

## CSC Comments on the Draft CSC Charter Review

1. The CSC welcomes the opportunity to comment on the RT's draft report. We would like at the outset to thank the RT for the open and collaborative manner in which they have developed their report and for allowing the CSC the opportunity to directly provide input.
2. Overall, the CSC believes that the report is both thorough and first-rate and fully support its recommendations. In particular, the CSC strongly agrees with the recommendation in 4.3.2 that 'the mission and scope of the responsibilities of the CSC should not be expanded'. We believe that the CSC has had a very productive and effective first 18 months and that this is in large part due to the focus required by the existing narrow mandate.
3. In Paragraph 4.3.11 the RT indicates that it "believes that the provision for a regular review of the RAPs (Remedial Action Procedures) should be included in the Charter". The RAPs contain language specific to the question of their periodic review, specifically that "*The Remedial Action Procedures should be reviewed twelve (12) months after the first initiation of the procedures and every twelve (12) months after a subsequent invocation of the Procedures, with a review occurring no more frequently than once in a twelve (12) month period.*" We would note that the proposed revised charter that has been submitted as part of the RT's report contains no wording with respect to the review of the RAPs. We confirm that is correct, because the RAPs address the regular review and therefore it is included by reference.
4. The CSC welcomed the RT's commentary on the two issues that it acknowledges are outside the scope of the RT's work:
  - a. Potentially Duplicative Reviews  
The RT correctly points to two forthcoming CSC related reviews, one a CSC effectiveness review, and the other, the first periodic IANA Naming Function Review (IFR), noting the potential burden that these simultaneous reviews could place on the CSC, as well as the real possibility of significant overlap of the two reviews, and concluding "that the number and timing of CSC related reviews has the potential to affect proper functioning of the CSC." The CSC is aware of this problem and strongly supports the RT's recommendation that the ccNSO and GNSO Councils conduct an analysis of the requirements of the reviews with a view to creating synergies and avoiding overlap.
  - b. Travel funding support for the CSC  
The RT correctly points out that the IANA Transition Proposal recommended that no travel support be provided to members or liaisons of the CSC because it was assumed that travel support could be sourced from their respective groups and that the main work of the CSC was expected to be done online. The selection criteria seeking CSC candidates explicitly mentioned that no travel funding would be made available. Since that time, it has become clear that CSC members need to attend ICANN meetings, both to enable a regular open CSC meeting and to consult with their constituencies on CSC matters. Consequently, the CSC informed the RT that the ability of CSC members to update the ICANN community at ICANN meetings could be compromised by the lack of

travel funding for Members. The CSC supports the RT's recommendation that the CSC be eligible to seek funding for travel support in accordance with ICANN's budget and travel policy requirements.

5. In closing, the CSC wishes to acknowledge the recognition that the RT has given to the CSC, in particular its words: "It is evident to the RT, as a result of the consultations undertaken, that the inaugural CSC is a cohesive and collaborative team that has, in its first 12 months of operation, undertaken a significant body of work in developing operating procedures and carrying out its role as prescribed in the Charter. Importantly, the CSC has also developed a good working relationship with PTI and the direct customers of the IANA naming services".