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| **Design Team M.** | **Escalation Mechanisms** |
| **Draft Transition Proposal Reference** | III.A.1.1.2 |
| **Summary Description** | Note: there were no formal escalation mechanisms described in the IANA Functions Contract for the NTIA any new arrangement will require these.  The purpose of this DT is to develop a set of escalation mechanisms for any cases where IANA naming services fail to meet the responsibilities to its direct customers both on a case by case basis and on a trending basis. |
| **Detailed description** | The design team is expected to propose a progressive set of escalation steps that can be performed as applicable by individual ccTLD or gTLD registry operators, registry organizations such as the ccNSO and RySG, the Customer Standing Committee (CSC) and any other TLD related entity that may be part of the final CWG IANA proposal for the IANA Stewardship Transition. The steps may address but not be limited to any or all of the following:   1. What can an individual registry operator do if IANA service is not provided in a timely and/or satisfactory manner (e.g., if SLEs are not met)? 2. What can be done if there are multiple instances of untimely and or unsatisfactory IANA naming services? 3. What role, if any, can existing registry organizations such as the ICANN ccNSO or the ICANN gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) have in escalating IANA naming services problems? 4. What role should the CSC play in the escalation process for IANA name services problems? 5. If IANA naming services problems cannot be solved at the CSC level, how and to whom should the problem be escalated? 6. What role, if any, do the other SOAC have in escalating IANA name services issues?   Additionally, the design team is expected to identify any areas that may require coordination with the CCWG and describe how that coordination should happen?  Finally, the design team should collaborate with DT-A (SLEs), DT-C (CSC) and any other DTs that may deal with escalation mechanisms to synchronize its recommendations with the work of those DTs. |
| **Proposed Membership** | * At a minimum two gTLD registry representatives with operational knowledge of IANA Functions * At a minimum two ccTLD registry representatives with operational knowledge of IANA Functions * One IANA staff member (current or former) * One non-direct customer representative with operational knowledge of IANA Functions |
| **Expressions of Interest received** | Avri Doria, Staffan Jonson, Erick Iriarte |
| **Proposed by / Lead** | The first draft of this was prepared by Chuck Gomes; Chuck is willing to serve as Lead but is also willing to serve as a participant if someone else wants to be the Lead. |
| **Staff Support** | Marika Konings (lead) / Berry Cobb |
| **Status** | **Step 7-10** |
| **Determination by CWG Chairs** | **Priority 1** |
| **Mailing list archives** |  |