will be met.

The RT is of the view that the continuing high level of effectiveness of the CSC is primarily due to the commitment, knowledge, and expertise of the people appointed to the CSC. Looking ahead, the RT is concerned that the effectiveness of the CSC could be compromised if appointing organizations are unable to select suitable candidates in the future. To mitigate this potential risk, the RT recommends: that the CSC (i) develop an overview of the skills and expertise required for effective

participation on the CSC, and (ii) map the skills of current members and liaisons against the required skill set to inform future selection processes of the appointing organizations.

The appointing organizations, in particular of the Members i.e. the ccNSO and RySG, are advised to carefully consider candidates against the full set of skills and expertise needed on the CSC to ensure the CSC remains successful and effective in the long term. The RT also recommends that the CSC develop an induction program for all new members and liaisons to ensure the continuity and the continued effectiveness of the CSC.

Recommendation 1:

Recommendation 2:

As part of its review the RT considered the scope of work of the CSC as recorded in its charter. After extensive conversations with the CSC and PTI the Review Team is of the view that the scope of work of the CSC should not be extended. As noted in the first review, and re-iterated in the discussions by the CSC and the PTI, the limited scope is effectively the strength of the CSC, broadening its scope of activities would put the focused approach at risk.

Annex A — Findings of 2nd CSC RT

	Metric	2 nd Review Assessment	Findings chec	2nd Review Outcome
1.	CSC monitors the performance of the IANA naming function against agreed service level targets on a regular basis	PTI sends the performance report to all CSC Members monthly. The CSC produces a monthly Findings report. The previous reports can be found at: https://www.icann.org/csc under the heading “Reports & Findings”. The PTI report includes references to all SLAs as listed under the IANA Naming Function Contract.	Detailed monthly PTI reports and CSC findings are available. I have noticed that one PTI report is missing (July 2020) and that a few that were missing have been posted last September. Further noticed that on January 20, 2022 the newest report is August 2022 and Findings July 2022.	Achieved
2.	CSC analyses monthly reports provided by PTI and publishes their findings			
3.	CSC follows up where required on any performance issues identified and agrees on a plan for resolution with PTI and ICANN	The CSC discusses and follows-up if an SLA is not met and reports the result in the Findings report, see for example: PTI performance Report December 2020 (https://www.icann.org/iana_csc_docs/519-csc-findings-of-pti-performance-december-2020-v-1) and follow-up discussion pertaining to the SLA that was missed (CSC agenda and discussion February & March 2021 (see for example: https://www.icann.org/uploads/iana_work_session_asset/attachment/1029/1631302896622Agenda_and_Notes_CSC_Meeting_47-17_February_2021.pdf))	Validated	Achieved
4.	Where appropriate, the CSC requests a review or change of a service level agreement.	The CSC is mandated to discuss the provisioning of IANA Naming Services through the process for amending the IANA Naming Service Level Agreements (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/iana-naming-function-sla-amendment-process-28mar19-en.pdf). After the process became effective, 3 Service Level Agreements have been changed/introduced:	Validated	Achieved

	Metric	2 nd Review Assessment	Findings chec	2nd Review Outcome
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical checks - Processing IDN Table (new SLA) - ccTLD delegation/transfer (amendment) <p>Additionally the CSC together with PTI explored the need to change an SLA in February and March 2021 (see above item # 3).</p>		
5.	Where appropriate the CSC undertakes remedial action to address poor performance in accordance with the Remedial Action Procedures	<p>The CSC is aware it is required to do this, but, so far, in my time in the CSC, this has never been required.</p> <p>No remedial action to date has been required The Procedure itself can be found at: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/csc-remedial-action-procedures-19feb19-en.pdf</p>	Validated	N/A
6.	When appropriate remedial action by the CSC has not resolved the poor performance, CSC is authorised to escalate the performance issues to the ccNSO and GNSO for consideration	To date, the Remedial Action Procedure has not been invoked.	Validated	N/A
7.	CSC has an effective process for tracking complaints that have been escalated to PTI Management (Escalations), and CSC Members can be directly informed of individual complaints by email.	<p>The CSC is informed by PTI if they have received complaints and, if so, how it was handled. This is reported in CSC Findings of PTI Performance (see the monthly Findings Reports). According to its Charter the CSC does not handle individual complaints (see: https://www.icann.org/en/csc/complaints).</p>	<p>Random review of a number of the reports but did not encounter an example. Handled means concluded or under discussion. CSC is not involved in handling of complaints (not its remit), however is informed</p>	Achieved (For future meetings to be considered, if frequencies is changed, possible impact of duration between meetings)

	Metric	2 nd Review Assessment	Findings chec	2nd Review Outcome
			about details to assess whether systemic issue or not. Very limited number of complaints.	
8.	CSC will, at least annually, conduct a consultation with PTI and ICANN, the primary customers of the naming services, and the ICANN community about the performance of PTI	<p>The CSC meets with the PTI Board and representatives of the ICANN board at least once each year to discuss PTI Performance and related matters.</p> <p>With respect to meetings with the BTC see for example agenda April 2021 (https://community.icann.org/display/CSC/14+April+2021). For meetings with PTI Board see for example agenda October 2020 (https://www.icann.org/uploads/iana_work_session_asset/attachment/1025/1631302807621A_genda_and_Notes_CSC_Meeting_44_October_2020.pdf)</p>	<p>Information on consultation of primary customers and the ICANN Community is missing.</p> <p>The meetings with community are scheduled and listed on the ICANN public meeting. Survey is conducted by PTI.</p> <p>Include requirement to list event on website. Advise annual report. Suggestion to be discussed with CSC at 2nd meeting. If so should not be to cumbersome.</p>	Not Achieved (because of pandemic)
9.	CSC, in consultation with the registry operators, is authorized to discuss with ICANN and PTI ways to enhance the provision of IANA's operational services	<p>The CSC is mandated to discuss the provisioning of IANA Naming Services through the process for amending the IANA Naming Service Level Agreements (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/iana-naming-function-sla-amendment-process-28mar19-en.pdf)</p> <p>According to process 3 Service Level Agreements have been changed/introduced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical checks - Processing IDN Table (new SLA) 	Validated	Achieved

	Metric	2 nd Review Assessment	Findings chec	2nd Review Outcome
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ccTLD delegation/transfer (amendment) <p>Additionally the CSC together with PTI explored need to change the a SLA (see above item # 3) and whether there is a role if any, with respect to DNSec KSK (for example see: item 6 agenda and notes CSC Meeting 45, https://www.icann.org/uploads/iana_work_session_asset/attachment/1027/1631302836785Agenda_and_Notes_CSC_Meeting_45_-_18_November_2020.pdf)</p>		
10.	Where ICANN and PTI have been responsible for implementing recommended changes to operational services or the Service Level Agreements, the CSC is confident that has been completed appropriately	<p>See examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical checks - Processing IDN Table (new SLA) - ccTLD delegation/transfer (amendment) <p>The conclusion of implementation of an amended SLA is integral part of the amendment process (See Amendment process, Section II, sub 5,</p>	Validated	Achieved
11.	CSC is providing a liaison to the IANA Functions Review Team	The CSC has appointed a liaison to the first IFRT (see: https://community.icann.org/display/ifr/Review+Team+Composition)	Validated	Achieved
12.	CSC is providing a liaison to a Separation Cross Community Working Group	To date, there is has not been separation cross community working group.	Validated	N/A
13.	Meeting attendance of CSC members	Attendance of the meetings for CSC Members is recorded here: https://community.icann.org/display/CSC/Attendance?preview	According to the attendance sheet, the minimum of nine meetings has not	Not Achieved (Discuss introducing alternates)

	Metric	2 nd Review Assessment	Findings chec	2nd Review Outcome
		=/84216784/180028098/CSC_Attendance%20Tracker%202020-2021%20JAN-%20OCT.xlsx	always been met, in part due to rotation sometimes not feasible to attend	
14.	Meeting attendance of CSC liaisons excluding PTI Liaison	Attendance of the meetings for CSC Liaisons is recorded here: https://community.icann.org/display/CSC/Attendance?preview=/84216784/180028098/CSC_Attendance%20Tracker%202020-2021%20JAN-%20OCT.xlsx	According to the attendance sheet, the minimum of nine meetings has not always been met	Not Achieved
15.	Implementation 1 st Effectiveness Review Recommendations	<p>Recommendation 1: The CSC is to document and publish the procedure for how the CSC intends to deal with complaints they receive from individual PTI customers.</p> <p>Current status</p> <p>See Message on website: https://www.icann.org/en/csc/complaints</p> <p>A link to the IANA complaint process is also included on CSC website.</p> <p>Recommendation 2: The CSC provides appointing organizations with attendance records on a regular basis, at least every year in the month of May, and, where minimum attendance requirements are not being met, the Chair of the CSC formally notifies the appointing organization.</p> <p>Current Status</p> <p>In order to meet the attendance record it is documented: Also noted that CSC now meets at rotational schedule (10.00 UTC, 18.00 UTC and 02.00 UTC).</p>	<p>Rec 1: Validated</p> <p>Rec 2: Attendance is recorded and published. No information about providing updates to the appointing organizations, as (lack of) attendance has not been an issue. Communities are informed</p> <p>Rec3: Validated</p> <p>Rec4: Validated</p>	<p>Rec 1: Achieved</p> <p>Rec 2: partially achieved</p> <p>Rec 3: Achieved</p> <p>Rec 4: Achieved.</p>

	Metric	2 nd Review Assessment	Findings chec	2nd Review Outcome
		<p>Members understand need to attend.</p> <p>Overview per meeting available: https://community.icann.org/display/CSC/Attendance</p> <p>Recommendation 3: The CSC develops an overview of the skills and expertise required on the CSC, and maps the skills of current members and liaisons against the required skill set to inform the selection process of the appointing organizations.</p> <p>Current Status</p> <p>Skill overview has been produced. Appointing organizations use it in call for volunteers. Currently membership very stable.</p> <p>See skill matrix: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/csc-skill-set-matrix-members-liaisons-04jun19-en.pdf</p> <p>Recommendation 4: The CSC develops an induction program that new members and liaisons are required to participate in and complete.</p> <p>Current Status</p> <p>Introduction of new members and liaisons: Subscription to email list upon appointment. On-boarding session(s) with appointee, chair, vice-chair and staff.</p>		

Metric	2 nd Review Assessment	Findings chec	2nd Review Outcome
	See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/csc-overview-members-liaisons-04jun19-en.pdf		

Overview of Issues Identified by the Review Team

During its work and interviews the CSC identified seven (7) issues, which are relevant and may impact the effectiveness of the CSC. They were not included in the original metrics and in the view of the RT should not be treated as metrics to assess the effectiveness. However the CSC RT believes that these issues need to be logged and solved at one point to ensure the CSC remains to be effective.

Table 2: Overview of Issues Identified by the Review Team

Item #	Issue identified CSC RT	Description and assessment	Validation	Additional Action required?
1.	Chair & Vice-chair Election. Should Chair be a member of the CSC?	<p>The current chair is a liaison to the CSC, appointed by RSAC. The current vice-chair is a member of the CSC, appointed by the ccNSO According to the CSC Charter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/csc-charter-amended-27jun18-en.pdf). “The Chair of the CSC will be elected on an annual basis by the CSC. Ideally the Chair will be a direct customer of the IANA naming function, and cannot be the IANA Functions Operator Liaison.” This is also reflected in the CSC internal procedure on election of Chair and Vice-Chair (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/csc-appointment-procedure-04nov19-en.pdf).</p> <p>According to the Charter and internal procedure the Chair cannot be the IANA Function Liaison.</p> <p>In addition, the internal procedure of the CSC foresees the election of a vice-chair (not foreseen in the charter).</p> <p>The text in the current Charter and original 2016 Charter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files</p>	Validated	

Item #	Issue identified CSC RT	Description and assessment	Validation	Additional Action required?
		<p>/files/csc-charter-19sep18-en.pdf) are the same.</p> <p>Results discussion CSC 16 February: Limited number of members may at times require flexibility. Discussion that members need to be present. Issue that because limited number of members both be a new member and churn does not leave the CSC in comfortable place. Fall back to liaison. Good flexibility ensures to have same kind of approach. Liman concurs with Brett.</p> <p>Observation Jonathan: current experience, useful language: language feels about right. Formulation quite to the point.</p>		
2.	NEW METRIC Frequency of meetings in light of the workload: is monthly meeting CSC still required?	<p>16 February meeting In developing the charter, and importance of the role, especially taking into. Account possibility of escalation, monthly meeting was needed, welcomed, foundation document Most of business in 20-30 minutes: is frequency needed? Also, in relation with scope. If CSC would like to take on larger role?</p> <p>Brett: on monthly basis limited time If that would be the case. If report does not need any discussion. If scope needs to be expended, more work to be done No need to become more agile, about fallback.</p> <p>Liman: current balance is good in light of scope. There was time low workload. Keeping current cadence Meeting rotate through time zones.</p> <p>Number of meetings: if fewer meetings with same issue. Monthly update that does not require discussion. If not meeting in zoom. People need to confirm</p>	To be reviewed/ /Topic to be discussed at 2 nd meeting with CSC	(Area for consideration) Noted this was not a metric but considered a topic /issue for further consideration

Item #	Issue identified CSC RT	Description and assessment	Validation	Additional Action required?
		<p>Absolute minimum to maintain relations at least every two-months</p> <p>Is work affected by pandemic? Need for cohesion, some of the members never met in person.</p> <p>Pandemic has not affected direct work: it naturally affects relationship, not just CSC but all groups.</p> <p>Attending from Sydney is a long haul. Meet during ICANN meeting good thing do, does not preclude participating in zoom.</p>		
3.	<p>NEW METRIC</p> <p>Attracting new and adequate volunteers: will the CSC keep attracting capable volunteers?</p>	<p>16 February meeting</p> <p>Need to line up people. Thankful everyone has expressed willingness to continue.</p> <p>Have all appointing organizations assigned people to the CSC?</p> <p>How interesting is the work: Is there a need to market what the CSC is doing and its value</p> <p>Anybody?</p> <p>Responses:</p> <p>Not all organizations have assigned people. SSAC declined structurally after first term. Lesser priority cannot find commitment. Low level of nominations</p> <p>Observation Sean: look at how I came to be here, I found the work interesting, but I found the description of qualifications were excluding, so I would not have normally applied even though I had interest.</p>	<p>To be reviewed/</p> <p>Topic to be discussed at 2nd meeting with CSC</p>	<p>Achieved to date</p> <p>(Concern for the future, topic for further consideration by RT and consultation with community)</p>
4.	<p>NEW METRIC</p> <p>Scope of CSC: Is the scope of activities still beneficial to the effectiveness of the CSC?</p>	<p>16 February meeting</p> <p>Result of initial conversation with CSC.</p> <p>From RT perspective: During the Stewardship transition process there was a point in creation of CSC it was discussed whether the CSC should take on broader role. In the end the CSC was tasked with a limited role: monitor PTI performance.</p> <p>What would happen if role of CSC would be broadened?</p> <p>Brett: suggest to this question in context of next question.</p>	<p>To be reviewed/</p> <p>Was discussed at 2nd meeting with CSC</p>	<p>Concern for the future, topic for further consideration by RT and consultation with community)</p>

Item #	Issue identified CSC RT	Description and assessment	Validation	Additional Action required?
		In Discussion with PTI Board noted the limited scope is strength of CSC, broadening the scope, would put focused approach at risk		
5.	<p>NEW Questions CSC:</p> <p>1. Is there an expectation that the SLAs would be reviewed periodically?</p> <p>2. If so, should this be done as part of the IANA Function Review or through CSC?</p>	<p>Background: CSC- PTI Process for Amending the IANA Naming Service Level Agreements. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/iana-naming-function-sla-amendment-process-28mar19-en.pdf)</p> <p>With respect to review of SOW and Performance PTI against SLAs see Article 18.3 (f).</p> <p>Per discussion 1 February: Assuming it is reasonable to expect a periodic review of the SLAs/ Thresholds and possible update, question is whether the IFR or CSC route is most appropriate?</p> <p>16 February meeting Liman: Compared of the work of the CSC with maintenance program for car. Certification gap IDN. Focus should remain limited. Issues emerge over long-term. Review may help for long-term and to be approved</p> <p>Nuanced distinction: existing accountability mechanism. What value would broader scope CSC add in wider context? Example: CSC identified gap in IDN related process and discussion around monitoring DNSsec key roll-over (discussed by the CSC in 2019). In latter case already extensive accountability mechanism in place, additional role add hardly any value, if at all.</p> <p>Appropriate to check accountability. Structure may need to be reviewed. Brett: defer until future. The CSC is not seeking additional work i.e looking for things to do. However, a regular review (whatever regular means) might be appropriate.</p>	<p>Topic discussed at 2nd meeting with CSC</p> <p>Observation: Basic requirement is public consultation direct customers and others.</p> <p>Observation from IANA Function Review Team Findings (Final Report 2021: https://community.icann.org/pages/view.page.action?pageId=120819021&preview=/120819021/158138633/IFR%20Final%20Report%20feb2021.pdf)</p> <p>See section 5.3 of the IFRT Final Report</p>	<p>Concern for the future, topic for further consideration by RT and consultation with community. Specifically will it be expected that the CSC reviews the SLAs on a regular basis, whilst keeping the direct customers involved?</p>

Item #	Issue identified CSC RT	Description and assessment	Validation	Additional Action required?
		<p>Kim Davies: Adequacy of current SLAs. CSC is well placed to be familiar with current are constructed set. However, CSC is small, broader input needed given number of direct customers.</p> <p>Note: At the same time there is a process in place for consultation related to Amendment 1 IANA Naming Function Contract.</p>	<p>(page 14 – 43), which list observations of the IFRT with respect to role of the CSC as anticipated under the IANA Naming Function Contract, specifically with respect to role of the CSC regarding changes of the Statement of Work and SLAs.</p>	
6.	Need to appoint Alternates for Members of the CSC?	<p>The CSC raised issue with RT that due to high quorum requirement for meetings (all 4 members need to attend the call) decision making maybe sometimes at risk if for example one of the members is not available at a call. This is particularly an issue due to geographic diversity requirement for membership. As a result of the geographic diversity requirement call time rotate: they shift 8 hours every other meeting. The RT Is requested to consider whether appointment of alternates may be a possible manner to reduce risk of non-quorate meetings</p>		
7.	Need to appoint alternates for the Liaisons to the CSC?	<p>The CSC raised issue with RT that due to geographic diversity the geographic diversity call times rotate for liaisons: they shift 8 hours every other meeting. The RT Is requested to consider whether appointment of alternates may be a possible manner to reduce risk of non-attendance of liaison from a liaison appointing organization.</p>		

Annex B: Comparison Findings 1st and 2nd CSC Review

	Metric	Outcome 2 nd Review	Outcome 1 st Review
1.	CSC monitors the performance of the IANA naming function against agreed service level targets on a regular basis	Achieved	Achieved
2.	CSC analyses monthly reports provided by PTI and publishes their findings		
3.	CSC follows up where required on any performance issues identified and agrees on a plan for resolution with PTI and ICANN	Achieved	Achieved
4.	Where appropriate, the CSC requests a review or change of a service level agreement.	Achieved	Achieved
5.	Where appropriate the CSC undertakes remedial action to address poor performance in accordance with the Remedial Action Procedures	N/A	N/A
6.	When appropriate remedial action by the CSC has not resolved the poor performance, CSC is authorised to escalate the performance issues to the ccNSO and GNSO for consideration	N/A	N/A
7.	CSC has an effective process for tracking complaints that have been escalated to PTI Management (Escalations), and CSC Members can be directly informed of individual complaints by email.	Achieved	Partially Achieved
8.	CSC will at least annually conduct a consultation with PTI and ICANN, the primary customers of the naming services and the ICANN community about the performance of PTI	Not Achieved	Achieved
9.	CSC, in consultation with the registry operators, is authorised to discuss with ICANN and PTI ways to enhance the provision of IANA's operational services	Achieved	Achieved
10.	Where ICANN and PTI have been responsible for implementing recommended changes to operational services or the Service Level Agreements, the CSC is confident that has been completed appropriately	Achieved	Achieved
11.	CSC is providing a liaison to the IANA Functions Review Team	Achieved	Achieved
12.	CSC is providing a liaison to a Separation Cross Community Working Group	N/A	N/A
13.	Meeting attendance of CSC members	Not Achieved	Achieved
14.	Meeting attendance of CSC liaisons excluding PTI Liaison	Not Achieved	Not Achieved

Annex C Second CSC EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW TEMPLATE

Conditionally Adopted by the ccNSO Council: 3 August 2021

Version 2

Adopted by the GNSO Council: 19 August 2021

Adopted by the ccNSO Council: 26 August 2021

1. Context

Section 17.3 (b) of the ICANN Bylaws and the Charter of the Customer Standing Committee (hereafter: CSC) require that the “... *effectiveness of the CSC will initially be reviewed two years after the first meeting of the CSC; and then every three years thereafter. The method of review will be determined by the ccNSO and GNSO.*”

The CSC was established in October 2016 and conducted its first meeting on 6 October 2016.

In October 2018, the first review of the CSC Effectiveness Review was kicked-off, and was concluded in March 2019, with adoption of the Final CSC Effectiveness Review Report by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils.

2. Intent of the Review

The CSC Effectiveness Review is intended to consider the Effectiveness of the CSC in carrying out its mission as defined in its charter.

3. Measures of CSC Effectiveness

- a. According to Section 17.3 (b) of the ICANN Bylaws and the CSC Charter “...the method of review will be determined by the ccNSO and GNSO.” Neither the relevant section of the Bylaws nor the Charter specify what is meant by, or how to measure, “effectiveness.”
- b. The mission of the CSC is defined in the relevant section of the ICANN Bylaws and Charter as:
 - i. to ensure the continued satisfactory performance of the IANA function for the direct customers of the naming services; and that this:
 - ii. will be achieved through regular monitoring by the CSC of the performance of the IANA naming function against agreed service level targets and through mechanisms to engage with the IANA Functions Operator to remedy identified areas of concern.
- c. The Scope of Responsibilities in the Charter identifies how the CSC should work:
 - i. The CSC is authorized to monitor the performance of the IANA naming function against agreed service level targets on a regular basis.
 - ii. The CSC will analyse reports provided by the IANA Functions Operator on a monthly basis and publish their findings.
 - iii. Where performance issues have been identified, the CSC will work with

- the IANA Functions Operator to understand the reasons for the failure and agree a plan for resolution.
- iv. Either the CSC or the IANA Functions Operator can request a review or change to service level/s, including the removal of existing service levels or the inclusion of new service levels. The procedures will have to be commensurate with the type of the service level change being proposed. Informing the registry operators about proposed changes shall always be required; however, the type of service level change will determine whether it is necessary to conduct a community-wide consultation.
 - v. The CSC is authorized to undertake remedial action to address poor performance in accordance with the Remedial Action Procedures, which have been developed and agreed by the CSC and the IANA Functions Operator.
 - vi. In the event performance issues are not remedied to the satisfaction of the CSC, despite good-faith attempts to do so, the CSC is authorized to escalate the performance issues to the ccNSO and GNSO for consideration.
 - vii. The CSC may receive complaints from individual registry operators regarding the performance of the IANA Naming Function; however, the CSC will not become involved in a direct dispute between any registry operator and IANA.
 - viii. The CSC will review individual complaints with a view to identifying any patterns of poor performance by the IANA Functions Operator in responding to complaints of a similar nature. In relation to problem resolution, if CSC determines that remedial action has been exhausted and has not led to necessary improvements, the CSC is authorized to escalate to the PTI Board and further if necessary.
 - ix. The CSC will, on an annual basis or as needs demand, conduct a consultation with the IANA Functions Operator, the primary customers of the naming services, and the ICANN community about the performance of the IANA Functions Operator.
 - x. The CSC, in consultation with registry operators, is authorized to discuss with the IANA Functions Operator ways to enhance the provision of IANA's operational services to meet changing technological environments; as a means to address performance issues; or other unforeseen circumstances. In the event it is agreed that a material change in IANA naming services or operations would be beneficial, the CSC reserves the right to call for a community consultation and independent validation, to be convened by the IANA Functions Operator, on the proposed change. Any recommended change must be approved by the ccNSO and RySG.
 - xi. The IANA Functions Operator would be responsible for implementing any recommended changes and must ensure that sufficient testing is undertaken to ensure smooth transition and no disruption to service levels.
 - xii. The CSC will provide a liaison to the IANA Function Review Team and a liaison to any Separation Cross Community Working Group.

4. Effectiveness can also be measured against these requirements.

- a. the Charter places certain requirements on members of, and liaisons to, the CSC and sets requirements for reporting to the community:

- i. The CSC should be kept small and comprise representatives with direct experience and knowledge of IANA naming functions;
 - ii. Minimum membership and openness to liaisons;
 - iii. Election of the Chair;
 - iv. primary and secondary points of contact to facilitate formal lines of communication between the CSC and the IANA Functions Operator;
 - v. Meeting frequency and publication of meeting record;
 - vi. Regular CSC updates to the direct customers of the IANA naming function.
- b. In working as a committee, the CSC has needed to define its working methods and in particular to assess how to work with the IFO. This includes defining with the IFO the framework for remedial action and amending Service Level Expectations, and establishing a framework for regular reporting to the community.

5. Method of assessing effectiveness

- a. In its nearly five years of operation, the CSC has regularly monitored the performance of IANA and informed the community of its findings. These monthly reports of the CSC together with the related monthly reports from PTI, provide a useful framework for assessing the effectiveness of the CSC in developing its relationship with PTI, keeping the direct customers informed of PTI performance and in ensuring that the wider community is also aware of how the PTI is meeting its obligations.
- b. The First Review Team developed a set of metrics drawn from requirements contained in the CSC Charter (see Sections 3 and 4 above) as the basis for assessing the effectiveness of the CSC in performing its role. It is recommended that the Second Review Team adopt the same methodology to ensure a consistent approach and allow for comparison of the effectiveness of the CSC over time. The performance indicators and related metrics are included in Annex A: Overview Metrics, Assessment and Outcome. Where needed the Review Team may draw on the recently concluded IANA Naming Function Review.
- c. In addition, the Second Review Team shall also assess if and to what extent the recommendations from the first review have been implemented and the extent to which the issue identified in the first review has been addressed. Related metrics and performance measures should be developed as considered necessary by the Review Team.
- d.
- e.
- f. In conducting the Review, the Review Team is encouraged to review publicly available documents and CSC reports to assess how effectively the CSC has performed since the first review and also engage directly with the members of the CSC and PTI as deemed appropriate by the Review Team..
- g. The Review Team is also expected to consider whether and how to consult with the direct customers on whose behalf the CSC is monitoring the performance of the PTI in performing the IANA Naming Functions and other ICANN community groups that appoint liaisons to the CSC about their awareness of the CSC's work and effectiveness and also the PTI Board.

6. Issue which are Out of Scope of the review

If, in the process of the review, the CSC Effectiveness Review Team becomes aware of issues that are out of scope of this 2nd CSC Effectiveness Review, but are considered relevant for the proper functioning of the CSC, it will inform both the ccNSO and GNSO Councils accordingly.

7. CSC Effectiveness Review Team

The ccNSO and GNSO will each appoint two members to CSC Review Team, in accordance with their internal processes. At least one member appointed by the ccNSO Council and one member appointed by the GNSO Council should be related to or associated with a TLD Operator (direct customer of the IANA Naming Function). The CSC is requested to appoint a Liaison to the Review Team. The PTI is also requested to appoint a Liaison to the Review team.

The Review team is expected to appoint a spokesperson who will, when needed, represent the Review Team and speak on behalf of the Review Team.

In developing its output – working method, work plan or any reports or papers - the full Review Team (members and liasons) shall seek to act by consensus (Full Consensus - a position where no minority disagrees; identified by an absence of objection or Consensus – a position where a small minority disagrees, but most agree)

In the absence of Full Consensus, the Review Team should allow for the submission of minority viewpoint(s) and these, along with the consensus view, shall be included in the report, paper or other relevant deliverable.

In rare cases, the Review Team may decide to use of a poll to assess the level of support for a deliverable. However, care should be taken in using polls: they should not become votes, as there are often disagreements about the meanings of the poll questions or of the poll results. Such a poll shall be limited to the members appointed by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils and the polling should be recorded and included in the deliverable.

8. Proposed Review Process

The role of the CSC Effectiveness Review Team is to:

1. Conduct a review of the CSC Effectiveness in accordance with the elements identified above. The review will include an analysis of governance or guiding documents developed during the implementation phase of the CSC, drafting of ICANN's bylaws only if considered to be relevant by the Review Team.
2. Conduct interviews with the CSC and the PTI to determine whether the CSC is fit for purpose and effective and whether measures should be taken to enhance the effectiveness of the CSC from their perspective.
3. Conduct a public session at or around ICANN72 (October 2021) that is intended to provide an opportunity for the community to provide input to the process.
4. Produce a Report on the outcome of the review. This report should also include suggested recommendations, if any, to improve the effectiveness of the CSC. The Report will be submitted to the ccNSO and GNSO Councils for discussion and adoption at the time foreseen in section 9, Review Schedule.

9. Review Schedule

The Review Schedule provided below is indicative only and will need to be reviewed and confirmed by the Review Team once appointed. However, it is the expectation of both the GNSO and ccNSO Councils that the review will be concluded within 12 months of the initial meeting of the Review Team.

September 2021- Adoption of Template for effectiveness review and appointment of the Review Team

- By 30 September 2021, the ccNSO and GNSO Councils are expected to have adopted the template for review of the effectiveness of the CSC and as a result have determined the method of the CSC Effectiveness Review.
- Each of the Councils is also expected to have appointed their members by 30 September 2021.

October 2021

- *Initial meeting of the CSC Effectiveness Review Team*
- *Agreement on scope, process and timeline*

November 2021 Consultation with CSC and PTI

- Informal consultations if considered necessary by the RT
- Virtual Public Consultation (open session) & Interview CSC and PTI
- Virtual Public consultation direct customers and other interested parties (ccTLD, gTLD operators, others) post ICANN72

December 2021 – January 2022 Draft Report on findings & recommendations

- Preparation draft initial report, including recommendations, if any. Include findings, report on identified issues, if any, and recommendations to resolve issues.

1 February 2022 Public comment period on draft report

- Virtual meeting to alert and introduce on findings prior to or during first week of Public comment period.
- Public comment period 40 days

April 2022 - Finalization Report and submission to ccNSO and GNSO Councils

- Publication and submission of the Final Report to ccNSO and GNSO Councils for adoption according to their own rules and procedures.
- Following the adoption of the report by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils, the review team closes.
- ccNSO and GNSO Councils inform CSC and ICANN of result.

10. Omission in or unreasonable impact of the Template

If, in the process of conducting the Review, the Review Team determines that the Template does not provide sufficient guidance and/or the impact of the Template is found to be unreasonable for conducting the business of the Review, the Review Team has the authority to determine a proper course of action to mitigate the issue. Any proposed modification to the Template shall only be effective after approval by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils. The Review Team shall exercise reasonable discretion with respect to whether this Template does not provide guidance and/or the impact of the Template is unworkable with respect to the conduct of business of the Review Team.

11. References

- Charter Customer Standing Committee - <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/csc-charter-amended-27jun18-en.pdf>
- CSC Charter review team - <https://community.icann.org/display/CRT/CSC+Review+Team+Home>
- First CSC Effectiveness Review - <https://community.icann.org/display/ER>

Annex D – Membership CSC Effectiveness Review Team

Members

Donna Austin - GNSO appointed
Maarten Simon - ccNSO appointed
Sean Copeland - ccNSO appointed
Jonathan Robinson - GNSO appointed

Liaison Brett Carr – CSC appointed

Expert Advisors

Amy Creamer
Kim Davies
Jennifer Bryce

Support Staff

Bart Boswinkel
Steve Chan
Caitlin Tubergen
Claudia Ruiz

ANNEX C - CSC Charter adopted June 2018

Charter of the Customer Standing Committee (CSC)

Mission

The Customer Standing Committee (CSC) has been established to perform the operational oversight previously performed by the U.S. Department of Commerce's National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) as it relates to the monitoring of performance of the IANA naming function. This transfer of responsibilities took effect on October 1, 2016.

The mission of the CSC is to ensure continued satisfactory performance of the IANA function for the direct customers of the naming services. The direct 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 function against agreed service levels and through mechanisms to engage with the IANA Functions Operator to remedy identified areas of concern, including but not limited to the Remedial Action Procedures.

The CSC is not authorized to initiate a change in the IANA Functions Operator via a Special IANA Function Review, but could escalate a failure to correct an identified deficiency to the ccNSO and GNSO Councils, who might then decide to take further action using agreed consultation and escalation processes, which may include a Special IANA Function Review.

The CSC will be the primary interface between the IANA Naming Functions Operator, currently PTI, and its customers. Should PTI cease to be the IANA Naming Functions Operator, there should be an obligation on successor operators to work with the CSC to ensure satisfactory performance of the IANA naming functions.

Scope of Responsibilities

The CSC monitors the performance of the IANA naming function against agreed service levels on a monthly basis.

The CSC will analyze reports provided by the IANA Functions Operator and publish their findings on a monthly basis.

Where performance issues have been identified, the CSC will work with the IANA Functions Operator to understand the reasons for the failure and agree a plan for resolution.

The CSC or the IANA Functions Operator can request a review or change to service

level/s.

The CSC, in consultation with the IANA Functions Operator, will develop procedures for changing service level/s including the removal of existing service levels or the inclusion of new service levels. These procedures will be commensurate with the type of the service level change being proposed. Informing the registry operators about proposed changes shall always be required; however, the type of service level change will determine whether it is necessary to conduct a community-wide consultation. The procedures may be updated from time to time and will only become effective after publication of the process on the CSC webpage, and after informing the ccNSO Council and RySG, the direct customers.

The CSC is authorized to undertake remedial action to address performance issues in accordance with the Remedial Action Procedures (RAP) published on the CSC website. The RAP may be updated from time to time in accordance with the change mechanism foreseen in the RAP.

Should a new IANA Functions Operator be appointed, for example through the recommendations from the Special IANA Naming Function Review Team², the ccNSO and GNSO Councils will require the CSC to review and revise the RAP as necessary with the new operator.

In the event performance issues are not remedied to the satisfaction of the CSC, despite good- faith attempts to do so, and following the agreed escalation processes contained in the RAP, the CSC is authorized to escalate the performance issues to the ccNSO and GNSO Councils for consideration.

The CSC may receive complaints from individual registry operators regarding the performance of the IANA Naming Function; however, the CSC will not become involved in a direct dispute between any registry operator and the IANA Functions Operator.

The CSC will review individual complaints with a view to identifying whether there are any patterns of poor performance by the IANA Functions Operator in responding to complaints of a similar nature. The CSC may invoke the RAP if necessary to resolve performance issues that may be systemic or persistent.

The CSC will, as need demands, conduct consultations with the IANA Functions Operator, meet with the direct customers of the naming services, and the ICANN community about the performance of the IANA Functions Operator.

The CSC, in consultation with registry operators, is authorized to discuss with the IANA Functions Operator ways to enhance the provision of IANA's operational services for any of the following reasons:

- to meet changing technological environments;

² See Section 18.12 ICANN Bylaws

- as a means to address performance issues; or
- other unforeseen circumstances.

In the event it is agreed that a material change in IANA naming services or operations would be beneficial, the CSC reserves the right to call for a community consultation and independent validation, to be convened by the IANA Functions Operator, on the proposed change. Any recommended change that does not require a change to the IANA Naming Function Contract must be approved by the ccNSO Council and RySG

The IANA Functions Operator would be responsible for implementing any recommended changes and must ensure that sufficient testing is undertaken to ensure smooth transition and no disruption to service levels.

The CSC will provide a liaison to the CSC Charter Review Team, the CSC Effectiveness Review Team, the IANA Function Review Team and to any Separation Cross Community Working Group.

Conflict of Interest

The ICANN Bylaws make clear that it must apply policies consistently, neutrally, objectively and fairly, without singling any party out for discriminatory treatment; which would require transparent fairness in its dispute resolution processes. Members of the CSC should accordingly disclose any conflicts of interest with a specific complaint or issue under review.

The CSC may exclude from the discussion of a specific complaint or issue any member deemed by the majority of CSC members and liaisons to have a conflict of interest.

Membership Composition

The CSC should be kept small and comprise representatives with direct experience and knowledge of IANA naming functions. At a minimum the CSC will comprise:

- Two individuals representing gTLD Registry Operators appointed by the Registries Stakeholder Group
- Two individuals representing ccTLD Registry Operators appointed by the ccNSO
- One liaison from the IANA Functions Operator (PTI).

An individual representing a TLD that is not considered to be a ccTLD or gTLD registry, for example from the Internet Architecture Board for .ARPA, may also be included as a member of the CSC. The individual would seek appointment by either the ccNSO or GNSO Council.

Liaisons can also be appointed from the following organizations; however, providing a Liaison is not mandatory for any group:

- One liaison each from other ICANN SOs and ACs:
 - GNSO (non-registry)
 - ALAC

- NRO (or ASO)
- GAC
- RSSAC
- SSAC

Liaisons shall not be members of or entitled to vote on the CSC, but otherwise liaisons shall be entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the CSC.

The Chair of the CSC will be elected on an annual basis by the CSC. Ideally the Chair will be a direct customer of the IANA naming function and cannot be the IANA Functions Operator Liaison.

The CSC and the IANA Functions Operator will nominate primary and secondary points of contact to facilitate formal lines of communication.

The CSC as a whole will decide who will serve as the Liaison to the IANA Function Review Team. Preference should be given to the Liaison being a registry representative given that technical expertise is anticipated to be valuable in the role.

Membership Selection Process

Members and Liaisons to the CSC will be appointed by their respective communities in accordance with internal processes. However, all candidates will be required to submit an Expression of Interest that includes a response addressing the following matters:

- Why they are interested in becoming involved in the CSC.
- What particular skills they would bring to the CSC.
- Their knowledge of the IANA Functions.
- Their understanding of the purpose of the CSC.
- That they understand the time necessary required to participate in the CSC and can commit to this role.

Interested candidates should also include a resume or curriculum vitae or biography in support of their Expression of Interest.

While the ccTLD and gTLD members will be appointed by the ccNSO and RySG respectively and liaisons by their applicable groups, ccTLD or gTLD registry operators that are not members of these groups will be eligible to participate in the CSC as members or liaisons. The ccNSO Council and RySG should consult prior to finalizing their selections with a view to providing a slate of members and liaisons that has, to the extent possible, diversity in terms of geography and skill set.

A representative for a TLD registry operator not associated with a ccTLD or gTLD registry, will be required to submit an Expression of Interest to either the ccNSO and GNSO Councils. The Expression of Interest must include a letter of support from the registry operator. This provision is intended to ensure orderly formal arrangements and is not

intended to imply those other registries are subordinate to either the ccNSO or the GNSO.

The full membership of the CSC must be approved by the ccNSO and the GNSO Councils. While it will not be the role of the ccNSO and GNSO to question the validity of any recommended appointments to the CSC, in approving the full slate the ccNSO and GNSO Councils will take into account the overall composition of the proposed CSC in terms of geographic diversity and skill sets.

Terms

CSC appointments, regardless of whether members or liaisons, will be for a two-year period with the option to renew for up to two additional two-year terms. The intention is to stagger appointments to provide for continuity and knowledge retention.

To facilitate this, at least half of the inaugural CSC appointees will be appointed for an initial term of three years. Subsequent terms will be for two years.

CSC appointees must attend a minimum of nine meetings in a one-year period and must not be absent for more than two consecutive meetings. Failure to meet this requirement may result in the Chair of the CSC requesting a replacement from the respective organization.

A vacancy on the CSC shall be deemed to exist in the case of the death, resignation, or removal of a CSC member or liaison. This vacancy shall be filled by the appointing organization or advisory committee for the unexpired term.

Changing circumstances of appointed CSC member

In the event that a member appointed to the CSC by either the ccNSO or RySG has a change in circumstances that may affect the basis upon which the member was appointed to the CSC, they are required to notify their appointing organization of their changing circumstances. If the member is willing to remain a member of the CSC, they will be required to seek re-confirmation of their appointment. The appointing organization will be responsible for considering the request in accordance with internal procedures.

The appointing organization will be responsible for notifying the Chair of the CSC of its decision and should also notify the other appointing organization.

In the event that the appointing organization is not willing to re-confirm the appointment, the member will be required to resign from the CSC and the appointing organization will be required to fill the vacancy as soon as possible. A temporary replacement may be appointed while attempts are made to fill the vacancy.

If a member wishes to resign from the CSC because of a change in circumstances, or for any other reason, they must notify their appointing organization.

Any new appointment will need to be approved by both the ccNSO Council and the RySG. The GNSO Council should be notified of any new appointment.

Recall of members or liaisons

Any CSC appointee can be recalled at the discretion of their appointing community.

In the event that a ccTLD or gTLD registry representative is recalled, a temporary replacement may be appointed by the designating group while attempts are made to fill the vacancy. As the CSC meets on a monthly basis, best efforts should be made to fill a vacancy within one month of the recall date.

The CSC may also request the recall of a member of the CSC in the event they have not met the minimum attendance requirements. The appointing community will be responsible for finding a suitable replacement.

Meetings

The CSC shall meet at least once every month via teleconference at a time and date agreed upon by members of the CSC.

The CSC will provide regular updates, at least twice per year, to the direct customers of the IANA naming function. These updates may be provided to the RySG and the ccNSO during ICANN meetings.

To allow the CSC to carry out the work identified above and, in particular, to help develop a cooperative relationship with the IANA Functions Operator, the CSC is also required to meet with the Board of the IANA Functions Operator at least twice a year. These meetings should, wherever possible, be held at ICANN meetings.

The CSC will also consider requests from other groups, including the ICANN Board and ICANN org, to provide updates regarding the IANA Functions Operator's performance.

Record of Proceedings

Minutes of all CSC teleconferences will be made public within five business days of the meeting.

In the event that the CSC invokes the RAP, it will be required to inform the RySG, ccNSO and GNSO Councils and provide regular status updates.

Information sessions conducted during ICANN meetings will be open and posting of transcripts and presentations will be done in accordance with ICANN's meeting requirements.

Secretariat

ICANN will provide secretariat support for the CSC and will also be expected to provide and facilitate remote participation in all meetings of the CSC.

Review

The Charter may be reviewed at the request of the CSC, ccNSO Council, RySG or GNSO Council or in connection with an IANA Function Review. The review will be conducted by a committee of representatives from the ccNSO and the RySG in accordance with a method determined by the ccNSO Council and RySG. Each review is to include the opportunity for input from other ICANN stakeholders, via a Public Comment process. Any recommended changes are to be ratified by the ccNSO and the GNSO Councils.

The effectiveness of the CSC will initially be reviewed two years after the first meeting of the CSC; and then every three years thereafter. The method of review will be determined by the ccNSO and GNSO.

Annex D Process and Schedule

ANNEX E Summary Public comments