
KIMBERLY CARLSON:

Sorry. Thank you for joining today's ccPDP on Review Mechanism on 8th of April at 18:00 UTC. Roll call will be taken in its usual fashion based on those on Zoom. As a reminder, this call will be recorded and the recording will be posted on the public Wiki. Also, as a reminder, please mute your phones and microphones when not speaking to avoid any background noise or echoing. And with that, Bart, I'll turn the call back over to you. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you, Kimberly. I assume we have nobody on phone only, so if you want to raise a question or a comment, please raise your hand in the chat and you can use the chat [app] of course.

So can you go through the agenda, please? So as you know – and welcome and roll call, we have done it – I [made this] announcement effectively... Yeah, there too. One is, and this is particularly relevant for the previous, say for the members of this group who are also members of the Retirement Working Group, so that's the other PDP Working Group. We've circulated a survey questionnaire last week. If you are able and willing, please respond to that questionnaire. It is intended to provide some feedback on the way the Retirement Working Group progressed and the working methods of that working group, and as a learning point for this working group. So feedback is really, really appreciated, especially by those from the Retirement Working Group. And you can see the link to the survey in the chat room. It takes about ten minutes, so if you do have the time, please don't hesitate to do so.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

I'll circulate an e-mail tomorrow as well, tomorrow morning my time, and the survey will close on Friday. So that was point 2.1.

The next one is the Chair and Vice-Chair election procedure. According to the charter, the working group, especially specifically the members of the working group, so these are the ccTLD-related people, persons on the working group, should nominate the Chair and Vice-Chair. After nomination is closed and both, and the candidates have accepted their nomination, next step would be to go to the Council for that and seek their appointment.

For this, to date, I haven't counted but it's very clearly both the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Retirement Working Group, so Stephen Deerhake and Eberhard Lisse were nominated to date only as Chair and Vice-Chair. And given the e-mails and their responses, I assume they accept the nomination, but just to be on the safe side, I'll first ask Eberhard as he is on the call. Eberhard, do you accept the nomination?

EBERHARD LISSE: Yes. Yes, I do.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you. And Stephen, do you... I don't know if Stephen is on the call.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I am.

BART BOSWINKEL: I am. Okay. And I hope you accept your nomination as Chair of this working group as well.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: The answer is yes and I want to thank everyone for their expression of confidence.

BART BOSWINKEL: So thank you. So following this, say, as the issue manager, I'll... I can tell you the appointment by the Council is already included on the draft agenda and the Council will have a meeting next, I think, I assume it's the 16th. Yeah, it's the 16th of April. So then both Stephen and Eberhard will be appointed formally. I don't expect any surprises there.

So first of all, congratulations from my end as well, Stephen and Eberhard, and looking forward to working with you again, so as under the Retirement Working Group. So that was... Are there any questions, comments to that, on this item? If not, then we'll proceed with the draft Rules of Engagement.

So as I indicated on the last, on our first call, one of the first working items for the working group is to discuss and agree upon Rules of Engagement. On the first call, I just introduced the concept and shared an updated version or an adjusted version – that's the better word – from the Rules of Engagement used by the Retirement Working Group because I assume that given the rules, they worked pretty well with the Retirement Working Group so it's a good starting point for this working group as well.

And it's also, I wanted to do this as a way of those who are not very familiar with the way ccNSO working groups function, to show you how working groups work, especially when we deal with a lot of documents. So as you will see, the document is numbered. It's got page numbers and line numbers and we'll go through it. And whatever is discussed on this call and whatever is acceptable on this call and this is just the first reading, it will be revisited when the Chair and the Vice-Chair have taken up their position and they can do whatever they want with it, of course. But I assume that they will take it to the next phase, and that is a second reading of these Rules of Engagement.

The Rules of Engagement, that role is more or less to, they are complimentary and add more color and depth to the provisions in the charter around the working method. So it very clearly, as is stated in the document as well, that the charter is paramount and if there is conflict in any place. But it's just to... It's intended to structure the working method and as a fallback mechanism for everybody in case there is, say, unclarity in the proceedings of the working group.

So the way I want to go through these documents is on a page by page basis and ask you to comment on a page by page basis with a reference to the line numbers. So as an example, we'll start with page one. I'll ask you for comments and as Eberhard has already added some, ask Eberhard what he's added to the paragraph, and then seek if there are any comments from other members as well. And then specifically if you have comments, please refer to a specific line item or line number.

So starting now with page one, Eberhard, can I ask you because you've added a whole paragraph, which paragraph, what is the background of adding this paragraph and what you've added?

EBERHARD LISSE:

We had this in the previous working group and we added it eventually to the Rules of Engagement, which weren't circulated that well. We had one opportunity, whatever, three or so members on the call only and we should, we decided that if we have less than five at the other group, then the question should be asked and debated whether the meeting should be continued because it's not really fair for the decision making process if two or three people meet and then it's counting as one reading. So in such a case, I think we should at least talk about it, not necessarily say we can't have it with less than five. But if it's less than five, the issue should be mentioned and not be overlooked.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you, Eberhard. Are there... Is there any questions, comments on this addition? I don't see any hands up or... So people on the call, if you agree, can you use your green tick, like "yes, please". Eberhard has [inaudible] more. Yes, I can see it. Anna, I think it looks like most people are in agreement. Is there anybody who's opposed to this? Are there nos?

EBERHARD LISSE:

Nos should push the "no" button.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. Yeah, I don't see any nos. Thank you. So we'll include this. It's, in the next reading, has standard text. So are there any other comments, questions regarding, say, from line item six through line item 24 on page one? I don't see anybody else. Yes, I see Francis. Francis, you got your hand up.

FRANCIS ALANEME: Yeah. Good evening, everybody.

BART BOSWINKEL: Good evening.

FRANCIS ALANEME: I have a question on line 15.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, go ahead.

FRANCIS ALANEME: It says the proposed [inaudible] will not appoint more than one member of [inaudible]. And I want to ask because I know we are quite [inaudible] on [inaudible] members, if more than one member, that doesn't mean the proposed extension will not [inaudible] or I think it should be a kind of percentage contribution instead of just one member. I [inaudible].

BART BOSWINKEL: You're talking about the line item, at least one we'd notice or be given if the scheduled duration is to be extended?

FRANCIS ALANEME: Yeah, [inaudible] line 15.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah.

FRANCIS ALANEME: [Inaudible] number of people that needs to object before [inaudible].

EBERHARD LISSE: Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Go ahead, Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: If I may, this is line 17. One thing, if I had known we were using this, I would have put this in a larger font and on landscape and for the new members, if you put your documents and you're trying to put it in larger font and on landscape so it fills the whole screen and it's easier to read.

The point about extension means that if we have scheduled a meeting, we usually schedule it for six, for 90 minutes and we try to close after 60 minutes. But we will close it after 90 minutes and only, for example, if

some urgent business, we say, "Okay, we can hang on a few minutes," but some of us have schedules so we don't want to let this... As a working group, we didn't want to let this get into a freefall and wanted to have a little bit of disciplined, that we discipline ourselves with regards to scheduling and timing and we found this worked very well.

We also don't have to over-engineer it, really, because the rules are more or less that we have a document that we can revert back from. We usually work back on census. And if somebody has an appointment, he can just leave the meeting. So I wouldn't make too much about it. It's just that generally speaking, we try not to extend it and if so, only shortly, and if there's something important, basically, then we can't do it unless everybody is in agreement.

FRANCIS ALANEME: Okay. Thank you very much.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. And Francis, is that your new hand or...

FRANCIS ALANEME: No, it is the old one.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay. Can you put it down please? So if there are no further questions, can we go to... Can you lower your hand please, Francis? Thank you. And

mute your microphone. Can we go to page two please? Or say it the first time [inaudible]. Thank you.

I see, so stop. Thank you. A little bit higher. Yeah, thank you.

So first of all, are there any questions regarding line items 25 to 28? I don't see anything. Then I go to line item 30 to 35, lines 30 to 35, and Eberhard, you have a comment there. He agrees [inaudible].

EBERHARD LISSE:

I found the language a little bit difficult to understand because I understood the sense of it, but maybe we should wordsmith it a little bit. I don't really understand, if I read it, having been discussed and opened, should be two words and it's a word and an adjective and I don't really understand it altogether. So maybe we just wordsmith it a little bit.

The point is that we will have two readings and we will not just make any decisions if, unless it has been debated at least twice. We must just wordsmith this a little bit. I just wanted to put a marker in that, to draw attention to it. That's all.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yeah. Okay, thank you. Noted and we'll adjust it for the next call. So thank you.

Any comments? And I Stephen is agreeing. What I think... I've noticed Jaap's comments in the chat around the position of the advisers and/or observers, etc. Because we're dealing with this, there is and that was

explained on the previous call that was shared between members and other participants with the exception, I would say, from support staff is that in principle, there is consensus and everybody participates on equal footing. So if there is an objection, say, in your role as adviser or just as a participant, then you should, say, as part of the consensus, then it's, of a consensus call, then there is no point.

Only when it comes to a vote and there is a clear, according to the charter at least, there is a clear distinction between members and non-members, so the other participants. Only the members will be asked for a vote. But in principle, and as you well know, to date, there has never been a call for a vote. So it's a consensus call and everybody should be able to share their views even in the consensus call. Eberhard, your hand is up.

EBERHARD LISSE:

I just wanted to read this. We tried to do this by consensus. Later in the document, we mention the [inaudible] in the ditch standard that only serious things that really, only serious issues should break consensus. We have, in the past, worked very well by saying minor issues, we let it go and we focus on the main picture. But if we cannot achieve consensus, then it comes to a vote and the vote is only the [inaudible]. Otherwise, if everybody is in agreement, then we don't need a vote. But even if two observers or two staff members break consensus, then we will still have a vote. Yeah?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Yeah.

EBERHARD LISSE: That's basically the point. The idea is not to have any vote. The idea is to come up with a thing that everybody can stand behind.

BART BOSWINKEL: So I hope that's clear from, in respect to your comment, Jaap. Eberhard, your hand is still up. Let's go to line item 35 to 38. Any comments there? I don't see any. And I see negative phrasing, a suggestion. Okay. Thank you, Peter. We'll take that into account as well. We'll say with respect to line 30 to 35. So back to 35 to 38, any comments there? 35 to 38? I don't see any hands up. No. No comments, then we proceed with 39 to 42. Any comments? None. Thank you.

Then we go into the Rules of Order. Again, this is... I'll go through it, say, paragraph by paragraph. So if you have any comments, then please focus on these paragraphs.

So 44 to 46, any comments? I don't see any. 47 to 49? No comments. 50? No comments. 51 to 55? No comments. Thank you. 56 to 57? No comments, and I'll go 58-59? 60-61? 62? None. 63 to 65?

EBERHARD LISSE: I just wanted to comment quickly a little bit.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. Go ahead, Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: We have never had to use this, but there have been working groups accountability framework, for example, where this became a little bit out of order or disorderly. So we wanted to put a reasonable mess. In previous working groups, we have put in a reasonable way of being able to deal with such events. We have never had to use it. We don't foresee. I don't foresee that it's going to be used, but it's better to have a little thing that we say in case this happens, this is how we are going to deal with it so everybody knows what can it can expect and is predictable.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. Thank you, Eberhard. And just to reiterate this point, that's why the charter has foreseen this document is the first one so you build upon these Rules of Engagement so there will be no surprises during the process. So that's the real reason for doing this, having rules that you all accept. So there will, at one point, will be a call for consensus around this one. Anna, go ahead.

ANNA KARAKHANYAN: Sorry. I passed the 62. In advance, in which way? It message to group or at the beginning of meeting or call? This can only be done in advance, but not during a meeting or call.

BART BOSWINKEL: What we were thinking last time is if meetings were starting to get consistently out of order, then we would, the Chair, the Vice-Chair, and the issue manager would issue, the Chair would write it and issue to the

list because of certain, for [this] reason, the next meeting, we are going to have, we are going to use this method of the Board.

ANNA KARAKHANYAN: Sorry. You mean something like presentation or just remarks?

BART BOSWINKEL: No. The idea is, for example, if we have a disorderly meeting where some people shout in-between and continue to comment like it was in the Accountability Working Group, then we will say, "Next meeting, everybody will, for example, only be allowed one contribution for each topic," and that means you must think before you speak, what you want to say, say everything and then it's done.

ANNA KARAKHANYAN: I understand.

BART BOSWINKEL: The idea is to protect everybody, that everybody can be heard if he or she wants to speak and not some people who are articulate, who speak good English, who are loud, who are not shy, then dominate the discussion, and that we want to have a fruitful debate where everybody, even people who are not native English speakers and who are a little bit shy of speaking up can feel free to debate and don't have to worry about being pushed or something.

ANNA KARAKHANYAN: Thank you very much.

BART BOSWINKEL: Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart. As Chair, I can sum this up quite succinctly. Shouting, interruption and rudeness will not be tolerated. That's basically what we're trying to say here and it's never been an issue in the past and I certainly do not expect it to be an issue of this group going forward. Thank you, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you. And maybe one more is because that's the background of doing something in advance is you don't want to change the rules of the game halfway through the game. So it's even if there is a meeting that is the Chair and the Vice-Chair always have the possibility to close it and then do something in advance of the meeting. But you don't want to change any rules pending a call or during a call, so you're all of a sudden having a different way of interacting with each other. That's the reason why it always needs to be done in advance. So again, as people say in the chat, it's to, yeah, make meetings predictable so you can know what to expect and how people can interact. I don't see any further questions or concerns.

Anna, is this an old hand or a new hand? If it's an old, please lower it. Thank you.

So that was line 62. If there are no further comments, we go to line 63 to 65. No comments. I don't see any hands up. 66 to 67? No comments. 68? Nothing. So thank you.

Now we're going into the sections and that was already... I was preempting a bit on Jaap's comment in the chat, but it's consensus and the way it deals with consensus. So lines 70 to 72. Are there any questions, comments regarding lines 70 to 72? Yes, I see Peter's hand is up. Peter, go ahead, and Eberhard. Peter, please.

PETER KOSH:

Thanks, Bart. I probably should know this but the minority statements are mentioned in the footnote. Is that something that could appear in a more prominent place?

BART BOSWINKEL:

It's included in the charter anyway.

PETER KOSH:

Okay, fine. Okay, yeah. I see. I should have known this.

BART BOSWINKEL:

But this is... So the footnote is just as a clarification. It's not part of the rule. That's why it was included in the footnote, but it's definitely included in the charter. Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE:

This is the well-known “die in the ditch” clause. It’s better to put it in the footnote. I think the point is we should try to achieve full consensus, if possible, some consensus, and avoid getting objections, avoid getting minority statements. Of course, if we cannot achieve that, objections and minority statements are covered by the charter. As a guiding principle, it’s good that if we have small misgivings about small items, not to break consensus on minor issues. But if it’s an important thing for which you would be, that’s what we call it “die in the ditch for”, then go ahead, do it. But the plan is to be, to avoid picking small things and breaking consensus on it. We will always try to agree to get full agreement on everything but even if there is somebody is objecting to a minor thing, then I have also sometimes in some working groups said I don’t like it, but I can live with it and that’s it. So as long as we get the work done and we get it done right and we only, and everybody agrees with the important and big issues, if somebody has some small issues, we try to reconcile it. But if we can’t, I would propose – and that’s what it means – let it go.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you, Eberhard. Any further comments, questions or... around 70-72? I don’t see anything. Thank you. Then we go into the next section, Amending of the Rules of Engagement. Again, because, say this is around the, say if you agree upon it, you want to agree upon rules to change it as well. So this is 74 to 81. I see your comments, Eberhard, but let’s go first to 74 to 76. Any questions, comments around 74 to 76? I don’t see any. Yes, Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE: Just to be clear, if the group decides to change the rules, we have to read these changes twice.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes.

EBERHARD LISSE: And then they become effective. It's just to make sure that we can't make things up as we go along it. The Chair and the Vice-Chair and the issue manager cannot dominate the procedures, cannot change the rules just willy-nilly so that it is a democratic process and that we basically carry on and we try to get everybody to buy in into everything.

Should... I don't foresee the need of it, but it's better to have it rightly covered so that later, we can always refer back to it and say, "Are we doing it right?"

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you. Lines 77 to 78. No comments. 79 to 80, I note your comments, Eberhard. Anybody else before I go to you, Eberhard? Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: In 79 and 80, it makes more sense to say the working group interprets the section because the working group can amend it so the working group is the decision maker. That's why I said I think we shouldn't have "Chair" there. And in the next line, 81, I personally am not a native

English speaker but I wouldn't have used the word [inaudible]. I would have said "the chapter prevails", but that's a matter for a native speaker. So Steve and Nick and one of those, and Bernard can look at it and choose the best language or even leave it in there. I don't care really. I just thought "it prevails" is better.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. Peter, I see your hand is up. Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOSH: Thanks. Yeah, I support the second move. For the first one, I think this language here is in perfect alignment with the voice used in Section 5.1, which defers everything to the Chair. So this is a binding clause for the Chair by means of the working group agreeing to this. I'm not trying to be legalese in a foreign language. I'll shut up now.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you. Anybody else? So with respect to 79-80, I think the reason for including this... Peter, your hand is still up. Is that an old or a new one? Thank you. So the reason for including this, if the working group this is to avoid a stalemate. At the end of the day, it's the Chair and it's the Chair can only do something with support of the working group itself. So that's why and to break a kind of stalemate if something is happening this way. That's why these type of clauses are included. But I suggest that we revisit this one in the next one and I see Nick's comment with regard to prevail, then paramount. So we'll change that

to prevail. But Eberhard, I see your hand is up and I assume it's going on 79-80.

EBERHARD LISSE:

I think I'm right and everybody else is wrong. But of course, this is a perfect example of not dying in the ditch. This is an issue that I don't feel very strongly about. If the working group wants Chair, it's perfectly fine with me. I'm the Vice-Chair, so I may have the opportunity once in a while to interpret this, but personally, I think working group is better. But this is not something that is to me of major importance, and therefore, it's a very good example of the dying in the ditch principle. I will not break consensus on this issue.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you and I'll revisit or we'll revisit this as soon as the Chair and Vice-Chair are appointed, but that's for the next call I hope.

The other sections, and if you scroll down. And thank you. This closes the bit on the Rules of Engagement. The other parts in the Rules of Engagement, so extracts from the charter. There is, these are direct quotes from the charter itself. So they are included just to provide a little bit more context to the Rules of Engagement if ever to be used so we don't have to switch between the Rules of Engagement and the charter itself. So that's why I propose that we will not revisit this. You look at these at your leisure and yeah, that's from my end, would conclude the discussion on the Rules of Engagement. So this would conclude the first reading in those terms and the next time we'll update it and revisit the sections where there were some comments, etc. and

focus on them and then go out for a call for consensus. That's more or less the process. So this is also a good exercise in how the working group functions.

Are there any closing remark comments from you with respect to the Rules of Engagement, any of you?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart, for walking us through it.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you, Stephen. If there are nobody, nothing else, Kim, can you go back to the charter? So that was item number three.

As discussed on the previous call, we already started identifying, which are also included in the issue report, some mechanisms in the context of decision making around delegations or transfers, revocations, and retirements. As part of that exercise, we've identified the PTI escalation process, the CSC remedial action procedures, and some other relevant procedures like the bylaw reconsideration, the independent review process. Then you have the Ombudsman and what it does, maybe that's relevant for this group as well. And then there is arbitration as included in some of the ccNSO, or excuse me, ICANN ccTLD accountability framework's exchange of letters. So not in all, but some have an arbitration rule included and it might be worthwhile for this group to look at. These are, as far as I can tell, currently the, yeah, relevant related procedures around, as I said, decisions on delegation, transfers, revocation, and retirement of ccTLDs.

That being said and there is one more and that's the, which is not included, which is for RFC 1591, but that never came into existence.

As a starting point, as you recall on the last call, we've asked PTI – in this case, Kim Davies and/or Naela – to do a presentation on the PTI escalation process, how that works and whether it could be relevant. And then we go into the remedial action procedure. So the floor is yours, either Kim or Naela. Who's going to do the presentation?

NAELA SARRAS: Hi, everyone. I will do it.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay. Very good then.

NAELA SARRAS: See, Kim volunteered me. See in the chat. No. So I'm happy to do this. Thank you for giving us a chance to explain this procedure that we have in the IANA that we operate under in PTI to this group and good day to everyone.

Okay. So we're going to talk about this procedure that we call the PTI Customer Complaint Process and how it escalates throughout the organization to hopefully reach a conclusion that is to the customer satisfaction. So Kimberly, will you please go to the next slide?

Okay. So it's important to explain there are... So what we do is on the IANA website, on IANA.org, we provide a complaint form that the

customer can go and lodge a complaint about a service that they've received from IANA. It's important to mention here that this is not just about a specific request. So I know Bart, you want us to... You said to specify that this applies to the delegation, revocation, transfers, and retirement. But essentially, this complaint form that anyone could use to complain about anything that we performed in terms of a service, they were not completely happy with and they want to draw our attention to it.

BART BOSWINKEL: So Naela, sorry. Because I can't raise my hand, that's why I just chime in. Just to do it reverse, so it means in case of delegations, there are complaints around delegations, transfers, revocations, and retirements, people could use this form.

NAELA SARRAS: Absolutely. Yes. Yes.

BART BOSWINKEL: And then the next question – maybe you will address this – who can use it?

NAELA SARRAS: Yes. Okay. So anyone can use this form. If it's a party that we've worked with on a specific request, it could be that requester or it could be anyone that's impacted by that request that was completed. What happens is when that form is submitted, the very first thing that we do

is we look at the specifics of what that complaint is about and try to either tie it to a specific request number that we worked on and then we take it from there in terms of reviewing it. And I'll go through the escalation part in the second slide.

Or it could be also something about where somebody sent a question to IANA and said, "I want to do this, X, and IANA doesn't perform X." So we say, "I'm sorry but it's not within our remit. We do not do this." So we basically turn down the request, and so it could be a complaint about that. So we need to go through a triage at the beginning of this request when it comes, when it is submitted. Is it something that we even do or perform? And as you can imagine, a lot of things come into IANA that are not within our control so we do have to explain that this is not something that we can address as a complaint but they might want to go consider talking to the service provider or other organizations. Is that clear? I don't see hands either. I'm not monitoring on the hands, so please stop me if that's not clear.

Another thing that I wanted to explain here is that the complaints don't necessarily have to come by going to our website and finding the complaint form. As of about a year and a few months ago, IANA implemented the How Did We Do Survey, the HDWD here that you see. So after completing each ticket and each request that comes into IANA, a few days after the completion of the request, we send an e-mail to the requester and we say, "How did we do? Did we complete this request to your satisfaction? And if there are any issues, let us know." It's a very simple yes/no. So if they hit "no", they have an option to provide us with a comment to say what it is that they were not satisfied with. So that's essentially another form that we can get immediate feedback and

they can give us immediate feedback about the performance that on that request and we can also, when we receive those nos that I was not necessarily happy with your performance on this request, we do follow-up with each no and say, "You gave us this rating. Was there something we could have done better?" So we don't necessarily wait for customers to need to go to the website and tell us that they have a complaint. We solicit that right away at the conclusion of each request that we do.

Another way, also, customers can reach us is on the website. We provide an e-mail address that they can e-mail us directly to and say, lodge a complaint or something that they were not completely satisfied with.

So those are the ways or the inputs in which feedback can come back to us if someone may be unhappy with the performance with how we completed a change request for them. And again, as I said, the very first thing of when these things are submitted is to verify whether this pertains to a specific request such as a revocation or a delegation or a transfer or if this is something that's not within IANA's remit. So next slide please, Kimberly.

So this is a little bit of... This is our internal process and we chose here to share with you the format that we use here. It's called the swim lane. So if you could just bear with us here. It's, the diagram is a little confusing but I want to take you through it and explain what we do and the way we escalate this process.

So on the previous slide, I said we have the triage on this side, whether it's something that is actually within our control and it's something that

we need to follow-up on. So in the first lane here, we have the customer. In the top row, we have the customer submitting a complaint form. The very first thing that we do is it comes back to the IANA Specialist or the team member that worked on that request and they read the input that's coming from the customer as to what their complaint is and they attempt to resolve that complaint by either remedying... if we, indeed, made a mistake, remedying that mistake or explaining why the specific action that was taken by the IANA Specialist was what it is and responding back to the customer.

That feedback goes back to the customer, from the IANA Specialist back up to the customer. The customer has a chance to confirm "yes, we've resolved their complaint" or "no, we haven't". If they determine that we still haven't resolved their complaint, then they can escalate to the next step and say "I'm still not satisfied with this resolution the IANA Specialist provided me with" and they can escalate to the next step which is the IANA management. This is basically the team that's overseeing the IANA specialists that are fulfilling the requests and looking into that request to see if, indeed, the customer has a legitimate complaint that we still haven't resolved or if we acted within exactly our process and they're just not happy with the results.

So that's what the, in the second lane here where we have IANA management, they do their part and they respond back to the customer. Again, it goes back to the customer. The customer, in this case, determines if the response they received from IANA management is satisfactory. If not, they have the option to reply back and say "I'm still not satisfied with this." At this point, the team has done what they could, their management has done what they could, then we take it to

the next step up and that goes to the next swim lane which is the PTI President.

The PTI President looks into the details of what the request originally was, what the work that the team has done to try and resolve it, and what explanations they provided with the customer. If, indeed, they acted improperly, the IANA Specialist and their management, then they resolve it. If not, then they explain what has been done and send it back to the customer. The customer, at that point, reviews, decides it has been resolved to their satisfaction. If not, then they choose to also escalate and they escalate. It has to go to the next step.

The next step after the PTI President is the ICANN CEO. ICANN CEO also repeats and reviews what the IANA team has done and their management and their president has tried to do to resolve this, informs the customer. If the customer is still, back up to the customer lane, if the customer is still not satisfied, at that point, IANA, the PTI has done all the escalations that they can, they've escalated to ICANN CEO and they're still not satisfied, they can go and opt to take the next escalation path which is the ICANN Ombudsman process. And I see that that's also later on in your slides, Bart.

So the ICANN Ombudsman process is completely external to the PTI process. We feed into it by providing information as requested by Ombudsman, but they're handling is completely outside of the IANA team. So the process basically ends there for us because we are not able to take it any further and the customer can escalate to the Ombudsman if they wish to.

So that's the flow chart here of how we handle escalations. I'll stop here.

BART BOSWINKEL: Naela?

NAELA SARRAS: Yes. Go ahead, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Do you, are you able to take questions during the presentation or you want to close it first? Because I see Peter's hand is up.

NAELA SARRAS: I think let's go ahead and take it now because it probably, it's good with this chart, the way it's, with how complicated this chart is, it probably is good to take it now.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay, thank you. Peter, go ahead.

PETER KOSH: Yeah, thanks Bart, and thanks Naela for letting me intervene here. So looking at this chart and I probably should know that myself, but I'm wondering. Usually, if you have a multi-tier appeals chain, then lower parts of the appeals chain will address the issue on substance and the upper parts would only look on the procedural issues. Is there any

separation like this in that escalation process? And if yes, where would that change apply?

NAELA SARRAS:

Yes. I think I... So Peter, you're saying on substance as in, let's say, on the lower part, did they do what was being asked of them to do correct? And then on the upper part, it's exactly what you're saying. In the upper part, it's looking at, for example, if the complaint isn't about that we did something wrong but we simply took too long. So the IANA Specialist will confirm that we did do the exact request that was requested of us to do, but then in the upper part, specifically at the IANA management and the PTI President level, they're looking at, yes we fulfilled the request but we took too long to do it. Where in the process are we failing and can we improve that part of the process? Does that answer your question, Peter? Did I understand it correctly?

PETER KOSH:

Yes. Thank you.

NAELA SARRAS:

Was there other questions on this one before we move on to the next slide?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

I have a question, Naela. I had my hand up but I didn't know if I was going to get called out or not.

NAELA SARRAS: Go ahead, Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: It's a sort of interesting question, really, and maybe, I thought you were going to come onto it, but could you give us some idea as to the number of these sorts of escalations that have ever happened? Has anything ever had to go to the ICANN CEO, for example? Or is it something which is there for people to use as a safeguard but actually in practice is never needed? Can you give us some sort of idea as to how many people actually use this and are there any sort of statistics around how many complaints are upheld or rejected or whatever?

NAELA SARRAS: Right. So it's interesting you're asking for numbers because we keep track of those numbers. So yes, the process it's used. It's very rare. I can tell you on the naming side, since this is a naming... a group that's concerned with the names, for example. Looking back, I was reviewing some of the data for this in the last couple days. This has been used about four times in the last three years and the reason I'm specifically saying that is we have to report those numbers to the Customer Standing Committee, so on this next slide, I was going to get to that. Each escalation that comes into IANA is reported to the Customer Standing Committee and the Customer Standing Committee, in their monthly meetings, ask IANA staff to explain the escalation and what we're doing to resolve it.

So the process is used and whether, how far it's... Honestly, I can't remember an example where it went up all the way to the ICANN CEO. It definitely gets up to the PTI President because there are examples where the escalation is triggered on things that we truly can't affect. I'm sorry I can't give specific examples out of respect for the specific complaints, and a lot of them could be our ccTLD-related and we want to respect national sovereignty issues and currently how TLDs are set up and operated. So they do get up to the PTI President. Kim could probably speak to that. I can't think of an example where we raised it to the CEO. If my colleagues, Kim and Selina, can think of examples there, I'd be happy to give them the floor. I don't think so. Yeah. Basically, if it goes to Kim, Kim is asked to escalate it to his management. Kim is saying, "I'm not aware of anyone who has escalated through the whole procedure," and Selina is saying the same thing.

Okay. So thank you, Nick. That's a really great question, and Peter. So can we go, Kimberly, to the next slide, please?

Okay, so as I explained on the swim lane chart in the previous slide, the escalation tiers are the IANA Specialist themselves who worked on the request, IANA management, PTI President, the CEO and then, if once they reach the CEO, they're still not happy with the resolution, they can trigger the Ombudsman process.

A very important development on this is as of 2016 October, when following the IANA transition, the Customer Standing Committee, which was formed as part of that process keeps track of escalations and in each monthly report that we send to the Customer Standing Committee, we do, as I said earlier, we do report if any escalations

come through and we do report during the calls on what we're doing to try and resolve the escalation. We also provide a write-up to the Customer Standing Committee of each escalation, what the complaint was, and what we have done about it. And those are sent up to the CSC reports, as mentioned here.

Then the CSC from their side, takes... I'll let that be explained in the next process which is if they determine that there is a pattern or there is the same complaint keeps coming over and over again, then that triggers them to look at it from their side and perhaps initiate the remedial action procedures with Allan will explain. And I believe, Kimberly, do we have anything after this slide? No. So we don't have anything.

So that's really the escalation process we use. It's fairly simple and it's fairly focused. It's primarily focused on if it's something we can address, we can do anything about. If yes, then let's do it. If not, then we need to explain why it's something that the IANA, it does not fall within the IANA functions and we cannot do anything about it.

And it's important to mention at the beginning also, as I said, this is anyone can lodge a process and this is really for all of the IANA functions. This is not just for the naming even though we're, as a group here, focused on names. This also applies to the numbering function as well as the [protocol] [fan] which is our work with the IETF.

So that's it from me here. And I'll open it...

BART BOSWINKEL:

Okay, Naela.

NAELA SARRAS: Yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks. Yeah. So are there any other questions right now? And then I'll want to do a time check with you. Angela, go ahead.

ANGELA MATLAPENG: Thanks, Bart and Naela for the presentation. I have two questions. Firstly, I'd like to know if all the complaints have to start with the, what do you call, with the specialist or do you have a complaint that might go straight to, say, management, perhaps? And then do you... The second question is do you prioritize your complaints and what's the criterion to do this?

NAELA SARRAS: Yeah. Thank you, Angela. So really great questions. The very first one where you said do they come only through the form? Thank you. That's really a good point to make. They don't only come through the form and they don't have to go through the form. In fact, we do have cases where our management are people known to the community, so Kim Davies is in meetings, his management is also in meetings that are happening with the community, and as such, they are known to the community. So we do have people approaching them directly to say, "This was, I have a complaint," or "This was done by your team member and I'm not happy with the resolution." So that certainly is a path in which complaints come into the IANA department.

That said, the responsibility is on those that receive the complaints via e-mail to put it through the system to make sure that we've done it correctly. So they do forward it to our ticketing system and we do have, if you will, an area or a queue where we keep track of those. It's called the feedback queue. And then we take it from there so that we can do numbers and reporting on it based on that.

So we... and their first point of check from there if something comes to our management is to send it back down to us as the people, to me and my team specifically, as the people that are responsible for fulfilling these requests and to ask us for details. Have we... What was the request? Is it that we., how did we fulfill the request and why is it that we're receiving this feedback? What did we not do correctly with this request?

So if, when it comes in that manner, it basically skips the... It doesn't skip IANA specialists and the management team because they still have the role in reviewing and answering to their management what the details of that request was.

In terms of prioritizing, I have to say, Angela, because the numbers are so low, we don't necessarily have... We don't triage them in terms of this complaint needs to be addressed faster than that. Where we find the hardest part is explaining this is something that is totally within IANA functions and what the contract of the IANA functions say that we are to fulfill versus things that are a complaint about how something works on the Internet that we simply cannot affect. For example, I'll give you one recent complaint we got is about all the websites right now that are promoting remedies for Coronavirus and trying to sell

people things that they obviously don't fix the Coronavirus and why aren't we doing something about it, and just explaining that that content isn't something we're responsible for. So it's that. It's basically just triaging if this is something that yes, we can do and we're responsible for and it's our job and we need to fix it versus this is something that we need to educate the complainant about. Yes, it's a problem and it's not something we can do anything about.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you, Naela.

ANGELA MATLAPENG: Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you for the questions. So just doing a time check. I know we had the related procedure on the remedial action process from the CSC on the agenda, however, it's the top of the hour and I think we did have a lot of information to digest already. Allan, would you be willing to do the presentation on the next call? So that's... Or would you be available? So that's in 2 weeks and I believe the six hour rotation. Certainly. So my suggestion is that on the next call as an agenda, we go first again through a second read of the Rules of Engagement and then continue with a second related post, say, procedure, the remedial action procedure from the CSC which Naela already alluded to, so we already have an agenda for the next meeting. If you agree on this, so I want to close this meeting unless somebody objects.

Then I'll go to the AOB. Are there any... Is there any other business? Anybody comments or questions whatsoever? I don't see any comments. So I thank you again for your participation. I thank you, Naela and Kim, for the presentation and the responses in the chat because I think it clarifies a lot on the basic procedure that is in place and it definitely shows the need and illustrates the need to invite the Ombudsman as well to explain if and how they can, he can play a role with respect to delegation, transfer, and revocation, and retirement.

So yeah, that's it from me. I'm looking forward to you at the next meeting. The next meeting is in two weeks and six hours, so that will be 23. What is it? What time do we... 22nd of April, 0:00 UTC. So in some ways, it's the first time you will have the pleasure of having a call at 2:00 A.M. I hope you'll be able to attend at that meeting as well. Thank you very much and talk to you, and looking forward to talk to you in two weeks. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, all.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, all. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye, all.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]