

**“Punch List”/Open Items on Post-Transition IANA Model
 Items for CWG Discussion and Input**

	Task	DT	DT-C Comments
IANA Function Review (IFR)			
6.	Proposal contemplates that a Special Review may also be initiated by TLDs on concerns raised by TLDs directly with the ccNSO or the GNSO. (Section III.A.i.d.)	DT-N	
Customer Standing Committee (CSC)			
11.	Composition: who will select the TLD representative that is not a ccTLD or gTLD registry? (Annex G, page 59)	DT-C	An Expression of Interest must be submitted to be considered eligible for the CSC. For a person seeking to represent a TLD not considered to be either a cc or gTLD registry, the Expression of Interest must have the support of the relevant registry, which will serve as a recommendation for appointment to the CSC. As the ccNSO and GNSO Councils are responsible for approving the full membership of the CSC, the EOI will be considered as part of that approval process. NB: References to ccNSO and GNSO should be changed to ccNSO Council and GNSO Council.
12.	Full membership of CSC is approved by ccNSO and GNSO. By what percentage? (Annex G, page 60)	DT-C	Full membership of the CSC is to be approved by the ccNSO Council and GNSO Council in accordance with their own rules and procedures. The approval process should include some form of consultation between the two Councils.

13.	If ccTLD or gTLD representative is recalled, can meetings continue before a replacement is named? (Annex G, page 60)	DT-C	In the event that a ccTLD or gTLD representative to the CSC is recalled, the appointing party can provide a temporary replacement while they endeavor to fill the vacancy. As the CSC will be meeting regularly on a monthly basis, best efforts should be made to fill the vacancy within one month of the recall.
14.	Determine how CSC will decide on who will be liaison to IFR. (Annex F, page 52)	DT-C	The CSC as a whole will decide who will serve as the Liaison to the IFR. Preference should be given to the Liaison being a registry representative given that technical expertise is anticipated to be valuable in the role.
15.	Proposed Remedial Action Procedures is noted as item to be agreed upon by CSC and PTI. Will this happen prior to transition? (Annex F, page 62)	DT-C	<p>It is expected that the CSC and the PTI will agree to Remedial Action Procedures post transition once the two entities are formed.</p> <p>It is important to note that the agreement should be between the CSC and PTI, not the CSC and PTI Board.</p>
16.	IANA Problem Resolution Process: contemplates that CSC can escalate to ccNSO and GNSO which may then decide to take further action “using agreed consultation and escalation processes”. What will these processes be and is anything contemplated beyond a Special Review? (Annex J, page 68)	DT-C	The ccNSO and GNSO will be responsible for developing their own procedures, which will be done post-transition. It is envisaged that the Special Review will not be the only possible escalation path available, for example the ccNSO and GNSO could seek a meeting with the ICANN Board as a mechanism to resolve issues.
ICANN/PTI Contract; Statement of Work and SLEs			

17.	Determine to what extent the ICANN/PTI contract will be enforceability mechanism (vs. CSC, IFR or other ICANN accountability mechanisms). (Section III.A.i. and Section III.A.i.c. See also Annex F)	CWG	
18.	Determine which rights under the existing NTIA contract will be implemented in the ICANN governance documents and which will be in the new ICANN/PTI contract. (Section III.A.i.c.)	CWG	
19.	Determine who will have the right to trigger remedies for breaches of, and otherwise enforce, ICANN/PTI Contract (i.e., will PTI Board exercise this right or will this require CSC or IFR). (Sections III.A.i.b, c, and d)	CWG	
20.	DT-A SLE documentation following receipt of additional IANA documentation. (Section III.A.ii.b. and Annex H)	DT-A	
Escalation mechanisms			
21.	Who does ccNSO/GNSO escalate unresolved issues to? Will there be an IRP process? (Section III.A.ii.a. and Annex J, footnote 22)	DT-M	This is related to Q. 16 and will be dependent upon the procedures developed by the ccNSO and GNSO, which are expected to happen post-transition.

22.	Additional detail on how a persistent performance issue/systemic problem will be defined (e.g., discretion given to CSC or some principles-based standard)? (Section III.A.ii.c.)	DT-M and DT-C	<p>This is related to Q15 and should also be considered in the context of the SLAs contained in the contract.</p> <p>The Remedial Action Procedures should contain a threshold of what is regarded persistent or systemic problems, for example if reports reveal that an SLA has not be met for 6 continuous months this would be considered a persistent performance issue; however, it should be recognized that the CSC will have the discretion to determine whether this is a trivial or serious matter, and agree a course of action appropriate to the circumstances.</p>
23.	Customer complaints, Phase 2: additional detail on customer mediation process and ability to initiate an IRP. (Annex I, page 66)	DT-M and DT-C	It appears that this question relates to a) and c) and as such is outside the remit of the CSC.
37.	Customer Standing Committee (CSC) – A CSC should be created and empowered to monitor the performance of the IANA functions and escalate non-remediated issues to the ccNSO and GNSO. The CSC should be contemplated by the ICANN bylaws. If not currently within the mandate, the ccNSO and/or GNSO should be empowered to address matters escalated by the CSC. Section III.A.ii.a.; Annex G and Annex J)	CWG	<i>Note: Continue to monitor</i>