**Customer Standing Committee (CSC) Meeting 11**

**15 June 2017 @ 20:00-21:30 UTC**

**Attendees:**

Members/Liaisons: Byron Holland, Elise Lindeberg, Jay Daley, Elaine Pruis, Kal Feher, Mohamed El Bashir, Jeff Bedser

Not present: James Gannon, Lars-Johan Liman

PTI: Elise Gerich, Marilia Hirano, Kim Davies

Staff: Ria Otanes, Bart Boswinkel, Amy Creamer

Observers: Allan MacGillivray

Apologies: None

Documents shared: see wiki space

**Action 11 2017 01: Byron to provide strawman on Remedial Action Procedures after the call**

**Action 11 2017 02: PTI to look into data collected with respect to submission of IDN Tables and include in addendum/table in July report**

**Action 11 2017 03: PTI check with vendor on adding the questions with size of TLD operator (TLD names managed by operator) on basis of self-selection**

**Action 11 2017 04: PTI to send draft survey to CSC list to seek additional feed-back from CSC**

**Action 11 2017 05: PTI to report back after conversation with vendor if there are issues with implementation of suggestions and that may affect the timeline**

**Action 11 2017 06: Secretariat to send out call for liaison to Review team CSC charter**

**Action 11 2017 07: Secretariat to send cheat sheet/overview of documentation and put item on next agenda.**

**Action 11 2017 08: PTI Document the complaint / escalation as appropriate to inform CSC**

**Agenda:**

**1. Welcome and Introduction**

All members present

Prioritize urgency of survey as informing community starts at ICANN 59.

Change to Agenda

Survey is now item 5 on agenda, SLE amendment process is item 7.

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

Action 10-2017-01 Elise G to circulate timeline at the end of the call. Completed

Action 10-2017-02 Trang/Bart provide clarity on role PTI Board in process. Completed

Action 10-2017-03 Elise, Kal and Jay to further define process (definition of SLE procedure) Ongoing

Defer or update now

defer to item 6

Action 10-2017-04 Create CSC WG to review remediation process included as Annex in CSC charter. Members Byron, Elise G (or someone else PTI team), Elaine and James Gannon. WG to recommend to CSC on further action. Pending

Determined to set-up wg.

No progress, put together a strawman

**Action 11 – 2017 01: Byron to provide strawman on Remedial action Procedures after the call**

Action 10-2017-05 Start review CSC charter in August Ongoing

Action 10-2017-06 Update work schedule to include CSC review of CSC charter (starting date August) Completed

**3. PTI Performance May 2017**

**a. PTI report to CSC**

Elise G:

2 areas where there were issues, technical checks. Discussed before

In all other area’s met the thresholds.  Threshold to be revisited as part of SLE

Addendum on revocation

Once there are revisions to SLE, will be added

Kal: Agree to include addendum on IDN table submissions?

Elise G: recollection not clear what needed to be included on submissions.

Kal: understanding that time between submission and inclusion? Whatever time recorded to build addendum with data available. Goal is to build data/ table to discuss and include in future version of SLEs.

Elsie G: Will look into it with team

**Action 11 – 2017 02 PTI: Look into data collected with respect to submission of IDN Tables and include in addendum/table in July report**

Kim: Just completed some last month (beyond period of May)

**b. CSC report**

Draft Report

**No Comments. Draft approved as proposed.**

Kal: Received query from registry stakeholder group

Perhaps, include statement when report is send out

**4. Update on Identified Working Items**

Given everything is captured in action items on the agenda.

No need to include in future as substantive agenda item

**5. Annual Customer Satisfaction Survey Discussion**

Allan MacGillivray: walked through presentation.

Remarks and Suggestions:

This is not survey specific for naming community. It is regularly cycle PTI follows.

There are 3 kinds of questions

- One set for all groups (answers are not segmented)

- Tailored questions

- Open Questions

Quite a good survey, with some opportunities for improvement:

1. response rate and
2. disaggregate some sets of responses

*Low response rate*

Response are not dis-aggregated. Difficult to understand how the TLD community feels about specific aspects.

Response rate ccTLD community in 2015 and 2016 was 0.

Response rate gTLD operators is slightly better for  (2013: 13 % and 2016: 5 %)

Question why 2014 higher?

Marilia: in 2014 first time gTLD were surveyed. Some ccTLD also operate gTLD, maybe they responded as such.

Point on response rate is not to get high number, but to get feed -back from customer community

Elaine: number of customers (4000 invites), and only low number.

Marilia: number of invites includes the overall number of IANA functions customers. This includes for example RIRs. So this is a larger group then TLD operators.

Further one invitation per operator. For number of TLD interactions see slide 10 out of 13.

Survey was send out to operators with interaction with PTI/IANA. Instances with email addresses is how operators are included

Question: Why did number ccTLDs drop since 2014? Note that the slide 10 is about delegation and transfers. TLD itself, the operator

Byron: Slide 9 provides broader perspective on numbers

Who should receive survey?

In particular on who and on what basis should be approached.

Elaine: Shorten the timeframe between interaction and sending the survey.

Elise G: Considering that people forget about the ticket (interaction/change). Include post - ticket survey. However, this needs to be build into the system. To do post ticket survey, need to be linked to ticket system. Currently other priorities.

Byron: At CIRA own customer satisfaction system. At CIRA currently post-ticket survey, not detailed. Try to get feed-back on each ticket. The outcome also provides sub-set on annual feed-back survey.

Byron: Any other comments?

Jay: What segmentation do you think should be added to the survey?

Allan: put selection at the start of the survey. Identifier upfront

Jay: Any other segmentation - such as sizing of the customer? Or regularity of contact?

Allan: Not discussed.

Jay: On Segmentation, development needed

Segmenting by size or contact:

TLD size: Not to be interpreted as (SLD) domain names under management but number of TLDs  managed by operator. Drives frequency of interaction. If included then self-identify of number of TLDs managed

**Action 11-2017 03: PTI check with vendor on adding the questions with size of TLD operator ( TLD names managed by operator) on basis of self-selection**

Allan: suggest CSC reach out to community to respond to increase response rate. This requires the survey timeline to change

Pre-notification in October and help promotion in Abu Dhabi (ICANN 60).

See slide 12 out of 13

Other Questions?

Marilia: Survey will be analyzed by vendor, change from past to ensure

complete independent analyses. However, PTI will also get raw data.

Jay: Satisfaction measure, needs to be linked with importance factor. Is that technique used? Marilia: first importance is measured,

Jay: Does the survey include broader questions on the set of services provided and the per eived need for new services to be introduced (or existing services dropped)?

Response: Only in open ended part.

Jay: include in more formal way. Opportunity to sense need for services

Elise G: As concept of survey is moving to post ticket questions and more formal survey in future, allows more room for these type of questions

Jay: is there a possibility that CSC may see questions before they are send out, to provide feed-back

Marilia: can send them

Byron: send to the list, pre-warns about wordsmithing, that is beyond responsibility of CSC.

Elise G: Need to be in touch with vendor, who needs to be alerted of potential changes, and at the same we need clarity whether timeline is affected.

**Action 11 2017 04: PTI to send draft survey to CSC list to seek additional feed-back from CSC**

**Action 11 2017 05: PTI Report back after conversation with vendor if there are**

**issues with implementation of suggestions and that may affect the timeline**

**6. Update on CSC Charter Review**

ccNSO – RySG led review

CSC liaison to the group.

Identify liaison put out request

**Action 11 2017 06: Secretariat to send out call for liaison to Review team CSC charter**

CSC to provide input

Elaine to lead the CSC internal review to provide input

assistance by Allan

Action Elaine: lead CSC internal review to start by August meeting

**7. Update on Procedure for SLA Amendment**

Jay: Two groups can do the SLE review?

Result of CWG proposal

IFRT is intended to contain CSC liaison

Jay: IFRT consultation and CSC /PTI Each can run process

Postpone further discussion:

Recommending changes

Byron: delicate balance otentially proportionality and need for streamlined way of conducting review

Further discussion next meeting

**Action 11 2017 07: Secretariat to send cheat sheet/overview of documentation and put item on next agenda.**

**8. AOB**

Elise G: PTI received complaint (June 2017) Escalation: requirement to add name to role account.

Jay: was copied noted the lack of respect etc.

**Action 11 2017 08: PTI Document the complaint / escalation as appropriate to inform CSC**

On Escalation: limited role CSC as prescribed in its charter.

Jay: intervene on the level of expectation and manner of interaction.

Outside normal escalation report

Report CSC stays as is, complaint was submitted in June 2017

**9.    Next meeting**

Monday 17 July 20.00 UTC

**10. Adjourn**