ICANN

Moderator: Donna Austin
March 26, 2015
4:00 am CT

Jonathan Robinson: Wonderful. Thanks, everyone. We're about to begin our next session on the design teams. And that'll be to deal with Design Team C. Just thinking about this, though, it's just to remind you of all of the interrelationship between the design teams so when you think of elements of concepts like escalation there is a design team that deals specifically with escalation, I think that's Design Team M.

When we look at this in the big picture, it's how do these fit into the proposal, how do the design teams interrelate. And remember also the first session on the CCWG and how that might support the ultimate escalation and the sort of mechanisms that may be possible there.

There was also an earlier point about, you know, how final and how much are we signing off on the work of these design teams. Well for the purposes of constructing a draft proposal for public comment it is our intention as far as possible to sign off on these design teams. We will look at them in the round but holistically tomorrow so there'll be another opportunity.

But I just want to encourage the use of not sort of multiple bites of the cherry. Wherever possible let's try and close them, then do some work on integrating and cross comparing them, then start to compile them in a kind of software-tense, compile them into the overall proposal so we get a coherent and working proposal.

But there will be opportunities, it's not that the door isn't firmly slammed shut. On the other hand we do want to be able to start to put things behind us and say that goes into the proposal, that goes into the proposal at least into the draft proposal.

So without further ado let me hand over to the design team lead on Design Team C. That's the slightly confusingly name CSC. I know just we weren't 100% sure what CSC stood for at some point. I think it started off being the customer standing committee. So please go ahead, Donna. Is Staffan - would you like to join Donna up at the mic or...

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jonathan. Donna Austin for the record. So Design Team C is the customer standing committee. And this is when we think back to the original CWG proposal that was posted in December last year this was one of the four structural components that was contained within that.

We fleshed it out a little bit based on some of the previous discussions that were had in the RFP 3 group. And the design team comprised - Staffan and myself as the co leads. Martin Boyle is another CC. We had Stephanie Duchesneau and Sarah Falvey from gTLD side and Kurt Pritz was also part of the team as well.

We did have input from Kim Davis from IANA which was really helpful and also we were able to engage with Ashley Heineman from NTIA just for some - we actually had some feedback from her this morning on one of the points that I need to flag as we go through this.

So I'll just go through the recommendations and I guess take questions at the end, Jonathan, if that's...

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, unless there's an urgent point of clarification but generally we'll build the queue and if you could - that - we'll do that as it goes. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks. Okay so the CSC should perform those activities currently undertaken by the NTIA in overseeing the performance of IANA functions as they relate to naming services. And as part of that engage - so the CSC should engage in a cooperative communication with the IANA functions operator on a regular basis. So I think what we're getting here is that there has to be a good communications base between the CSC and IANA.

And the CSC will have monthly meetings to review performance reports and conduct other business as required. Engagement with IANA - the direct customers of the IANA naming function and the ICANN community to discuss emerging technologies and issues that might impact the provision of IANA services.

So what this is getting to here is I think it was David Conrad that mentioned on the - one of the - during one chain of discussion that there are emerging issues that come up that aren't necessarily part of the day to day operations of what IANA does now.

So I think the example we've seen (unintelligible) so how do we kind of have those discussions and how do we build that into this process so what we're saying here is that that's an engagement with IANA and the direct customers and the community to have that discussion about what emerging things are coming up and how can that be managed moving forward.

Formal regular meetings, at least annually with the IANA functions operator for direct customers of the IANA functions and the ICANN community to discuss the performance of the IANA naming functions. So this is a regular conversation about how IANA is performing over a, you know, a 12-month period so it's an opportunity for interaction with, you know, the - not only the direct customers but also the community at large.

The scope of the CSC is somewhat limited so the CSC is only responsible for monitoring and ensuring the performance of the IANA functions operator. It is not to engage in policy related topics or policy related disputes. That's definitely off the table.

We've used the term remedial actions as opposed to the term escalation. And I think Martin spoke to this earlier that in the minds of some escalation has a negative connotation or it has baggage with it so we've actually used the term remedial action. So the CSC may take action to address issues of IANA poor performance identified through the reporting and monitoring process.

In the body of the work that we did we actually had an - for illustrative purposes what that remedial process would look like. And basically what we're talking about is that - and I think this was discussed earlier during Paul's session, is that in the event of IANA's poor performance the CSC will engage with what is currently (Elise Gary) and if there's no resolution there then it takes - we go up to the president of the GDD and then if there's resolution

there if we bring it up - when I say we I mean the CSC - would bring it up to the CEO or board level.

The open question of course is what happens if we can't have resolution at the end of that conversation. And I think in our minds that is something that we hoped will be picked up by the CCWG.

CSC can be a point of contact for TLD registry asserting that they have received poor service from IANA. So we're making a distinction here. There are two types of remediation. So one is about the poor - can't say those two words together - the poor performance of IANA on a regular basis - on a monitoring basis as a whole. But there's a secondary and quite separate path and that is if a TLD operator is not happy with the performance of IANA as it relates to their TLD they can come visit CSC and see if they can, you know, provide some kind of mediation or help out to resolve an issue.

And we do note, in the body of our report, has IANA currently has a process for dealing with individual customer complaints. And if you have a look through that process you can actually see that the customer can go directly to IANA, they can go to Fadi, they can go to whoever they want really to try to get some action. So the CSC would just become another body.

Handover of responsibilities from NTIA to the CSC process would involve the IANA functions operator. What we were trying to get at here is if you - and this is where Ashley has come back and said this - the use of the language handover could be problematic from the NTIA's perspective.

What we're kind of talking to here is if you think about it in terms of if somebody - if you're about to leave your job and you need to do a handover with the person coming in behind you so that's the kind of thing that we're

talking about here is that as NTIA steps away from what they're doing in terms of monitoring we thought there would be value in the CSC, IANA, NTIA having a conversation about this is how we've managed the process now you might want to take X, Y Z out of it. So that's all we're getting to here is that there might be some value in having that conversation.

Can you scroll up a bit please? Thank you. Creation of - so in terms of creating the CSC what we're proposing is that a working group of direct IANA function customers should be established to develop a charter for the CSC. Now obviously that's going to have to happen if these recommendations are adopted.

There's a timing issue here in terms of transition and when this would happen. So we believe that a charter should be established by the direct customers through a working group but the CSC itself would be responsible for developing its own working methods and work plan so that's at their discretion to be able to do that. And in the body of the work that we did we actually had some kind of indication of what we thought those roles and things would be.

So the composition requirements which is always the most contentious when we get to these - so the primary points that we want to make about this is that it has to be lightweight and small and in order to be effective in the work that it's doing. And then we don't - I don't think this slide actually shows the composition so we actually had two ideas on the table.

And we work at this from a minimum level so in both options that we suggested there would be a minimum two CC operators and two G operators. And they are primary members of the CSC. In Option A we had, in addition to that, we would have a liaison from RSAC and a liaison from IANA.

And the reason for pulling those two out is that RSAC is actually a customer of IANA even though quite infrequently but they still are a customer and we thought there would be value in having IANA available if necessary to the CSC on a regular basis, you know, to maybe interpret some of the reports or respond during discussions. And that's notwithstanding the fact that there will be, you know, that cooperative relationship between IANA and the CSC on an ongoing basis.

The Option B that we had on the table is the core is two Cs, two Gs and liaisons which is open ended. We want to keep the group small. We want the group to have the expertise in terms of understanding the technical functions and being able to contribute to discussions. So we put a qualifier on the composition that you have to have the expertise and maybe that's, you know, at some point the criteria would have to be developed to do that. So there are the two options that we identified.

The other thing that we've stated here is no travel funding. And I would qualify that with ICANN actually has a process now through the different communities that you can seek travel support. So that mechanism would still be available to you but in terms of the CSC itself no dedicated travel funding.

That's the end, I think that's the end. I think we'll open up for questions. Thanks, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Donna, is there anything you'd like to add before we turn it over to questions?

Staffan Jonson: Quite a good summary of what we've discussing. Maybe to highlight that the process of developing its own work, internal work, might be considered

continuous process, also after transition. So what is absolutely necessary for the transition in itself but it must be continuous work or actually improving all the time (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: It helps me to imagine a customer and a supplier. No customer is ever going to say to the supplier, "You supply the same service indefinitely and I'll be forever happy." There's clearly going to be an ongoing dialogue both in terms of short term acute issues and longer term chronic or required development so that's my personal picture. But there's plenty of other people with personal or other views so I'm going to hand over to that rapidly developing queue. Starting off with Chris Disspain.

Chris Disspain: Thank you, Jonathan, Donna. Thanks. Just some questions. The escalation - am I right that this design team was basically designing the CSC itself. I don't know the escalation mechanisms within that - from that would have designed by Chuck's team, is that right?

Donna Austin: So yes, to some extent we've had a duplicated effort.

Chris Disspain: Right

Donna Austin: We did do some work for illustrative purposes about what that would look like but...

Chris Disspain: The escalation mechanisms are assuming that there is a CSC for it to be escalated through.

Donna Austin: Yes.

Chris Disspain: Okay, thank you. That's great. And I just wanted to pick up two other things, one of the things they're some stuff going on in the chat because you actually said you would hand over stuff to the CCWG, I think what you mean is that you reach a point in the escalation mechanisms where you then step into the CCWG's mechanisms so they are the next step above what the CSC would do, is that right?

Donna Austin: Yes. So I think what I was hinting at is that we developed this in isolation, I guess is the best way to do it because we don't know what other mechanisms are going to sit out there, so we're hoping that, you know, as everybody has always said that hopefully things can be resolved in the processes that we have. But if it doesn't we don't know where that kind of...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: Okay. And we've got some more clarity around that this morning by getting - okay. And finally just one other small question, I just got a little bit confused about the charter. Are you saying that the customer services committee - the CWG endorses the charger or the CWG endorses the creation of the customer services committee and then it goes away with the working group and creates a charter, and that has nothing to do with the CWG anymore. When does the charter come back to the CWG?

Donna Austin: Yeah, so certainly in my mind the recommendation is that the customers of IANA would develop a charter for the workings of the CSC and that would not come back to the CWG, that's just a recommendation.

Jonathan Robinson: I'll just make a brief comment, they're both in relation to Chris's questions and Donna's original point. There's clearly - and just to bear this in mind there's clearly some sort of reconciliation work that needs to be done. The

design seems we've commissioned and they've gone off, they've made best efforts to correlate.

There are necessarily some loose ends as you've just highlighted between things like SLAs, escalation. And so one of the reasons we structured the morning as we did was CCWG and then the design teams in this particular order so they were close enough that we could hopefully make those links.

But clearly there's some work to be done to reconcile it, and we're going to have a session - our intention currently - our current plan is to have a session which seeks to further reconcile based on what's come out of this.

One other related point is that Donna did - when she talked about - at one point she made an escalation referred to, for example, the head of the GDD. Now clearly the only working assumption they could work with - the intention was that the design teams, to the best extent possible, worked independent of structural consideration.

But nevertheless it's quite clear that there's a whole other of track of thinking which says well what's the structure going to work. So again there will be another form of reconciliation that needs to be done as the structural discussions evolve. But it feels to me that that's not an unresolvable challenge. For the moment, to the best extent they can, the design teams have to work with either structurally independent proposals or assuming elements of existing structures.

So just to bear in mind, that's not forgotten about, it's in the mix. Right, I think - oh I see Greg next in the queue so, Greg, let me go to you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Jonathan. Greg Shatan. A couple of points, first clearly on day one posted transition this CSC needs to be in place so whatever actions need to be taken need to be, you know, reflected in the proposal. And, you know, to be taken place in days minus the transition or before the transition.

I'm a little concerned about the lack of multi stakeholder involvement at any level here. I think that, you know, first I think in terms of composition there should be some, albeit possibly minimalist multi stakeholder representation in the committee. I'm concerned about the idea of just having customers kind of amongst themselves that says, you know, customers meeting inside; multi stakeholders keep out.

We don't want CSC to stand for customers secret cartel. I think we want to make sure that it's open and transparent but also has - is part of the multi stakeholder model. One of the things we don't know yet, since this is being worked out in isolation, is what kind of oversight there will be of the CSC.

In our previous model we had the MRT, which was robustly multi stakeholder engaging in oversight of the CSC. We don't know yet whether that is going to stay in place.

The more multi stakeholder oversight you have of the CSC the last multi stakeholder participation you may need but I still don't think it goes down to zero.

And I think that applies too to the creation of the charter, you know, typically charters and ICANN are approved by one of the chartering organizations so it's in here that they should go - if it doesn't go to the CWG for approval, which I think it should, it should go to the - at least the GNSO and ccNSO for approval and not just be a kind of hothouse atmosphere where the customers

are proving themselves, you know, in a room which includes no one but customers. I'll stop there. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Greg, can we just make sure we put a pin in that and hold it that there is a requirement to - depending on how other structural components evolve to recognize this multi stakeholder point, that seems to be the key point that it's multi stakeholder role question mark. Where's the multi stakeholder involvement?

And it may be that it's trying to some extent by other structures, it may not be. And therefore that's going to be afforded there. Elise - or Olivier, sorry, Olivier. Please, Staffan, sorry.

Staffan Jonson: Just a short exclamation. As discussed already in Frankfurt the underlying idea here is actually to isolate this to very minimal function, as small as possible, both in scope and in the number of participants because this is the standing party of it actually not being a multi stakeholder organization. This assumes another multi stakeholder organization or representation talking about the more general governance of this.

But for this specific function the idea is to have a really, really small and very close to operations, technical operation specifically. And actually at this level avoiding policy or business considerations in the operations so it's a very conscious design, institutional design to isolate a multi stakeholder in this organization.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Staffan. Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks, Jonathan. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking. And I've noticed in the document - I've noticed in the document that the team has kept

away from putting actual timeframes on the SLAs and SLEs. That said there are two points, I think it's C.4.2 and C.4 (unintelligible) reports and so when there is already a figure there and I just wanted to flag that obviously this figure would have to be changed accordingly what DTA would be.

Donna Austin: So we did not have the benefit of Paul's work when we put this together. The table that I think you're referring to was taken pretty much out of a contract (unintelligible) at the moment. And I think 2.8 was the performance SLAs which is the work that we stated that Paul's stuff would have to come into. So that obviously has to be factored in, yeah.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I think we'll come down and we'll go to Paul Kane.

Paul Kane: And...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: I'm sorry, Paul. Because your hand dropped in anticipation of the - I thought you had removed your hand from the queue so apologies, go ahead.

Elise Lindeberg: Okay, thank you. Thank you. No I just wanted to support the comments that have been made about the multi stakeholder component to the overview function. I'm a bit surprised when I read about the CSC team that nothing is mentioned - nothing is referenced to - if you go to the escalation process about any multi stakeholder component in that one.

Because we used a lot of time discussing and, you know, the role between the CSC and an MRT as we called it then. We used hours and hours during this intensive work weekend trying to figure out the role of where the multi

stakeholder component was diving into a situation where we are not happy with the IANA function as such.

And it disappeared a bit I think in the (unintelligible) draft as it is now. So I would like to then support the (unintelligible) having a reference between clearly (unintelligible) in this group that we need to go back and look at that. It could be that it is, as you said, an escalation thing. It could be that it's taken care of by the CCWG. But we need a linkage to this that is very clear otherwise a lot of the community is going to react to this.

So I think the scope that is set in the CSC - if you go up to the first slide you have - I think under Point 1 I think it's a very wide description of the CSC role. I think it's too wide actually. I think the scope should be more precise because I think you have the multi stakeholder component also within the - under the Point 1.

So we can work on that. But as it stands now it looks like the CSC of everything - now we have discussed that a lot of the - that a lot of the groups don't want to be, you know, in the daily business of looking over the IANA function (unintelligible) agree on that. So it's not that somebody wants to dive into the CSC as such. It (unintelligible) problems, that is not problem, it has to be escalated (unintelligible) some sort of multi stakeholder (unintelligible).

Staffan Jonson: Well the MRT and multi stakeholder model is for sure not forgotten, it's just defined out of this box right now because of actually getting ahead with things instead of trying to solve all in one time. If you look at Point 3 in this, if you could scroll to point - there is actually a placeholder for multi stakeholder discussions, formal regular meetings at least annually with the IANA functions operator, the direct customers of the other naming functions and the

ICANN community to discuss the performance of the IANA naming functions is to be part of it.

I know that is not all but for sure it's not forgotten. But it's important that we also get ahead with some kind of concerns, some issues.

Jonathan Robinson: Elise, you want to come back on that briefly?

Elise Lindeberg: No, as I said, I see it in Number 3 but as I said it doesn't cover it so you need some stronger than that I think.

Jonathan Robinson: So currently...

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: So I just wanted to remind you that there were two options that we had on the table involve liaisons for the CSC which is part of the multi stakeholder part as well. So we're not excluding - it's not just a CSC made up of C and G registry operators, it actually is broader than that. So that's - the liaisons is what we're using to cover up that multi stakeholder part.

Jonathan Robinson: So there's a queue building. It's quite clear there's a concern in and around the multi stakeholder role, where it fits in and how it fits in but it's also clear that it hasn't been ignored by the design team so it's a matter of where the comfortable place for that is and whether that's covered in the composition discussion.

Did indicate a concern with Point 1 and I'm just wondering whether it may be worth trying to fix that very briefly with something like those operational activities currently undertaken by the NTIA or whether that was already

considered by the design team and, you know, maybe that in Point 1 something as simple as that might fix the concern.

Is that consistent with the work of the design team? I see nodding from both of you so maybe that that's just a quick fix but - because if not I don't want to dwell on it but it struck me that there may be a quick fix that we could use there. Donna.

Donna Austin: I think that's probably okay. And if Stephanie, Sarah, Martin, whether you agree on that. But this is also something that we had to go back and review in light of some information we got from Ashley this morning as well. So we can, you know, review Number 1.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay well let's move on from that but it may be that that particular component - the concern over 1 is more readily dealt with then the multi stakeholder which might take more time to work through. Paul.

Paul Kane: Thank you very much. I would just like to support the recommendations as presented. I think the point that Elise has made with respect to multi stakeholderism is very valid. I like the idea of having liaisons. I don't think it's appropriate for the CSC to work in a vacuum and certainly not to become a cartel.

The issue I would like to raise is one that I don't think the CSC has covered or I'd like an explanation. So with regard to indemnification of the officers who are elected, selected to be CSC members, because if I'm understanding the process correctly CSC should in theory be very boring job, boring as possible, and that means - mainly because IANA is, as I've mentioned, doing quite a good job.

But if there is a problem it will be highlight the problem to which ICANN/IANA may take issue. So we need to ensure that the officers of the CSC, elected and liaisons, are covered for any work that they do.

The question I would welcome clarification on is when I was last seriously involved in IANA, which is probably 2008, the goal then was to ensure that the IANA operations were separate from ICANN operations. They've always had a separate department, separate budget, separate list. And I'm not familiar with it but you mentioned it in your presentation and I'd welcome clarification.

You mentioned something GDD, I am not familiar with GDD. And I want to make sure that the independence of the IANA to deliver a service, and even to export that service to another party if the escalation path so required it, is available. And the closer we get the IANA to ICANN's internal structure the harder that would become.

So I'd like an explanation as to what the GDD thing is about, if we have lost the independence of the IANA functions operator, in which case that should come back to being independent. But the customer services group, you've done a good job and I think multi stakeholders need to be involved but certainly we need the - a greater liaison role. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Paul. So I take three points: one, CSC is largely okay; two, you're supportive of a multi stakeholder; and, three, you've got a structural concern as to the organization of IANA within ICANN. I think the structural one we've got a note and move to structural discussions. But it - I'm not kicking it up - out of the field but it's not for this particular - it's not the role of the CSC although I acknowledge because I heard Donna mention the GDD which is why I brought it up as well and made reference to that structural point.

I'm very conscious we've got a tight timeframe and a long queue so I'm going to go straight to Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have a question about the membership especially the two ccTLD members that agree being proposed. So let's say I am a ccTLD that doesn't have any relationship with IANA or ICANN what I want to be part of that, you know, how do you envision that process? How can be that inclusive to those ccTLDs and which group is going to decide that those two ccTLDs, you know, where are they coming from? Is it a ccNSO or an independent something that would decide who it will be. Thank you.

Donna Austin: So I guess, Eduardo, to some extent we haven't delved into this but our understanding is that those CC and G representatives would be selected from within the constituencies. Now I understand the point that all CCs don't belong to the ccNSO, and I'll also make the point that there are a lot of new gTLD registries that don't currently belong to the Registry Stakeholder Group as well so that would have to be covered off.

And potentially this is, in my mind, this is potentially something that could be picked up within the charter discussion about how that would actually occur.

Jonathan Robinson: ...where we captured the requirement to develop the charter and/or composition discussions so who's taking notes on this just making sure that that's properly captured. All right I'm going to move straight on then to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I won't belabor the multi stakeholder point. It is extremely important to At Large. I do want to look at a couple of the details where you are specifying possible multi stakeholder involvement, however.

Under liaison you imply that this person may not actually be involved in all of the CSC activities, it might be somewhat limited. You also say the person is appointed by the CSC and for a limited term. And those are somewhat confusing and possibly disruptive. If At Large, for instance, had someone they could put on it I wouldn't want - I certainly would support you saying you had to vet the person and you could suggest they be removed if they were being disruptive or problematic.

On the other hand, we may not have a huge supply of them and telling us we need a new one every six months might really be problematic. So those kind of things I think we need to look at.

The concept of an IANA liaison, I would not think that adding that one person to the group makes the group any more heavyweight but may make the group more effective. And similarly with the RSAC one, that person is not going to be particularly involved most of the time or care but you want that person to have a really direct path into discussions with the CSC and to IANA. So I would think that those two are a given regardless of the rest of the structure. They're pretty lightweight and could be very effective.

And lastly, the issue on travel funding, I don't foresee a lot of travel in this whole process. But I would not want it to disadvantage a small ccTLD or gTLD or liaison for instance, that's saying they can't participate because they don't have independent funds. So I would think requiring travel funding if the individual cannot provide it themselves is something that would increase inclusiveness without imposing a huge financial cost on anything.

Donna Austin: I guess on that last point my feeling is, which may be different from the group, but my feeling is that there are actually existing processes now that you can seek travel funding through your communities. Now I understand a lot of

that is taken whatever but rather than create another process that people have
to go through why not leverage the ones that exist now?

Alan Greenberg: There are special budget requests one can do. You've got to do that a year
ahead of time and that may prohibit someone from volunteering not knowing
whether they're going to get money or not. Doing it through the ACs and SOs
at this point, certainly from my AC's point of view, we are told who we can
fund. And if I want to fund a liaison I have to stop funding somebody else. So
it's not quite as flexible as you're implying, sadly.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. Have we - all right, let's move on to (David).

(David Conrad): This may be just a clarification but in the Option 1 in terms of the
membership, you list the CCs and Gs and RSAC - there is one other direct
customer of the IANA root zone function and that is the IAB and dotARPA
top level domain. IANA - sorry, IAB is the TLD manager for dotARPA and
that may suggest that if, you know, RSAC is being included because of, you
know, say rootservers.net and the need for direct customer interaction with
that zone, that the IAB might be appropriate there as well.

Donna Austin: Thanks, (David), I think we can note that. But my initial reaction to that is that
it's the AIB actually a registry then why wouldn't it come through the -
because it's not a G or it's not a C..

(David Conrad): Yeah, ARPA is very, very odd that way.

Donna Austin: Yeah.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, I'm going to flag with you that I'd like to close the queue at this time. We've got a pretty lengthy queue that's providing some very good feedback. So that was (David). Let's go to Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. Chuck Gomes. And I've got several points that I'll try and be brief on. Let me - since there's been so much - quite a bit of talk about the multi stakeholder issue - now I'm not opposed to having some liaisons, I think that's fine. But, again, I think it's important that people realize that the CSC, as scoped here, I don't believe it has any decision making, I mean, actions that it's going to do.

Anything that would be a big decision would be filtered up to other places and the whole community would be involved. So I just throw that out. Again, I'm not opposed to having some liaisons but I do think it's important to keep it small. With regard to the composition issue, first of all I don't think that it's - I think if you have somebody on the CSC there should be some reason that they might add value. I don't, in my own mind, see how the RSAC adds any value.

They are a customer but if somebody can tell me - and we don't need to do this here but if there's not a particular reason why they would add value in that I wouldn't include them. We're trying to keep it small.

Now it could be that the IAB would be a better choice than the RSAC but, again, we can evaluate that. A real quick point, and I don't need a response on this, I've already talked to the gTLD registry reps on this. But one of the things we need to deal with in the composition of the CSC is conflicts of interest. So when the CSC is dealing with a particular TLD if that person - if a rep on the CSC is related to that registry operator, we need to deal with that; that could be through alternates.

Might need a bigger composition so they can just recuse themselves and so forth. The - a minor point on the final report you say that's no longer needed actually it probably would be needed if there ever was any separation that happened. So that's real minor. I mentioned this to the registry reps again this morning. I'm not sure keeping data one year is enough. That's what happens now. And I guess it's working okay but if there ever was an issue you might need data more than a year.

And then finally, a question, how will disagreements between the CSC and the IANA functions operator be resolved? That's just a question. You don't need to answer that right now but that's probably something we should look at on this. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Isn't that your job, Chuck, with the escalation stuff?

Chuck Gomes: Maybe.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, I'll try to be brief. Greg Shatan. Echoing to some extent what Elise Lindeberg said earlier that this remit seems to have gotten a bit broader. For instance, I see that the annual reviews are now in this group when originally we had contemplated having them in another group. And, you know, I think the - as it gets broader we know it becomes more of a concern.

And not all of these are kind of purely technical, they are operational. I guess again, you know, as the composition and the oversight of the group becomes more clear, there may be less concern about having all of the reviews being done in a single body.

I would also dispute the idea that this group has no decision making authority. Clearly if they're trying to resolve issues with IANA there - that is a form of decision making as you decide, you know, what matters, what the concerns are, how you're going to change them. It may not have decision making such as getting rid of the IANA or moving the operator but that is still a level of decision making. So again, you know, the accountability, transparency oversight issues I think all need to be well handled. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. Jordan.

Jordan Carter: Thanks, Jonathan. Jordan Carter for the record. I just wanted to make two points. First of all the important point and principle that I think we all agree on is that the customer services committee isn't the multi stakeholder piece of this puzzle. It isn't going to be the part of the puzzle that, for instance, would be at the end point of a escalation process that might see the IANA function as being reassigned.

And so I think that's certainly why I as the registry was happy to put my name to some advice to the CWG that suggested that the primary focus membership should be customer related.

Whether there are liaison members or not I think is a detail and given that all of the proceedings of this group should be open anyway, you know, I don't feel very strongly about that.

The other point I just wanted to make, it's a question I asked in the chat was somewhere on the screen in this document is a Recommendation Number 8 which is that the charter for the CSC should be spelled out in some detail by - and it says by working group of the IANA direct customers.

I'm not entirely sure why it wouldn't be better to do that work in a design team under the CWG framework. But I'd welcome a view. I don't think that constituting that committee is a particularly difficult job, but I think it is vital. And the reason why relates to the reception (unintelligible) the community gave to the December proposal from the CWG.

It's obvious there's a high degree of scrutiny here. And when things that bodies can do or can't do are not spelled out in the writing that would exist the opportunity for FUD emerges. FUD is fear, uncertainty and doubt. There's a lot of that in this process.

We want as little as possible so specifying things in detail early is a good idea. I think that the exact nature of the customer service committee, possibly even including a list of things that it cannot and shall never do would be a really useful output soon. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Jordan. Stephanie.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Stephanie Duchesneau for the record. I want to half agree with Jordan's starting point. While this isn't the primary multi stakeholder body, and I think the responsibilities that we've attributed to the CSC properly fall with the direct users of the IANA function, I still think there are ways that this improves upon what we have now from a multi stakeholder perspective.

And while it's narrow in composition I don't think anyone participating in the group envisions this as being a bunch of ccTLDs, a gTLD sitting in a closed room without any transparency.

It's really clear in the Registry's position on this and it's also come through very, very strongly in all of our conversations that there is an expectation that,

A, all of this work would be carried out as openly as possible through open calls, through publications of transcripts and also in line with what Jordan says that it would be - the mandate would be very clearly limited and decisions related to the CSC mandate any changes to that, that would be something that went to the broader community.

So we're not empowering the CSC to change or expand upon its role as scoped without outside of it being a broader community process.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I've got two more comments or questions coming up. Do you want to respond to that at all or are you (unintelligible).

Donna Austin: I'm comfortable with the way that Stephanie categorized.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Paul and then Chris Disspain. So, Paul.

Paul Kane: Well...

Jonathan Robinson: Having ceded your place in the queue you've created a lucky opportunity for Elise, otherwise I was going to have to be tough on her. Chris.

Chris Disspain: Thank you. A couple short points and then something slightly - perhaps slightly longer. So on ccTLD appointment question that Eduardo asked, I think the ccNSO is very, very well aware of the fact that not all ccTLDs belong.

In fact a number of ccTLDs that don't belong come to ccNSO meetings even though they don't belong and we've used this CWG process and the CCWG process to enroll non members as well so we would have no issue whatsoever

in opening up the membership of the customer services committee to any ccTLD manager.

Secondly, on liaisons, I'm fine with having liaisons. I've seen some - there's been some chat in the - on the list about liaisons don't have any power. And I've asked the question, which I still have no answer to, which is why do they need power? It's a customer services committee. The customers are the ones who need the power.

But let me explain why I think that's okay. Might be time to lay some cards on the table. But I think we're slightly - we're talking slightly in a vacuum here because we've got stuff - outlying stuff like is there an MRT? Is there not an MRT? And so on.

So my view, and I'm speaking as the ccTLD manager for dotAU, is that there does not need to be an MRT, and I'll explain why. There is a problem, if AU has an issue with IANA. We go to IANA and we say we have a problem. We can't resolve that problem, we go to the CSC. The CSC has some mechanisms in place to help us to resolve that problem. That doesn't work, there may be a next stage which let's say is mediation.

Mediation happens, mediation is about getting the parties to agree. The parties still can't agree. The next stage might end up being arbitration and that might be - we might have agreed that that's binding arbitration. All of this is still customer focused stuff, nothing to do with anything else.

The binding arbitration decision comes down and dotAU wins, and ICANN still refuses to do what it's supposed to do. At that point you are then escalating it - I would argue, to the CCWG mechanisms which for the sake of

this discussion we'll call a community council but it hasn't decided yet, but let's say it is.

At that point their mechanisms kick in and their mechanisms escalate right the way up to the possibility of spilling the board. So it seems to me that the community council type of thing is effectively an MRT. And to create something else specifically just to deal with escalation mechanisms in IANA doesn't make any sense to me.

So that's my - that's how I see it. And it seems to me that these two things are starting to dovetail together certainly in my mind. And thanks for the opportunity to say all those.

Jonathan Robinson: So thanks, Chris. So the way I see this as going, and let's - is that this has thrown up a number of open items, reasonable questions and issues posed. In your mind, and perhaps in the mind of others, these will be resolved as we start to deal with, for example, escalation mechanisms, for example, the advice we receive on structure.

There are other ways in which this might start to become coherent. And I'm grappling with how we bring this design team currently. Our objective is to try and close out some of these points. So I think the way we can perhaps do that is recognizing - and we'll have to do some careful work on the notes.

And I know that that - I'm not sure they captured this adequately here - that there are a number of open items that may be resolved by other work in other areas of the group and so that - and to the extent that they are, great. To the extent that they remain open items or questions, we can come back to them. Chris, do you want to respond very briefly?

Chris Disspain: Just very briefly.

Jonathan Robinson: I did say I would let Elise make a point and then we can wrap it up.

Chris Disspain: Jonathan, thank you. Yes, I think what you're saying is right. I think there's a next step for this particular design team and I think that is to get together with Chuck's design team and sew those two things together so that we - once we are seeing Chuck's stuff - so that we then have a clear understanding of not just how many people are on it, etcetera, but what the escalation mechanisms from it would be because then it makes it much easier for us to understand where we're going.

Jonathan Robinson: That holistic picture will, as I say, I hope begin to emerge as we deal with the different bits. Elise.

Elise Lindeberg: Thank you. No, thank you to Chris. I think I agree on most of what you said, it's the problem that the design team of the escalation mechanism hasn't been started yet so we link them. And also I agree that the MRT component, if you call it like that, doesn't have to be here. But as it is now it's closing and we don't have any linkage to any anchors, that one.

And that will be a huge problem if this goes out without this linkage. So I think that the CSC doesn't have to be multi stakeholder, it has to be transparent. And that is the liaison role. The liaison role has nothing to do with the multi stakeholder component, I agree. It is just to have someone who can vie and look what they're doing in this group (unintelligible) back to the communities that are worried or whatever.

That could be a good thing to have. I don't think that's a dramatic thing that needs to be worked a lot on in this group (unintelligible) very clear on the

linkage to the MRT component (unintelligible) also the (unintelligible) in the draft that we have now and I think we might be there.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks for the spirit in which you take that because I think that goes back to that point I made earlier about bearing in mind not so much the requirement to have an MRT but the requirement to have certain requirements met whether or not they are met by that structure - that structure or that organ of what we start to work. So I think that, you know, I sense from you, Elise, and others that there's a recognition of certain requirements.

It's not 100% clear that those requirements will be fulfilled by the CSC as currently proposed but it may be that as the whole quilt gets knitted together those requirements are met and should they not be met you've put placeholders in for saying look those requirements are still there.

We understood they were going to meet here or there in one or another place and so we retain our opportunity to come back on those requirements. I think we need to bring this particular discussion to a close and move on to the escalation.

Okay. So we'll draw that to a close we'll do some work on trying to capture the key points in the notes and we're going to move onto the next design team, which is design team M and you can clearly see the theme as we start to work with the service level agreements that the customer service committee will rely on.

And then the escalation, which will be presented to us by the design team lead Chuck and (Don) to see how that might tie in and of course they don't dovetail or tie in perfectly at this stage but hopefully the picture is starting to emerge. Chuck.

Okay so we'll just make sure we thank the design team leads and of course those that (unintelligible) design team. Great work, substantial work and so met all the key criteria from the chairs point of view, thank you and welcome Chuck to talk to us about design team.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, this is Chuck's team now that's what people are calling it right? No we have a good group of people. Interestingly enough I'm the only gTLD registry that's involved in it right now but staff on and (Eric) are on from the ccTLDs and Avri is on representing everybody else.

Okay, now first of all again we know that there's not a lot of detail on this. We've been working just a little over a week but what we want to do today is to show you where our thinking is now and get your reaction to see if we're going in a direction that makes sense or if you think we ought to modify the direction we're going in some way.

We will still have to put implementation detail and so forth to anything we end up with here but what we have in front of you and let's go, the escalation steps are shown they're starting with number 1.

And step number 1 is just between the gTLD or ccTLD registry operator and the IANA. Try and resolve the problem at the closest level first. And if that can't happen if that's unsuccessful go to step 2 and certainly report that to the CSC not for action but just for recordkeeping.

And have an option to escalate it to the ombudsman using an ICANN service that's available now. If for some reason it was separated later it could be something equivalent okay.

We put that down for now as an optional step. There may be ccTLDs for example that would rather or not deal with anything ICANN and that's okay. So they wouldn't have to use the ombudsman if they were uncomfortable with that.

But if the ombudsman could facilitate a resolution great, if not the third step then is to take it up to the CSC and allow the CSC the opportunity to mediate that, whatever that means would need some definition; right?

Step 4 then the CSC could involve mediation now, guess where we got that idea. Right from the guidance proposal that Chris was talking about earlier.

Step 5, if the issue still isn't resolved and hopefully most of these never go past step 1 right but step 5 then would be to decide whether it's a critical persistent or systematic problem.

And if so then take it over to a second part of the process, which we call problem management and I'll get to that in a moment. So if it's a series of problems if the audits show that there's a persistent problem that isn't getting solved if it's a very critical issue or whatever it would go into a different track and the CSC would make that decision to put it over into that track.

Now number 6 there we think is important and that is, is that if the - an issue has not been addressed satisfactorily the registry operator, CRG should be able to file an independent appeal on its own okay if they want okay.

Now, so that first part of the process is kind of the incident response part of the process. You see now on the screen the problem management escalation steps.

So these would be for the persistent critical or systemic failure type problems. And in that case what we're suggesting step 1 is, the CSC reports it to the IANA functions operator and requests a response within some specific number of days okay.

Step 2, CSC decides whether this, whether the action by the IANA operator is sufficient and confirms that the remediation whatever that is, is completed. If not if it is unsatisfactory step 4 the CSC could involve a mediator, okay.

And then step 5, if mediation fails binding any an appeals panel is initiated. Now Chris, interesting Chris introduced another step in between there. We didn't put it in ours yet that's something that could be considered where you have arbitration and then that kind of details we can decide.

Do you need remediation, a mediator and arbitration or both I don't know if people have ideas on that please share them with us. But that essentially shows where we're at right now.

And what we would like to leave here with today is okay what do you think some of these steps do you like them, you don't like then, why, why not. Give us some guidance and then we will continue to put some details around this, thank you.

Donna Austin: Chuck, I think you've reached a great amount of work in a very short time. That's very good. I see there is a line okay, you're one of the first Paul.

Paul Kane: Thank you very much Chuck. I have to say this is the first time I've seen it and there seems to be two issues. One is an operational problem, which needs to be fixed yesterday.

A specific example, someone does a DS key change and wants to roll it back instantly and is prevented from doing so because of one reason or another. That needs to be fixed in milliseconds. Failure to do so impacts the stable operation of the gTLD.

The other one is the systemic issues that's identified and that can take significantly longer. So may I make a suggestion that your escalation team splits or considers two distinct issues?

One, day-to-day transactions making sure they operate efficiently and there is an efficient path for escalation. The second area is the systemic failure, which possibly is more along the lines of what you've been working on.

But well done for the work done so far and I - if my design team is over I would be happy to pay a little more attention to what you're doing.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Paul, Chuck speaking. And I think that's kind of what we tried to do in the first section it's the incident response steps okay and then the second is the systemic or bigger problem.

Are you saying something different than that than the incident response situation?

Paul Kane: I think we are along similar lines. You mentioned 30 days, 30 days for a key roll back is too long. So it's I'm going to say Chris very kindly used the word emergency.

For there to be an issue that needs instant response let's consider it an emergency. But if ICANN is asleep because it's a weekend, they can't be bothered to do it because it's not - the API isn't working.

There could be legitimate reasons it's Christmas and I just also want to stand up for the IANA team. The research we did showed that the IANA team does work over weekends as and when needed.

So the mechanism is already there but I'm just thinking if this team is trying to come up with a plan it needs to be an emergency one, a normal operation one and a systemic escalation path.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Paul, Chuck again. The notice at the 30 day was just a suggestion and that was for the systemic one not for the incident response okay. So but your point is well taken.

In fact it reminds me of a point that I meant to ask when we were on (Paul's) team and that was, is there an SLA for emergency situations? Because I think there may be those and should there be an SLA for emergency situations because I totally agree with you.

If my TLD is down for some reason and you need a - and my understanding is IANA now has emergency release procedures and they will come to VeriSign as the route zone maintainer and to ask, to tell us we don't make the decision.

But they tell us to do an out of cycle in other words not in 12 hours but sooner release. So but that raises an interesting question sorry to bring it back to your team but I think that's something that would be good to consider.

Should there be an emergency SLA for cases like that because that's really important. If all of your customers, it's one thing if it's a new delegation and that may be problematic enough.

But if there are, if there are a bunch of customers that are out of service and something is needed that's really critical. So I fully understand the time sensitivity there.

Paul Kane: So two answers that is an area we have not investigated as a group. It is certainly a question I'm very happy to place to the IANA staff to ask them specifically what would be helpful in terms of identifying the steps.

So thank you for the suggestion we'll take it on board.

Donna Austin: Well thank you Paul and thank you Chuck and I think those two comments are very good examples of how closely related these three groups are because (Lee) it goes back to you and actually the other point about day-to-day operations also a part of the CSC group.

So I think it's very important that we keep a close eye on where those overlapping issues are and you guys are trying to work it together so we're not doing double work but instead are complementing each other.

And I know that Marika will have a word before I go back to the queue, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika I just wanted to add to what Chuck already mentioned and as part of the design team they already looked at, they looked as well at what is currently in place and there is an emergency number that is currently in place for emergency situations.

But I think it's a good point and need to follow up to see if there are specific SLAs associated with that emergency number and I think indeed the

recommendation is that of course that would continue and not be terminated after transition.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Marika, this is Chuck and just very quickly. We will add more detail to for example step 1 what can be done there and we have looked at that in terms there's a general number that can be used by anybody.

There is an emergency number that can be used for, by certain people with standing for example a registry operator. So that kind of detail would be added to this.

Donna Austin: Thank you, Chuck. And Chris you were next in.

Chris Disspain: Thank you, would it be possible just briefly to go back to the previous slide just so that I can have a look at something? So Chuck I just wanted to address the point you made about arbitration.

I had in my head it's they are the same in this sense, independent appeals panel and arbitration. I think we might need to offer a choice because there might be some people who would say, no, no I need to go to a binding arbitration finding, which is not quite the same as an independent appeals panel or might not be.

We could make them the same but if they were different it's that thing about some cc's want to be involved in ICANN run processes, some don't and an arbitration thing could be completely independent whereas an appeals panel is actually facilitated by ICANN even though it's independent.

So that was the reason for making that distinction but I don't think it's an extra step I think it's an either or otherwise it becomes ludicrous because you

end up with so many different ways you can fix it. So I just wanted to add that thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Chris that's helpful appreciate that.

Donna Austin: Well we are mindful of time because we are to actually have lunch at half past. So I'll close the queue by having I think it was (David) as the last one but next in line is Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz: Thank you, this is Eduardo for the record. Chuck you mentioned at the beginning of your presentation that, you know, part of the escalation you can go to the ombudsman and, you know, if you don't have any relation with or you don't want to have any relationship with ICANN then you will go to the CSC.

So, you know, when you mentioned something like that is the implication there is that the CSC will not be part of ICANN, will be an independent? Maybe just something that we can discuss later. Is that the implication there? Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, this is Chuck again. I don't think we were assuming one way or the other because that's one of those things that (Jonathan) talked about at the beginning of the morning right, that we kind of, we're not assuming any particular structure internal, external or whatever.

Obviously it brings up different issues if it's internal or external and that we'll have to work through but as far as design team (unintelligible) is concerned we weren't assuming one or the other and whichever way we go we're going to have to fill in the blanks.

Donna Austin: Well thank you, Alan Greenberg you're next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. It's Alan Greenberg for the record. Actually my comment may be more directed at the CCWG than this but nevertheless I'll make it at this point.

It goes to the question of whether for an IAP to be accepted in whatever concept they're doing whether the CSC process fees would have to have been gone through before it would be accepted.

So that's in other words can you go directly to them or would you have to firstly exhaust what the CSC has done? So I maybe made the comment more for (Leon's) benefit than for ours but it's something to think about.

Donna Austin: All right, (Leon) do you want to - no okay. And Elise is next in line.

Elise Lindeberg: Thank you (unintelligible) design team for escalation that is driving processes on a daily basis also that could - button or some (unintelligible) that's more for the overall performance on a daily basis.

But I think that escalation is the main thing when you - although that occurs on many different areas and you have a problem that has to be taken - a bigger force than the CSC or the process that they have.

So to define as I said I think (Paul Kane) also said that to define the different kind of like groups of problems that we are dealing with. Overarching problems that has an interest in the whole community, the IANA performance overall is of interest of the whole community.

The case, you know, each and every case is - also then I think you have quite a difficult - power in a way - deal with this on this level of...

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Elise. This is Chuck again. I think I understand the first point I'm not sure I totally get the second one so I may need some clarification there. But with regard to the first point do you think that more is in the second part if we can scroll back up to the second set of steps the problem management steps there.

That was the more, for the more significant. Are you suggesting that something else is needed in there to involve the broader community? I'd be curious what you think there and then if you can help me understand the second point I don't think I fully grasp it.

Elise Lindeberg: I could explain a bit more of course, the planning of powers is more like - I think we're discussing that under the CSC. Which group are responsible or what kind of mechanism is responsible on which level to do something, to deal with something?

That is the - because CSC is not going to (unintelligible) component as I said is going to be open, it's going to be transparent but it's not going to be a multi-stakeholder group on it.

So you need something as we also talked about the link to maybe the (CCDG) process and so on in this escalation that needs to be clear. So which mechanism at which level is diving in? That is the main I think your main task and I think it's very difficult that's what I'm...

Donna Austin: So Elise what I'm hearing is we should be careful of investigating this regarding the CSC and we're talking about being careful of having the

element of multi-stakeholder as an open issue if we're not going to have an MRT.

So we need to find out how to place this, is that what you're addressing here?

Elise Lindeberg: Yes I think it is the main issue for the escalation team.

Donna Austin: And then I have (David) and I have a final question for Chuck after (David) and then the queue is closed and it is lunch time.

(David Conrad):   Yes I just wanted to speak very briefly on sort of the emergency escalation process as it currently it just as I understand them and I have to preface this in saying that I'm going to be speaking about the historical processes that were around when I was running IANA.

It's probably changed since I left and I don't know what the changes were but back in the day there is a telephone emergency hotline number that the customers of IANA can use.

The, you know, it doesn't matter and it's 24 by 7 by 365 and will ring into sort of the IANA officer of the day, the person who is actually responsible to hold the token or emergency responses.

Once an emergency request is lodged it will go through the, you know, currently the existing IANA process, which involves NTI approvals and contact in VeriSign.

I believe the SLAs used to be on the order of four hours to get an emergency change done but that is dependent on a number of factors. I think it was

exercised once to my knowledge when an event occurred that caused both name servers for a TLD to be unreachable.

And the change was forced through I think if I remember correctly within the four hour window but that was an exceptional circumstance. I will take it upon myself to actually find the actual escalation process for those emergency situations and report back to you Chuck or should it go to...

Chuck Gomes: I think that's to Paul and his team in terms of that. But you can, why don't you just include both of us and we'll work together.

(David Conrad): Okay.

Donna Austin: Okay thank you (David). I have a last question because I know that the accountability team when they are looking at the independent review panel they are looking at this process being as inexpensive as possible as one of the parameters. Is this going to be one of the parameters for this group too?

Chuck Gomes: Could you repeat that please?

Donna Austin: The process is going to be as inexpensive as possible for an independent review panel. So are we going to look at, are we going to have this as a principle too that it has to be as inexpensive as possible because you would have small registries escalating things and money is going to be an issue too.

Chuck Gomes: That's a very good question I think we always want to try and be as cost effective as possible that goes without saying. But when you start getting in to mediation and arbitration and even the independent appeals panel there are going to be costs.

And those are going to be big issues for us and probably the CCWG as well to deal with, so.

Donna Austin: Okay thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Can I say one thing in closing? Over lunch if any of you want to hear how we used to do it in the late 90's when we were only updating the route server three times a week that makes for kind of a funny story.

Donna Austin: Okay I actually closed the queue but I see (Donna) is having her last and final question.

Donna Austin: Sorry and this isn't actually related to Chuck's escalation piece. But I realized after (Stephanie) had done our presentation that two of the recommendations from our work hadn't been included in the summary report.

So I will send those to the CWG and just highlight those, thanks.

Donna Austin: And with this we will go for lunch and reconvene - yes sorry thank you Chuck.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks everyone, 1:30 starts one hour from now.

Donna Austin: If you'd like to leave your computers or things here you can do that there will be someone in the room and we'll make sure...

END