

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
March 18, 2015
8:30 am CT**

Marika Konings: Your recordings are started. Speakers, you may begin.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. So this is Chuck Gomes and this is the drafting team (M) first meeting on the 18th of March, fairly early in the morning for me. Probably not quite so bad for the two - for the rest of you.

Late in the day for Marika. Not quite but later certainly. So first of all, let me thank each of you for volunteering and for responding so quickly to being able to have a quick call this morning.

And I very much appreciate that. I sent around, within the last five minutes, a very quick agenda. I don't even know if you've had a chance to look at it but it's just a proposed agenda so anybody wants to add anything to it or make any changes, we can.

The first question I'd like to discuss is whether someone else wants to lead this or you want me to go ahead and lead it? I think we should decide that. As I said, why drafted up the template for this drafting team I'm willing to lead it if no one else is or doesn't want to.

But let's - we will first of all put that to bed. And then we'll discuss the first cut of a deliverable template that Marika sent around, again, in the last half-hour.

And then talk about the escalation procedures that I took out of a document that I became aware of late last week and see where we go with that. And then talk about next steps. Any suggestions for a diff- any changes to our approach? Anything we need to add us morning?

And, by the way, for the recording's we should identify ourselves and - but I think we're a small enough group that if you wanted - I mean, you're welcome to raise her hand. I am looking and Adobe.

But also I don't think it's bad for four of us - for people to speak up as long as we're respectful of people that are talking. So if everybody is comfortable with that, feel free to do that. Any suggestions on the agenda?

Okay, and again, we can change as we go because we are a small group and I think we're going to work quickly and be able to move forward on this in short order.

So let me - this is still Chuck speaking, so let's put the question to bed of who our leader will be for this. Again, I'm comfortable whatever wants to lead it. I will do that if you want. I think we're small enough group that leadership is not going to be a big issue but any thoughts on that?

Anybody want to volunteer to lead it? Do you want me to just go ahead and lead it? My guess is we'll proba- this is - working group will be a short lived working group other than any follow-up activity.

So, okay. So all right. So what I'm seeing in the chat is I'll just go ahead and lead it and you can put me down as the lead in the template for that, Marika. Did - I assume every - did either of you not see the information that was distributed yesterday? Is a link to our Wiki.

The - there's a link to the archives for the email. Of course, the email address and so forth. I think we're all okay on that. And so the - okay, so you have the basic information. Marika sent around - it both of you see the draft - first draft of the template for our deliverable that Marika sent around today?

Did either of you - let me ask it this way - did either of you not see that? It's not that you needed to spend a lot of time on it but I want to make sure you saw it. And so that is out there. Now that follows, I think, as will the, you know, that follows (unintelligible) a template that was put out - getting some echo there.

Am I - I wonder if I'm doing something. I have my computer phone off or computer mic off so I'm okay there. So it may be that both of you have to mute when I'm speaking or something. It seems to be okay now.

So that template - now Marika, and I'll let you respond to this but you're going to come in that template, fill in the left column, if I understand correctly. Right now, it just says reference the current page of the IANA's functions contract. And we're going to put in - there is no language in there so are we going to have anything in that box? Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, so this is Marika. It's my understanding that currently there is nothing in relation to escalation in the contract. So that's why it currently has NA and as

well in the background current state. That's what it basically describes. So I think in this case, there may not be anything we need to put in there.

Although, you know, there may have been - I'm not aware but maybe there have been formal escalation mechanisms whereby, you know, people have gone to NTIA and spoken to them if they were unhappy are other ways that we may want to reference.

But at least as far as I'm aware, I don't think there's anything formal in the contract as such that we could use as a basis. But I'm happy to stand corrected on that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. Erick, go ahead. Erick, are you on mute? I'm not hearing you.

Erick Iriate: Okay, you can listen to me now?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Erick Iriate: Okay, thank you. Erick Iriate. I have a question relating to point C with the issues you identified. It's about the reorganization of ccTLDs. For example, the TLD or center or (APT) could be part of this point C, existing register organization for ccTLDs?

Chuck Gomes: Let me make sure I understood you. Are you asking could we discussed that first? And that's fine if you'd like to. Would you like to start there?

Erick Iriate: Yes, because it - we started with this point. We can be more fast with the rest of the points. If you think that we don't have (unintelligible) ccTLDs could be there for my (site), it's fine because also some ccTLDs are not GNSO but are included in the reorganization of ccTLDs.

Chuck Gomes: Right. No, I understand that very well. It was (unintelligible). And we - so let me ask you a question. One of the - obviously question Number C is - in whatever escalation procedures we propose, should we consider allowing existing TLD organizations, whether be G or C?

Should we allow them to have any role in the escalation process? I don't have a firm answer for that. I don't have a strong opinion on that. But that's one of the questions in our, so to speak, charter here as to what we're doing.

I'm curious what both of you think, and Marika, as well, in terms of that. Do - and we don't have to finalize this decision right now. But as we're developing some escalation procedures, that's a question we will ultimately need to answer. So if I can stop there. Erick, why don't you respond first and Tommy what you think on that?

Erick Iriate: Okay, Erick Iriate again. It's clear that right now it (fits) only five reorganizations with ccTLDs. But in the future, it will appear more. It's not necessary but we have three or four ccTLDs and then appear in the organization.

Maybe we can (offer) clauses or a clause that we clearly say these organizations could have this power to escalate some of the situations. Maybe, but we need to almost include the (existing) organization for close to that - only create organization to create some troubles in the future. It is not clear for me how but I want to respect the (unintelligible) at this moment.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Erick. Do you think that it may be too problematic to allow such organizations to be involved in the escalation process?

Erick Iriate: It will be important to have their participation because (unintelligible) Latin America, we're more communicative - we have - working more together than other regions mostly in the (case of centers), we're more together than alone. So it will be important, I think, having that - in that case to have an escalation power.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. One more question for you before I go to Avri. The - do you think that the involvement of those organizations that be just through the CSC, the Customer Standing Committee, which I think the - it looks like the CSC will definitely have a role in the escalation process based on everything that's happened in the CWG so far and so forth.

But, what you thi- I mean, would it be sufficient to involve regional organiza- ccTLD and gTLD organizations - involve just with the CSC rather than having a direct involvement in escalation?

Erick Iriate: It's (incorrect), Chuck, only ccTLDs have a (reorganization). In the case of gTLDs, they don't have some kind of structure like that. And if I am correct, maybe I am wrong, in the CSC, it's not included directly the reorganization of ccTLDs.

This is very - a specific topic that has the opportunity to be working together between the ccTLDs and (for some reason). So for more reasons, I support the idea of including them in the point C specifically.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right, that's good. Avri, let me turn it over to you. This is Chuck again - and see what you're thinking about all this.

Avri Doria: Hi. This is Avri speaking. She, I hadn't even raise my hand.

Chuck Gomes: I know.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I was pretty much just thinking about all this and not thinking about talking about what I was thinking. In terms of the issue that was just brought up, in terms of can individual (unintelligible), and I'm not sure I totally understood, it certainly make sense for me that going through one of the -- what word are we using -- entities.

Going through one of the structures for individual registries and others that might have an issue makes sense, so going to the GNSO, going through the ccNSO, going through the CSC.

Now I don't think that the first thought that comes to my mind is that the SOs shouldn't need to go through the CSC but they could go to the CSC but that they shouldn't necessarily need to.

Now I - but I haven't really thought that through so I'm not really sure of that. But that's sort of my first instinct on that. And I do worry about the access point for the unaffiliated ccTLDs.

You know, I don't understand to what degree they're okay with going through the ccNSO. But I don't think they all are. And I don't understand to what degree - you know, we haven't really gotten into the (internals) of the CSC well enough to know what access the unaffiliated ccTLDs have to that.

So I'm not sure that they're covered yet. And that's one of the pending issues, you know, that I've got for that. And then I wonder about another access point and that's where there's also, you know, does the ombudsman have a role, for

example, in dealing with individuals, you know, within his role of the world being fair?

Is there a role there that sort of says that is another entry point that the individuals or the unaffiliated ccTLDs have a pass and it sort of gets vetted through their in the ombudsman can say, "Yes, this is an issue," and - because they couldn't deal with it at their point and he would work with CSCs or with whatever, and then escalated from there.

So that's the kind of thing I'm looking at, as communal, SOs have got to be able to go. The CSC has its own reasons for doing it, should have an opening channel. But there may be - need to be an unaffiliated type of access point also. Thanks. I hope that wasn't confusing or unhelpful.

Chuck Gomes: No, a lot of good thoughts in there, Avri. This is Chuck again. The - one thing - maybe it would be - based on one of the things you said it would be good to ask Marika to follow up on something unless she knows the answer.

And that is maybe checking with the ombudsman and seeing whether a role for the ombudsman could be in this esca- in the escalation procedures. For example, could a TLD regardless of whether they are part of the CNSO or gTLD registry stakeholder group, could they raise an issue with the ombudsman to help get resolution here?

And I think that's a very good question. Marika, I don't know - could you check with the ombudsman and just see whether that's - whether he thinks it's within his purview to get involved and things like that or if we're violating anything in the bylaws in that regard?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I can check, Chuck, on that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good, because I think you raise an interesting point there. With regard to the affiliated and unaffiliated registries - and by the way, I don't - we have some registries on the gTLD side that aren't members of the registry stakeholder group.

So to a lesser extent, we probably would also face that issue. I think that's one that drafting team C, the CSC one is going to have to deal with in terms of that and we may be dependent on what they come up with.

If they don't, then I think we're going to have to deal with that as well in terms of escalation procedures. So you raise a really good issue there. Any other thoughts on Item C that Erick raised?

We're going to come - we will come back to that because eventually will have to answer each of these questions in our final proposal. So okay, not seeing any hands, let me look in the chat here.

And obviously, I think we're all on the same page that, whether a registry is in the registry stakeholder group or in the ccNSO or even one of the regional organizations shouldn't impact their ability to participate in the process.

I don't think there's any standing requirement nor do I expect there to be one that you have to be a member of the ccNSO or the registry stakeholder group or any other organization to be able to benefit from the services of the IANA.

So - and the - I'm just looking at your last statement there, Avri. Yes, good point on the CCWG. So that's good. All right, so let's go on that we will come back all of these questions, okay, and we can talk about them as we're doing other things as well.

But let's go on to the draft escalation procedures that this group of registries and registrar - excuse me, ccTLD registries and gTLD registries have been working on. I was not part of that, by the way, just to set the record straight.

One of the participants in that group alerted me and some others in the gTLD registries group on, I think it was Friday, that these discussions have been going on and they're working on some ideas and so forth. And I literally just learned this morning that they have created a new version of the source document where I took those procedures from.

I haven't had time to look at that because I literally just saw it about 15 minutes, 15, 20 minutes this call started. I will look at that and pass on any information I get.

I - my understanding from one of the players in that is that they expect to publish for public consumption early tomorrow a version of the document and at that point, I can I'll send it out. Not that we have to be concerned with the total document because the total document covers more than just escalation procedures.

It has ideas with regard to CSC and some other stuff but the escalation part is what jumped out at me because of our task and so I pulled apart out and sent it around yesterday.

Did either of you not have time to look at that? Just let me know. If so, we'll go through it. If I know you've read it, we can just talk about it. We don't have to go through it.

Avri Doria: I haven't read it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, that's all I needed to know. So let's do this then - it's not very long, okay, so let's go through it and is it possible to put that up - in fact, Marika, what you have I think in your template there, actually included it in the - yes, you did.

So if we look at - and it's on - if you look at the first blocks there that start off with individual party dispute, and then it's number one, two, three and so forth, that, in essence, is that document.

Now I'm not saying we have to use this. Please understand that. But I thought they had put some thought into this that would get us started. So let's take a look at that if nobody objects to that.

So you can see on the screen there in Abode item number one, and the way it starts out, just as a quick overview, and it's kind of the way I was thinking anyway with regard to escalation before I ever saw the document, is that, you know, it should be the responsibility of individual registries to escalate a problem with the IANA first.

That was kind of my thinking anyway before it goes up to higher levels. And so you'll see that that's the way this starts out. So what you're seeing now are excerpts from this document that I referenced from - that some registries are working on.

The - so number one says where a TLD registry operator as a dispute regarding agreed levels of service or performance with the IANA functions manager, I think that's what that stands for, isn't it?

And the parties have been unable to negotiate a satisfactory outcome, the TLD registry operator will lodge a written complaint with the CSC. So they start out escalating right away here.

But the assumption, in my mind, is that the -- and this would maybe be the first step in an escalation process -- is that the operator itself with first escalate the issue to the IANA and before it ever gets to a point where it goes to the CSC or anywhere else. Let me stop there and see if that makes sense to both of you. Erick, go ahead.

Erick Iriate: Thank you. Erick Iriate. It's only a question. No, with the proposal, I am fine with the (unintelligible) but it's about the time. You said in the document, ten working days.

That's some days it will be too - it's a long time the problem reflects directly to a TLD in one moment. So - and to have all clarification about why it's ten days, why it's not one day, 24 hours or more quickly if possible.

Chuck Gomes: Well, thanks, Erick. Chuck again. First of all, the - what is it, design team A is working on service level expectations as both of you know. So they are going to - they're working on the number of days, okay.

And I agree with you, one of the concerns I have had is, okay, if a TLD is down because - maybe it's because of the delegation problem and it needs an emergency delegation, yes, I agree with you, ten days is way too long.

So that's an issue, though, that I think we need to work with (Paul Cain) and design team A on because I think they're doing that. So I would suggest that, if you haven't already done so, that you communicate with (Paul) or some other member of design team A in terms of your concern. I think it's perfectly

valid but I don't think it's part of our mandate to decide what the SLEs will be.
Does that make sense?

Erick Iriate: Yes, it makes sense for me but what that reason we can't - don't put exactly the number of days. I'm waiting for that document, so.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and don't worry about some of the elements of what we're looking at. Some of them will really relate more to other design teams than us. Let's try and keep our focus on the actual escalation steps and how those happen and what are the consequences if, you know, if they're successful, okay?

But your point, I'm with you 100% on the timing there especially in the case where a TLD, whether it be G or C is down. That can have huge consequences. So - but back to my - okay, Avri, it's your turn. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Thanks. My question was on a slightly different tack. It's in principle I think having the registries be able to go directly to IANA as their first stop in dealing with an issue makes sense.

(What I'm looking for) is, does IANA already have that customer service interface? Or is that - or does interface -- and this could be something I don't know -- or does that (instance) come through some other path within ICANN? And if so, how does that interface kind of, you know, move or (re-spliced) with IANA becomes an issue?

The other point is that if the CSC is the entry point for any and all individual registry issues with IANA, does it have or have to have a customer service type of entry point that can cope with the degree of how quickly do you answer questions, all the issues you deal with in a customer service

environment in terms of, you know, satisfaction and speed of answer and all that other stuff. So that's my question. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Great questions. Two of them there I think. And they're really good questions. With regard to the first one, I think that registries do have interface because they have to submit their request, whether it be a (route zone) Whois request change or a delegation or re-delegation request.

My understanding is that it has to be submitted by the registry to the IANA. So I think the interface exists. Now, a question for Marika again. I know that staff was working on trying to identify within the IANA team some representatives or a representative for several of our design teams that could help us on issues like the ones that Avri just raised. Do you know, Marika, what the status of that is?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I believe that we're working with (Elise) to identify what we can tap into for each of the design teams as we, you know, at the same time don't want to overburden the people in the group. And I need to check in where that stands.

But in the meantime, you know, if there are specific questions that you have, you know, we can start listing those and I can't, you know, record these and as soon as I've identified who is the person for our group, I can forward those.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I think the one that - the first question that Avri raised is certainly one that you can go ahead and pass on. I think I know the answer to it but let's get confirmation and make sure I'm not the one that's involved in interfacing with IANA so I don't have direct knowledge there.

Obviously we can go back to our people but I think it's better to go to the source since ICANN is the IANA is the source there. So that would if you can do that that would be good. Avri you want to continue?

Avri Doria: Yes thank you. Yes I guess I just wanted to reiterate on that.

What I was asking not so much do they have an interface to IANA. I know they submit their change requests.

But is there a customer service interface that sort of says, you know, what if the customer, you know, the registry as customer?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Avri Doria: Now I know within the ITF protocol side I send an email to them. And that's the customer service interface.

And if that's what it is that's fine but then you have to decide is that the way it wants to be, that's all. Thanks.

So yes I'm asking about a customer service interface for issues, not asking about the interface for submitting change requests. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Very well said. And I did not capture that very well. Marika you have that?

Marika Konings: This is - yes I believe so although, you know, Avri have a look at - I put the question on the right. If there is anything missing, put it in the chat and I'll add - I'll update it.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. And that's a great question. And that's...

Avri Doria: Yes, that looks...

Chuck Gomes: ...really critical for the escalation process. Go ahead. Okay?

Avri Doria: I was just saying that looks about.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks. So can I assume that the four of us are in agreement that it makes sense for the individual registry operator to escalate any problems directly with IANA?

Okay. So then that takes us to what this document on the screen jumps to right away what happens if there's a problem there or if there are unnecessary delays? What should the registry operator do?

Now what this document says is that, you know, it jumps right in. And their newer version which I haven't looked at yet may have changed this. And I'll let you know later today.

But is it our thinking that the very next step is to escalate it to the CSC or should there be some sort of intermediary step?

Is there something that should be done before going to the CFC? Any thoughts on that? Erick, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes. And...

Erick Iriate: Thanks Chuck. Maybe there is no direct answer to your question but is to add another question to this - to the (exclusion).

How does ccTLDs that are working for example in security aspects to protect ccTLDs or the TLD system that are related with security topics that is not exactly inside IANA, it's more in other parts of ICANN.

And this could be some article or some paragraph that could be inside another topics related could be problematic could be work it with other organization not acceptable yes?

I am clear that this work is for the IANA process. But some of topics that is not covered right now by IANA are covered by other parts in ICANN and especially in security topics. So I don't know how that could be mixed in the document or is not necessarily mixed.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Erick. Chuck again. Well first of all and I'm going to share my opinion so you're welcome to disagree with me and Avri too. But, I think that our focus in the CWG is on IANA related issues and that accountability, even the accountability part of that we're look to the CCWG to deal with that.

But if there are issues that have to do with for example security like you raised with ICANN outside of IANA then I don't think that's in our remit in our design team to deal with that.

And I think that it should be dealt I think in the accountability group for ICANN so that there's accountability as needed and transparency and so forth on those issues.

But I don't think it directly relates to our task at hand. Is there any disagreement with that?

Erick Iriate: I don't completely agree with you but this agreeing that the things that you said, one day TLD go down for some reason and that reason is a technical reason because from that ccTLD share span to all the system or something like that.

That is a security topic inside IANA situation and the IANA relation with the TLD. But it's also related with other teams or parts of the system. We don't say exactly ICANN.

It's necessary to have some paragraph or some article about that relation with other teams outside IANA or it's not necessary?

I agree with you. It's not necessary but it's only to put that topic in the description if the situation could reappear again.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Yes and so it sounds like we're in agreement. Now what we're going to do ultimately as our design team is come up with a proposal and submit it to the full CWG for their review and comment and ultimately approval to include it in the overall plan.

This particular issue I don't think we can spend a lot of time on if it's outside now. If it's a security issue with regard to IANA like for example with DNSSEC that's a different story.

There needs to be a way to - the escalation procedure we're working on would need to cover that.

Any further discussion on that?

So back to my question then I'd like to get those of us on the call to express opinions on that so we begin to see whether we're coming together on things. And that is does - should the - if the operator is not successful at - in solving the problem that was escalated directly to IANA should the next step be the CSC or should there be an intermediary step? And if so what could - what are some possibilities for intermediary steps?

Avri?

Avri Doria: Hi. Yes I think it kind of depends on the kind of issue. I think the CFC will largely be dealing with the structural issues of the SLE or the SLA whichever - what term we're using. And so that would mark off certain type of issue.

Now there's other issues, the issues of we're not being treated fairly for some reason or other that can have a different path and then for example if we get so far as to include it on a budget and path anything they can get tagged as a fairness issue believe would satisfactorily even within the current bylaws funnel themselves into a possible ombudsman entry point.

And so perhaps you actually have two entry points that if the complaint is such that it's pointing to a systemic problem that's definitely should have a CSC point.

But if it's, you know, we're not being treated fairly issue I don't know that you want to stick those in a CSC because they're not going to have that kind of at least I didn't expect that they would have that kind of individual case investigation judgment but figured more they'd be working on the aggregate systemic issue of the SLSLEs. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay no that's good. Thanks Avri, Chuck again. So let me translate in my own head okay and verbalize it to make sure I've got it right.

So if it's an SE issue I'll go ahead use a term SLE even though I like SLA better but I think that's the direction they're going.

So SLE, if it's an SLE issue did I understand you to say that that would go to the CSC? And I'll stop there before going on.

Avri Doria: I think...

Chuck Gomes: Is that correct?

Avri Doria: Yes I think especially it's - I think it's essentially correct. It's an SL issue that looks like it's a systemic issue.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Avri Doria: And, you know, so yes, but I don't know that each individual they did meet my SLE for some reason issue would necessarily be something that the CSC does.

As I say I don't know to what degree they're getting themselves into the mode of doing individual case work or are they working on an aggregate systemic level?

And so that's a question I don't have about the CSC but that makes a difference.

Chuck Gomes: Yes it does. So let me ask this then, Chuck again. If the - so is there a possible role - and I'm just picking up on an idea you mentioned earlier.

Is there a possible role for the ombudsman depending on the information we get back from Marika and the ombudsman is there a possible row for the ombudsman in cases like that where it's not - doesn't really need to go to the CSC, it's not a SLE and more indication of a systemic problem so it doesn't go to the - would the ombudsman then in your mind maybe be an option for dealing with that issue? And then I'll stop there. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes. I obviously I think so. But what I'm saying is as an entry point. And now the ombudsman in terms of ombudsman's informal process may be able to help them solve the problem, you know, and then that's it.

The ombudsman also be the one that knows that that function -- and I use a he simply because it's a he at the moment but there's two of them and there could be more of them -- that the function see many of these problems and says, you know, I'm looking at this aggregate in this looks like an issue for the CSC and actually ends up being one way that the ombudsman helped solve it is pass it off to the CSC.

The other possibility is that the ombudsman looks at it, can't solve it, doesn't see it as fitting into a systemic and but thinks there really is a valid issue here and then passes it up to the next piece of the escalation process.

So I mean the ombudsman will only solve things in that informal arbitrate nonbinding arbitration sort of manner.

And then they can either say no there's no healer here. They can say yeah, we've solved it. They can say this is a systemic problem, it's - it gets passed

on to CSC or it can say no this is a genuine appeal situation that couldn't be resolved in binding arbitration and, you know, it can go forward. That kind of decision-making process that can solve but can also pass on.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. And just one - Chuck again, one clarifying question. You mentioned something - and I haven't got the exact words. But you said something about if the ombudsman cannot solve the problem then it would move up to the next level in the process. What are you referring to in the next level? I mean I know we haven't got that far but have - what did you have in mind? What were you thinking in terms of moving...

Avri Doria: Exactly. That's where I think we have the variety of appeals panels. And we haven't gotten into how that works, how that unfolds but that's what I'm...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, good all right. Good. Are you on board with this so far Erick?

Erick Iriate: Yes, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Good.

Erick Iriate: (Unintelligible) and I support the idea of (unintelligible) of (unintelligible) related with the ombudsman but it's not clear for me that IANA will have ombudsman in the future but it's clear.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Well we - we'll get more clarity on that I think when Marika reaches out to the ombudsman and we go forward.

So let's - we've got about 15 minutes maybe not quite left in our hour of call.

I'd kind of like to get through the rest of this proposal just to see whether we're kind of in sync or not with some of the things they're suggesting.

Don't worry too much about how we might fit it into details at this point like we've been doing with the first couple steps but just want to get a sense of where we're at.

So but continuing in number one it says the CSC will request a written response from the IANA functions manager. Is that what that stands for? Am I doing that right IFM? Is that IANA Functions Manager? Does anybody have - is that okay? Does that makes sense?

I guess none of us really know.

Marika Konings: I think that is the acronym of the week.

Chuck Gomes: Okay all right. Thanks. Yes if there's just one per week.

The so within ten working days we won't worry about the ten days. That's not our issue but we'll asses the circumstances and we'll attempt to facilitate an agreed outcome between the parties.

So this is almost kind of like the informal role that we were talking about for the ombudsman. And all disputes between the IFM and the TLD registry operators will be archived for future reference.

So that's just a good principle I think in terms of making sure everything's archived and transparent.

Number two it says should this stage of resolution fail the CSC will engage the services of an external mediator and will provide reports to the mediator on previous attempts at resolution.

The IFM will also provide a report to the mediator. If that mediator is unable to bring the parties to an agreed outcome, excuse me while I scroll down, it will be taken and the records of the dispute will be archived.

Should mediation fail an independent appeals panel will kick in. And I don't need to read all that I don't think and will be engaged by the CSC.

So in other words what they're proposing which is kind of interesting is once it goes to the CSC the first thing you do is you try mediation which is not binding but it's just an informal method of trying to resolve the dispute.

And then if that doesn't work then NIAP kicks in. And I'll stop there.

What are your thoughts on their approach? Any concerns? Do you think they may be onto something? Feel free to say anything you like in terms of what they're proposing.

I'm not advocating what they're proposing but I'm just trying to see do we have something here maybe we can with as well?

So my general question is okay so they suggest okay the CSC once it comes to them they first of all hire a mediator and I think they go into more details in some of that later.

And if that works, great. If it doesn't then it goes to an independent panel. And so it's a form of escalation that they've mapped out here, reactions to that?

And any concerns? Do you think it's something maybe we can develop further or modify and develop further? Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes again I guess on this one I start to worry about scope in terms and scale not scope, in terms of hiring a mediator for each case.

I guess that's the reason why I was trying to put that on a case issue. But yes I think that if there weren't an ombudsman entry point then they would be stuck having to have an ombudsman type mediation function to look at each of the cases that they received.

So if the CSC were to be the primary function or anything that's going to be a primary function let's put it this way is going to need first of all a scalable entry point because, you know, as we get thousands of these things there could be thousands of issues in any particular time.

And if a blip happens, you know, it's going to be seen as 1000 points of blip. So, you know, so they'll need a way to take that in and to funnel it down and to get mediation experience.

So yes if CSC is the primary entry point that makes sense.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thank you. Erick any thoughts?

Erick Iriate: No. It's fine for me at this moment. If we choose this (message) is on (message). All the proposal could be fine and we need to have feedback from the rest.

But for me only change the team - the issue of the dates but the rest of the idea is correct for me.

The same topic on about the day will be appearing the .2 of the systemic file that said year to day. So me it's a long time that is not necessary to have that but it's fine for me the document.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. So what they go on to next then is they talk about systemic failure. And it's kind of a similar process except it's a little more serious because it's an ongoing problem that hasn't been solved.

And again they bring in mediation and again if that doesn't work it goes on to an independent appeals panel.

I don't think we need to get too bogged down in all of the details of what they have there but it's a process.

Now moving ahead to next steps for us let's map out a plan for the next day or so terms of where we go from here.

One of the thoughts that was running through my mind that I'll bounce off of you is if we could take what they've done and what we've have talked about because I think we've introduced a new element. Avri did in our talks with the role of the ombudsman.

And maybe just in very much briefer form just outlined some escalation steps and maybe write that up in very brief form that we can begin to develop further based on our conversation this morning and based on the information that we've gotten from these people that have done this other work.

Does that make sense maybe? And I can do that. I don't know if Marika or I could do that or if somebody else wants to do that. That's perfectly possible.

But maybe in the - I could probably get to it within the next few hours. I don't know if Marika could get to it any further. I know how swamped she and Avri and Marika and I are also involved in other activity today that's timely today to and demanding and that's the Policy and Implementation Working Group.

And then so and I'm sure Marika's supporting other design teams as well. So I'm willing if unless somebody else wants to do it to take a first crack at that and send it to the list and then let people just critique it and add to it and so forth.

Is that a reasonable way forward? No? That's okay, nobody...

Avri Doria: Seems...

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: It seems okay to me. And, you know, I can help contribute especially for the drive document I can help contribute.

If it's going and passed back and forth files I may contribute but for some reason that is much harder to get to but I'm constantly in the middle of drive document so I bounce around from document to document so but whatever.

I'll certainly help in terms of describing, you know, an ombudsman vetting/whatever track in whatever document you put together if you want.
Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks. That's great. So I will do that. And so I'll take first crack. And what I'd like each of you to do is to add to it like Avri just suggested and let's do that now.

So I'll get something around as quickly as I can today that you can respond to.

Now as far as the - and that may give us a first crack at something that we can begin to refine.

It seems to me if we want to try and deliver even a draft version of what we're considering that it would be good for us to have a call on Friday.

Is anybody not available on Friday at all? I would ask Marika to do a Doodle poll so that we coordinate calendars. But is anybody totally not available on Friday?

Erick Iriate: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Erick Iriate: I will be complicated all the Friday...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Erick Iriate: ...for reviews, meetings and hearing...

Chuck Gomes: Are you available any times on Friday Erick? I mean it's okay to say no. I - it's helpful for us to know that now.

Erick Iriate: Very early in the morning 6:00, 7:00.

Chuck Gomes: And you're on which time zone Erick?

Erick Iriate: Ah, less five.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so...

Avri Doria: That would be 1 o'clock in the morning, 2:00 in the morning your time?

Erick Iriate: Yes. I prefer that time for me. It is the real time. The further will be a complicate date for me decided specifically.

Chuck Gomes: Could you - would late Thursday be better?

Erick Iriate: You decide. I will take your time, decide with Avri this time and I will be in the meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Marika let's do a Doodle poll unless you have a better idea for late Thursday afternoon early Friday.

Marika Konings: Late Thursday afternoon where? Can you give me some UTC times?

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry. Oh, that's right for you that's in the middle of the night, yes. So it doesn't work...

Marika Konings: But, I mean I'm alternating with - or (Barry)'s also back up so we can switch out...

Avri Doria: For the - yes. Would have to be over the GNSO Council meeting.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: (Unintelligible) Thursday. Let's...

Marika Konings: Yes?

Chuck Gomes: ...pick a time that works for you Marika on Thursday if there is one and add that to some...

Marika Konings: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...early times on Friday and let's do a Doodle poll on that...

Marika Konings: All right.

Chuck Gomes: ...see if we can get together okay?

Marika Konings: Yes so maybe 2000 UTCs. It's right after the GNSO Council meeting. That may be something that Avri's already suggesting so...

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good, yes.

Avri Doria: Yes after, but perhaps not right after.

Marika Konings: Okay, so...

Chuck Gomes: Give her three minutes.

Avri Doria: I - right. I like the GAC period in there, but yes, after that some time works for me.

Marika Konings: Okay. I'll put a couple times (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Let's try that and see if we can get together. And hopefully (Stephan) will be available on one of those on a time that we can get together and we'll see where we are.

In the meantime please try to be as active as possible on our list in terms of interacting. That way by the time we get to that meeting we will have made some progress in terms of where we're heading.

And I will also have an action item to give you updates from the - this new document that I saw today that has escalation. This - I don't know if they changed the escalation procedures that we look at today or not but I'll let you know.

Anything else?

Avri Doria: Is this a DTC doc?

Chuck Gomes: No it - you know, I - Avri it's some ccTLD and gTLD registries that have been working behind the scenes. And I don't even know all of the participants yet. I think that'll be come available I've been told tomorrow when - tomorrow early when they put it out more widely.

So it's kind of an...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...independent effort but trying to come up with some constructive suggestion.
And again I have not been involved in that process. So I'm in the same boat as
you. I'm seeing it second-hand. So...

Avri Doria: Okay, another one of those ad hoc teams.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, yes.

Avri Doria: I'm in favor of the ad hoc teams.

Chuck Gomes: Which is fine, you know, as long as we can get the information and so forth.
And it does look like they're being constructive so that's good.

Okay, so all right. Well I think is there anything else we need to cover?

Thanks to all of you and...

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: And I appreciate it very much. Have a good rest of the day.

Avri Doria: You too.

Marika Konings: Thank you. Bye.

Chuck Gomes: Bye.

END