

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
March 19, 2015
4:00 pm CT**

Operator: The recordings are started.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you. This is the Design Team M Meeting, the second one of our meetings on the 19th of March and we have full house. So Avri, Erick, Stephane and I as members are on and Marika and Berry are also on to support us. So welcome everyone. Stephane, glad you could join us today.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: And we got a - I got a - I thought a pretty good start the other day, although I haven't seen any discussion on the list. So I assume everybody has been busy on a bunch of other things like I have. So I fully understand that. The agenda is pretty simple. Just - and, of course, we can cover other things on the agenda and let me start there and see if anybody wants to cover anything that's not on the agenda.

I'm not seeing or hearing anyone and it looks like everybody is in Adobe Connect so we can use that. Again, we still have a relatively small group so if you want to jump in politely verbally I think that's okay. If it becomes a

problem we can always revert to raising hands and it's still okay to raise hands if you'd like if you're more comfortable with that.

So as promised after the last meeting I did send - I did draft a cursory outline of some steps for escalation, but before we go there I did send around a version of the document, the public version, that was sent out I guess yesterday on the guidance for the transition of stewardship of IANA functions. And we started with some of their ideas in terms of escalation, not that we have to use them, but we started there and added a few things to it based on our call the other day.

So I didn't see too much different in the escalation part of that document. They did change the name of CSC to Direct User Group or at least something like CSC as they said in a footnote, but I think the escalation procedures are kind of the same. It goes to - now it's DUG and then mediation and then appeals panel is kind of the pattern they've followed in both instances of an individual registry and a - in case of a systemic or critical failure.

So that said I - you can see that the steps that I drafted - and please understand that these are just my take and I doubt that I incorporated everything people said. And what I did - I tried as much as possible, but I only had so much time to spend on it.

So let me start off to get the discussion going and ask this question, does it make sense to divide escalation steps into a couple categories like the two I have up here and like they did in that document where there's escalations steps that an individual registry could follow in their relationship with the IANA and then there are escalation steps in the case of a systemic or critical failure. And let me pause there and let's talk about that. By the way we might

be able to break it out differently than that. I just followed what they did.
Stephane, please.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you. Yes, the reason why I haven't (unintelligible) this group is because I've been away in meeting lots of CCs these two last days and we have been discussing this as well. And hopefully we have actually come quite far on the common view of CSC in the first place.

So that is, of course, I am very hopeful that we actually got quite far these two days and good mandates. And in these discussions we also talked about escalation and one idea that came up is to talk about a similar separation as you do, or rather we talk about internal and external separation are two things -two mechanisms. So it can be approached from several directions at once.

So I'm not sure - I haven't had time to react to this conversation yet, but I'm just mentioning that there is other discussion going on in - mainly in CC community and in - and it will probably have some input to CSC grant proposal as well.

Chuck Gomes: Absolutely. Thanks Stephane. This is Chuck again and in fact part of our responsibility and Drafting Team aim is to coordinate with Drafting Team C because of the close connection. So that's real good. Before I go to Berry, could you explain to us, for those of us that don't know, what's the internal versus external division that you've talked about in drafting terms in crafting teams - excuse me Design Team C?

Stephane Van Gelder: Sorry, I was on mute. Yes, I'm frantically trying to put down in writing what we actually said and how it was put, but there's talk about internal work - or internal audits going on - or review if you want to call it that and that is also - should also be part of escalation. There's - I'm afraid - I won't give the

proposal a fair view since I need to consider it before taking further (unintelligible). I will just destroy the proposal itself. Just after this call I'll sit down and try to write it down in more specific wording how we came to, but if you give me just a couple more hours I'll have something down.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine. That's fine Stephane, thanks. Thank you for being willing to do that. I appreciate that. Let's go to Berry.

Berry Cobb: All right, thank you Chuck, and Berry Cobb for the record. So I kind of used to do this in my previous life, but you'll have to forgive my ignorance in not knowing exactly how IANA operates internally. I'll start off by saying I do agree with your separation here and in the IT world from my previous life that your first section kind of deals in the world of incident management and, you know, it's from the moment an incident occurs until it's resolved and there may be a series of steps that involve escalation up to the point that it gets resolved.

And then the second part is when you see a series of errors - or series of bad transactions that have been escalated that goes into the realm of problem management and it's usually a separate team that analyzes all of these bad transactions and comes up with a solution to fix it.

So that's, again, kind of the IT world of using that terminology and the only other thing that I'll circle back to is your step 1 in the individual registry issue and something this group may want to consider. You know, when we read this that the registry operator will escalate to IANA directly and if it's unsatisfactory it goes to the Ombudsman.

It seems pretty quick and I'm just curious if there's not an internal escalation mechanism within IANA and so, for example, let's say it's a who is update.

Something goes wrong with - either IANA is not responding or reacting in enough time. The registry operator will call the first line, so to speak, and say, you know, when are you going to get this done?

Typically that first line - if they can't handle the issue for whatever the reason will be then it goes - it gets escalated to level 2 and I'm just kind of curious if IANA has that kind of internal escalation mechanism that might be worthy of listing here. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Berry. So you would call it incident issues and what was the systemic or critical ones to be called?

Berry Cobb: The first is incident management and then the second is problem management.

Chuck Gomes: Problem management.

Berry Cobb: And then to bore you to death when you've understood what the root cause of the problem is then you use change management procedures to rectify the problem that led to multiple incidents.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, okay, very good. I want to come back to something - thanks Berry. I want to come back to something that Avri said in the chat there and make something really clear. I'm not advocating, nor do I think we can as a group, advocate support for the DUG model or this model that Chris Disspain sent around. The only portions of that I really wanted us to pick from - to the extent that we want to - is their escalation procedures because it provided some specific steps that we can consider. So please don't think - and it's not up to use to decide the CSC model.

That's for the Design Team C to come up with a model and the composition of that. They will make some recommendations to the full CWG. So please - because we're using some ideas from this paper with particular suggestions in it - kind of put those aside and let's focus on the escalation steps, not the model. I hope that makes sense. So - and...

Avri Doria: Chuck, this is Avri.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes - no, it was just that when you were starting to talk about the paper you said the CSC or the DUG model as it's now called.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: And therefore I reflexed it, but I understand that we're not process accepting the model but we also have to be careful not to accept its premises.

Chuck Gomes: Exactly. No, I'm with you all the way on that. Thanks for pointing that out because I wasn't very careful in the way I worded that. So what do others think about this - breaking it up into incident management and problem management? And ultimately even maybe, you know, then transitioning into change management. Any problems with that? Is that an effective way to capture this? Anybody disagree with that? Okay...

Stephane Van Gelder: Stephane here.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Stephane Van Gelder: Yes, thank you. Well, there are several things that is actually going to be transitioned. Not only changes to the (unintelligible) to say and this is defined in Document 069 as defined by the SSAC and I - my drafting (unintelligible) out those functions that - and actually is being - or rather what functions is actually being transitioned and we tend to look very close (unintelligible) those changes in the (root) zone and that is one part of it.

There are several things in that and it might become a thing that different functions transitioned might demand different kinds of escalation. I'm not saying - arguing for this. I hope we can avoid it, but because different things to transition and they have quite different features actually.

So, for example, we talk - and I think all people talk about changes to the (root) zone and that is a technical change. But there is also change in, for example, the (unintelligible) database. And the change of technical compact, etcetera.

There is a change - who is appointed registry from already existing TLD and then we're talking (CC World) about delegation - re-delegation and that is yet another kind of escalation. So actually I think we're point out four or five different paths of escalation at first case at least. So I just want to flag this and I'll as soon as possible I'll send the distinction to hopefully help. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So let me ask you a - this is Chuck again. Let me ask you a question Stephane. As far as escalation is concerned, do you think we need to differentiate by the type of problem? For example, whether a registry or some of their party is escalating a problem.

Does it matter whether it's an IANA who is problem, for example, updating a name server. Or a delegation or re-delegation problem? Now I know

delegation and re-delegation get into some special issues, especially with ccTLD so I'm not really talking about that, but do you think we need a separate escalation procedure, for example, for IANA who is change versus a delegation or re-delegation change?

Stephane Van Gelder: Well at worst case, yes. I hope not. So, but I can't overview all this. I need to go back to some tables and try to figure this out. I'm not sure I'll be able to do it myself, but it might become an issue at least.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Stephane Van Gelder: I'm just flagging it up now.

Chuck Gomes: Good. No, that's good. I'm glad you flagged it. Thanks - this is Chuck speaking again. And so I'm going to come back to Avri on something from the chat too. Avri, you mentioned in the chat that it might not just be a registry that would raise an issue - escalate an issue. Give me - can you give me an example of another party in the community that might have standing to raise and issue with IANA?

Avri Doria: Avri, speaking. Might have standing or perhaps should have standing?

Chuck Gomes: Either one, I don't care. I mean that's fine (unintelligible) is fine.

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay, so at the - at a certain point, and we've talked about it before, if we noticed that - if, for example, an SO noticed that the implementations were not matching the policies or had a question about it - where would they take that?

And as they would address an incident you could also have an individual trying to find the, you know, the people responsible for registry and that part of who is and, you know, finding false information. I don't know enough about the CC side, but when I, you know, listened to people talk about delegations and re-delegations there's more than a single part. That there's the relationship between the three parties.

Now I'm not quite sure how that works, but it just struck me as possible that there could be parties that weren't the registry per se that might have something to say about how it was being done, the information that was recorded, etcetera.

I think primarily you're right. It's going to be registries and it's going to be day to day down to earth, you know, kinds of issues. I'm just looking for it to be open to other forms of incident - other, you know, forms of report and that's what was going through my mind at the time. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, this is Chuck. And I think it's something we definitely have to talk about because I think to come up with a proposal for escalation procedures we definitely have to define who has standing to escalate an issue and who they escalate it to. So bringing up the point is very good and I think essential for our tasks. So thanks for bringing that up.

Let's talk about standing a little bit and since we're on that topic right now what do some of the rest of you think in terms of who has standing? Notice in our tasks one of the things that - one of the questions we're supposed to answer is should TLD organizations have any standing to escalate issues? For example, should the ccNSO or the registry stakeholder group or one of the ccTLD name organizations like center or something like that.

So that's another area - one of the questions we asked - and we have to answer the question that Avri is raising too should an individual user who catches something have standing to escalate an issue or should they go through an intermediate who would raise that issue? I'm not advocating one way or the other, but those are questions we have to answer I think. Stephane, go ahead.

Stephane Van Gelder: Thank you. Yes, there is a point. I would answer Avri's question with, yes, direct customers should (unintelligible) first hand be standing to raise issues. At least if we're defining the CSC as a (unintelligible) technical operations as we were talking about in Frankfort and it depends on - and so if we start by defining the CSC as a very - a watchdog of technical performance rather.

It makes it very easy to define who is direct customers of the IANA functions and I would argue for that, but if you also involve - let's say more broader public policy issues in the CSC we have a totally different arena - like if we compare the Frankfort discussion.

If we eliminate the (unintelligible) stakeholder review team in this equation we do have problems, but I believe at least that the elegance with CSC is to narrow it down and take away two difficult (unintelligible) business or public policy interests from the chair operations at least and that's why I - again, going back to what exact functions are to be transitioned and in what way should the review look. I think we need to go back and look to those functions again. I think the answer is in that.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Stephane. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Hi, yes, this is Avri speaking again. Part of (unintelligible), you know, really good in terms of cleaning up the function of the CSC one of the things that we talked about was whether indeed all issues with IANA are indeed CSC issues.

If, for example, the CSC is defined as strictly technical issues then any other issues - any of those policy issues that someone may want to bring up to IANA because - and I think this is a very important concern whether it's in the CSC or it's not, but before you get to a full-fledged MRT issue there are possible mismatches between implementation and policy. We talk about that all the time in other groups.

Now how does - when one of those is noticed how does that get escalated into the system? Sure, I can write email to the folks I know at IANA and say, hey, you know, what you've implemented in the policy that came out of the GNSO seemed to not match to me, but beyond that is there anything that I could do? Is there anything that my stakeholder group could do?

Is there anything that the GNSO, ALAC or GAC could do in terms of noticing a policy issues in the implementation? Now you may be right in that this doesn't go through the CSC because it's not a strictly technical issue and I'm very comfortable with that limitation on the CSC, but then there still has to be some path for that incident - that issue to get dealt with in the escalation path.

And that's why we had talked, I think, the other day about the possibility of a direct Ombudsman path into this that has nothing to do perhaps with the CSC because it's not a technical issue. It's a policy impedance mismatch or something like that.

So that's where I'm going. I'm not arguing the function of the CSC, you know, that's not this particular design team, but looking at issues dealing with IANA and how they are escalated. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Avri. So, okay - Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just to raise on the Ombudsman point and I don't know if Avri may have not seen the messages, but we did reach out to the Ombudsman and he clarified that he already currently has standing to deal with IANA related issues, but he also noted that in his tenure with ICANN I think there was only once that he was contacted about something related to IANA, but actually that complaint was not further pursued. So that is already a mechanism that is in place for issues that people want to raise with the Ombudsman.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Marika. And, this is Chuck again, and if we go to the IANA customer service site that I sent you a link for - thanks to Donna Austin - the - they actually list the Ombudsman as another form of problem resolution on their website page there. So that's there.

Now, Avri, I want to come back to the - okay, so what happens if it appears that policy is implemented improperly? Now, in my opinion in terms of the process that would not be something that's done by IANA, but something by whoever is authorizing the delegations of a TLD or the change to a TLD or something like that. So it seems to me that would happen before the IANA gets involved, but let's talk about that. Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Avri speaking. I think for many issues you're right. There you're dealing with the policy of the decision-making gets there before IANA. There because we will have various relationships, you know, in the group when we talk about, you know, there being more to really IANA function than just the statement of work about SLEs, you know, that there's more to it than that. That there's more we have to review.

There are indeed policies that will be implemented by IANA about how they do their work. There could be policies implemented about what they do with

the who is. There could be policies implemented about other aspects of how they keep the directories. You know, just sort of looking ahead. These are things that registries may or may not, you know, be the ones to report problems from. It's very similar to a policy implementation balance.

So it - all policies will not necessarily (unintelligible) single GTLD and it's being put into the root or it's being taken out or it's, you know, changes to it. It may be about how the directories are kept, how the information is put out by IANA. It could be any number of other IANA issues that would be more policy linked in a general sense than just the specific TLD issues. So that's really what I'm getting to in terms of the SOs or the ACs looking at it and saying we thought you were going to do this, but you're doing that.

So the first thing they would do is go to IANA and say, you know, we thought the policy was - and we don't understand how your implementation, you know, implements this policy and there's an interaction. Most of the time it would be resolved, oh, I understand - no, we don't understand. And it's just if that gets to a point of impasse then what do you do? Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: No, thank you Avri. Chuck again, and very good clarification. So now I can differentiate between how you were using policy there and obviously the way I was thinking of it in my traditional GNSO sense. So that's clear and I get that. Let's go to Erick. Are you...

Erick Iriarte: Thanks Chuck. It's only to help us to be clear with expectation with that Ombudsman. If I am correct the procedures to escalate to the Ombudsman is because IANA is now inside ICANN and the Ombudsman is the ICANN Ombudsman. So in the future the (unintelligible) that ICANN (unintelligible) with the activity of IANA we don't need exactly our Ombudsman. So the question is we will request to the new administrator of IANA in the future -

(unintelligible) yet or this situation is only because we want to keep inside ICANN framework that (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Erick and your points well taken. I think it's fair for us to assume in the CWG that at first the IANA functions are going to be operated by ICANN. So immediately after the transition happens things like the Ombudsman if we keep that in there would work, but we would have to word it in such a way that that step may have to be replaced with something else should the functions ever be transitioned.

In most cases that's probably fairly easy - like, for example, I also sent you a little excerpt of a document that (Kirk Pritz) had done with regard to the CSC months ago, again, thanks to Donna and you notice his escalation path was from the IANA manager to the VP of the GDD to the ICANN board. Well, that's also very ICANN specific, but we could probably easily generalize that to be steps corresponding steps if we went - if we use those steps for a new entity, but your point is well taken. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, hi, thanks. Avri again, I apologize for talking so much. In this case I'm still not sure - okay, in terms of the models we're looking at lots of the models have some degree of continuing ICANN insiderness, whether it's wholly within ICANN or in some notion of subsidiary and, yes, there's one possibility external, but even in that case this would still be a function that was working with ICANN and in very similar to what we've seen in this case where any of the actions of one of ICANN's contractors that's performing a function - the access point for anybody within ICANN or who gets ICANN, you know, names or numbers even.

The access point for almost any issue is the Ombudsman who then sort of sort out the proper place that the issue belongs and if the issue belongs inside

ICANN at that point where there is structural separation of some sort or another. It's still the Ombudsman who could take it up to that edge and know what the process was for taking it further. As opposed to needing to necessarily open up a process at the bleeding edge that's open to everyone.

You've basically got the Ombudsman as a rational actor that understands all pathways to solving a problem when a problem that comes in as an ICANN problem and remembering that in any of these models ICANN, even if it's not controlling the IANA function, is interacting with it, is contracting to it, is performing it under contract or what have you and you note that those legal issues are still being taught, but there is a relationship there, except for maybe the most extreme model, which I don't think any of us as betting people would necessarily bet on being the solution.

So in any of these - so that is a role that the Ombudsman fulfills now. It may have some complexity, it may have some, you know, as you say fine-tuning language, but already if I want to complain about unfairness or a process not having been carried right by someone that is working on contract to ICANN, you know, problem - dispute resolution or what have you, it's the Ombudsman is one of the paths for taking the issue.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, thank you and by the way, just as a side comment. I bounced some of our discussion off of some of my registry colleagues today and brought up the idea of the Ombudsman. The one point that was made is that the Ombudsman is not always a very timely process. Now let's not talk about that now. I just throw that out so that in the future if we leave that step in there that may be an issue we may need to talk about.

So now what I want to do is try and zero in a little bit because this has been really useful discussion, at least for me. So right now we have two categories,

an incident management category and a problem management category. I think we're all fairly clear on the case of the direct customers in the incident management piece.

Do we need a separate part for the kind of escalations that Avri is talking about where a policy has been developed and that could probably be either through the IETF or it could be through the policy making bodies, maybe even a cross community working group with the ccNSO and the GNSO in terms of the way the IANA does certain things.

Where - could that fit - you think that'll be able to fit into what we're now calling incident management? Or do you think we might need a separate process for that kind of escalation procedure? I'll let you think about that and then respond.

Let me ask this question while you're thinking, I'll come right back to you, Avri, does anyone disagree that the issues that Avri raised also needs to have a point of escalation? If so, would you speak up - just speak up right now just say I disagree if you do.

So I'm sensing that there's support for that. And I do too; I think she's raised something that's valid there. Then let me go to her right now. Okay good.

Avri Doria: There, I've un-muted. Yeah, I wasn't going to answer that second question because obviously I believe what I've been saying. But in terms of - I think that they're very similar. I think, you know, as I say it's almost the same process the two entry points with (unintelligible) and one of them has a CSC recording and CSC tracks it; and one of them doesn't.

But I also see now problem with, you know, because we had steps 2a and 2b, reports to the CSC, escalates to ombudsman and report for CSC was to record only. So in other words it really is almost a single escalation to ombudsman where it's either reported to CSC or it isn't. You know, in some sense the A and B there becomes that sort of same incident reporting system slightly different path after it follows.

But then you look at the, you know, then the path would change a little but, you know, and the one thing that comes to my mind is wouldn't the CSC want to be notified of it anyway even if it (was) issue. That I don't know. But so I don't think they need to be radically different. I think it's similar to what we were talking about before when - I just made a mistake of looking at the chat and reading it and confusing myself.

But okay there was - and there was actually - we had talked about there being several types and there would all be a similar incident. But as Berry had talked about earlier, had talked about there being, you know, different incident types with different categorizations and possibly even, you know, it wasn't mentioned in that note, a different path through that system.

Now if I could also address a couple other things. Marika also asked do I think there will suddenly be more issues after the transition compared to now? No, the coincidence may - any rise in incidents may have more to do with thousands of new TLDs than it would with just because we transitioned.

But I also know that many of us, and not just registries though registries do it too, get on the phone, get on our chat lines and talk to NTIA when there are issues when we don't understand things. And that's a path that won't be there. So, you know, now I would just pick up the phone, or actually I would probably use Skype, and, you know, just talk to someone at NTIA to

understand what was going on, a particular situation why IANA, you know, this wasn't working right.

Then we won't have that path. So I'm - I certainly don't think that there will be more issues but there may be issues that we never saw because they were getting dealt with in sort of a back channel that will no longer exist.

In terms of the issues rising, our IANA issues and whether they arise early in the process, I think that's actually a good consideration for our policy development processes. Within the IETF, for example, on its protocols and its inputs to IANA, we go through a stage where IANA actually reviews what we're asking for.

Now we haven't done IANA policies and I think - so it hasn't been a need. But, yes, if there were issues that look like they might be IANA issues it would actually be a good thing for us to deal with it in a PDP. Nonetheless, there could still be an instance of a policy change having come out of ICANN and IANA's implementation of it where the SOs of the cross community working group that did that work or individuals or individual stakeholder groups see issues.

The other thing that I had mentioned as a possibility was more than single case of, you know, the individual users noticing that the information is wrong when they go to get information from an IANA database. And they want to report that as an incident. And does that have to go through a registry or not? So - or does that go through the CSC but - or get channeled to them?

So I could see many different kinds of issues. I think it's good to have a common entry point and then to discriminate after that entry point as to how it gets recorded, how it gets labeled, how it gets processed further. And we may

find that there are various tracks in that. But I think having a common entry makes sense. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And before I go to Marika, I'm wondering if the IANA customer service interface that I sent around the link to if that could be the point of entry, in other words, Avri, when you notice something that was entered incorrectly or some policy wasn't followed if the first step could be contacting the customer service...

Avri Doria: Yeah, it obviously would be.

Chuck Gomes: And then...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: It obviously would be but then if I didn't get satisfaction what do I do?

Chuck Gomes: Exactly, that's where I was going next. And I'll stop there and go to Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. On the customer service center, as I understand it, that is for emergencies only; that is not a kind of like oh, you know, I need this or that. No, that's an emergency issue only. So indeed if your TLD suddenly doesn't appear in the root anymore you want to call someone, you know, 24/7. So I don't think it's a normal customer service with any issues you call and it's only for direct customers.

It also goes back to my point and the point I've tried to make in the chat...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Hold on a second, I want to stop you there, okay, because - and then I'll let you continue. But I didn't read it that way that it was an emergency thing. In fact it says "Who can use the process? This process is open to anyone using IANA functions." And I don't - I'm looking at the site right now. It doesn't look like this is an emergency process.

Marika Konings: That's what I understood from the slides that were also included...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Oh yeah, the slides. If you look at the site itself it doesn't look like it. But do me a favor after the meeting, okay, let's check that and see. Because if it is just for emergencies, obviously it doesn't work for what we're talking about. Now, please go ahead and continue.

Marika Konings: Yeah, so what I was saying is - and I'm still having a hard time understanding what those issues would be that would, you know, affect a nondirect customer that wouldn't be flagged by a direct customer. And I understand some of the points that Avri is raising but I'm still having a hard time in understanding how those would be, you know, IANA issues. I know Avri was referring to, you know, possible PDP that would direct IANA. I don't think that would be even in scope at least in the gTLD side.

So I'm - and maybe Avri can write up a couple of use cases that really would make specific in which instances there would be, indeed, a situation by which a non-direct customer would have an issue with IANA that wouldn't affect, you know, a direct customer that would immediately flag that.

Because, you know, I'm all for that, of course people have a path to escalate and be able to get answers. But I do want to make sure as well that we don't

overload a system that, you know, currently is intended for very specific usage and, you know, for direct customers that are directly affected by certain things with things that actually need to be dealt with somewhere else.

So maybe Avri can write up a couple of use cases and maybe we can then as well check that with some of the IANA staff to see indeed if that is something that would indeed land on their plate or it's indeed something that actually is much further up the line and there are other escalation paths that deal with those. And again also noting that the path to the ombudsman is already open for, you know, anyone that has identified certain issues.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Marika. So, Avri, can you take up Marika's challenge there and...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I suppose I can. I don't know when I can get it done but it was quite a barrier put in my way but certainly I'll see what I can do.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. In the mean time let's assume that we can handle them both in the same (unintelligible) and let's jump ahead to the - to that - the incident management steps. And how would you - how would you change any of those? I mean, are we on the right path or there are some things you would add, delete?

Should we add maybe some of Kurt's steps in there where - especially while it's with IANA, I mean, excuse me, with ICANN where maybe you go to the IANA manager first. That's kind of the step we already have in there. It doesn't necessarily have to be the IANA manager, I guess. And then should it go to the VP of the - or the president of the GDD and then to the board? Let me stop there and let people talk.

And let me get back into the Adobe room here. So if I could - Marika, could you manage the queue while I switch phones? I've got to go pick up my granddaughter, I'm going to switch over to my cell phone. So if you could manage the queue while I'm switching the phone I would appreciate that.

What do you think about that? What are the steps? Should we change some of them? Should we add some new steps in terms of the incident management process? Or list the steps there?

Marika Konings: Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Marika. You know, I guess I really don't have much, you know, I think the outline that you have here seems like an appropriate escalation path. And whatever the final result looks like. I also might suggest that, you know, instead of just an outline form that we can also leverage something that's been created in the past which is what they call tiers.

So, you know, your Tier 1 escalation entry point is calling, you know, contacting IANA directly. Tier 2, should that fail, would be the ombudsman. And then Tier 3, which is where things get really hot and heated is the CSC because then, you know, it more and less - and that's more or less what compliance has done with their three step program and their compliance process. So it's really kind of leveraging some of that industry standard there.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, anyone else that would like to comment or provide feedback? Don't have anyone in the queue, Chuck, don't know if you're already back. I guess Chuck is still searching phones. This is your chance. Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Just to avoid silence - and begin with Step 1, you know, it seems a little immediate that Step 2 or Tier 2 is directly to the ombudsman after a single call. And I'm just kind of curious if the first step when the registry operator contacts IANA directly, should it be - should it just be one call and they are dissatisfied and then they directly go to the ombudsman or is it two calls?

And again, I think it would be interesting to understand if there is any kind of escalation path within IANA itself, because if you think about it if it's something that - let's say a Severity 2 for example, you know, that kind of issue could happen within the course of two or three hours depending on the severity of the incident that's being addressed.

Marika Konings: This is Marika again. Chuck, are you already back?

Chuck Gomes: Excuse me, okay I had to get off of mute. I am back, if you can continue to manage it until I get driving here so I don't have too much background noise. Let me throw another question out too that people can talk about before I go on mute for another minute.

One of the things I - one concern that hit me, if we open this up to anyone being able to escalate something, I think going to the customer service line is probably okay assuming it's not an emergency line like Marika mentioned, because there is a facility to handle that.

But when you get beyond that if anybody in the world can do that I wonder if we're opening up a - a new problem, a new complication to the IANA services that we may want to control in some way. And I'll throw that out and I'll go on mute and I'll be back - hopefully once I get moving so that's not too noisy when I'm closing the garage door and so forth.

Marika Konings: Thanks, Chuck. I've actually put myself in the queue because on the previous question, on the current escalation mechanism, I just quickly looked back at the slide deck as well as the Website that you shared so it looks actually like their to escalation paths. So one of them is the emergency phone number, so that is indeed only for direct customers and only in case of emergency.

And then is indeed on the email or the link you sent, the Website, that is an email escalation process. And, you know, the number is publicly posted. I think it does say there anyone using the IANA functions, I'm not sure how they deal with, you know, people writing to that address that are maybe not using the IANA functions or may have, you know, issues that are not directly related to IANA.

I presume that similarly to as how compliance works, I presume they look at the complaint and see if it's, you know, related - fits within their remit and not, you know, otherwise erected somewhere else or, you know, make sure that they make suggestions or where people can find information so maybe that is indeed already in existence.

And, you know, as a possible path should there be issues that are raised even by non-direct customers. So, you know, I'm happy to follow up as well with IANA colleagues to find out whether indeed that email escalation process can be used by anyone or how they judge whether indeed a complaint has standing or not, whether that is based on who is submitting it or whether they just look at the, you know, what is actually being raised and is that indeed and IANA issue or not. So if it's helpful to look into that I'm happy to do so.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so - can you hear me okay? This is Chuck.

Marika Konings: Yes we can.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so I hope there's no too much distracting noise because I am driving. But so, yeah, I think it would be helpful if you did follow up a little bit on that. I have another question for people to think about and respond to if you'd like. And if - I just lost it so it'll come back to me hopefully shortly here.

So - oh I know what it is. So if we go that route through the customer service line and there's not satisfaction there, what's next? Does it go to the next step in the process which is to bring the ombudsman in? Does that make sense? And if you could respond to that. And, Marika, again, I can't see the Adobe now so if you can manage that I would appreciate it.

What do you think about that? Would it go to the ombudsman next?

Marika Konings: No hands yet.

Chuck Gomes: And then while you're thinking about that after the ombudsman, what if it's not settled there, does it keep going up the chain? Does this - whoever this person is in the world that does this, besides Avri, okay, raise this - does it keep going up?

And again, what about this complication of expanding to the whole universe - giving standing to the whole universe to raise an issue? How do we manage that effectively without it becoming overly burdensome?

Marika Konings: Avri has her hand raised.

Avri Doria: Okay well obviously I'm not going to argue for expanding it anymore. Obviously it's just going to be the registries. But in which case I'm not sure I see any point in using the ombudsman. So leaving aside other people and

whether they should or shouldn't have standing, why - if there's the CSC, why doesn't the CSC deal with things directly? Why would it go to the ombudsman? I'm just not sure because the CSC is going to be an internal ICANN organization and they usually have, you know, direct paths to things.

So in thinking about it further and then subtracting other users from the formula as a possibility, because I'm obviously - don't believe that I'll necessarily produce cases that can convince people, is why would the CSC use an on button at all? And so I actually start to lose that feeling for including the ombudsman in the process. The CSC should be able to deal with its issues directly. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Avri, this is Chuck. My intent in raising those issues was not to put down your idea but rather to identify issues that we need to solve.

Avri Doria: I understand.

Chuck Gomes: I actually think that the ombudsman, you know, there may be a role there. I like the idea of having intermediary steps. If I can say it this way, and I don't mean it derogatorily, the lower we can solve the problem the better. So if we have intermediate steps, if the ombudsman - if you can't solve your problem with the IANA directly and the ombudsman can facilitate a solution before even going to the CSC, I think that's good. If they can't we've got the CSC to go to. That's just Chuck speaking personally.

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay, I'm the only one with my hand up now so I'll just go. But, okay but that's already changing this; that sort of thing that you go into the ombudsman first and then if the ombudsman can't solve it then they go to the CSC.

I suppose that's possible but if it's just registries doing CSC business, that are the kinds of things I think you comment you know, are being talked about here then I'm not sure why - it just seems like it may just be, you know, and extra usage of the ombudsman's time; just let the CSC deal with it direct. I don't know.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again. And I don't think we know whether it's going to be just registries. That's being handled by another group. And then ultimately a decision made by the whole CWG. So we kind of have to act in the dark here, I think, and assume that.

Now I don't think the CSC needs to be overburdened with a lot of stuff because if in fact it's volunteers that makes up the CSC, again, that's just me thinking. So somebody else - some of the rest of you jump in and share some thoughts on this.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I actually put myself in the queue. And actually I think, Avri, you gave a very good example I think on the last call on why you do want to have an ombudsman in the, you know, possible escalation path or at least as an option. Because I think you mentioned the scenario, for example, whereby it's not a technical issue or an SLE issue that is at stake, but for example, where someone feels treated unfairly for whatever reason. And that may be more of an ombudsman issue than a CSC issue.

And also I think as well like looking out, you know, looking at the current process, and I think - and I've already sent an email to follow up on that, if indeed the issues that are being raised there are basically valued on what the issue is and not to submit it, it basically already means that that path exists and maybe it's just then for this group to say that should continue, and basically that should be open for, you know, anyone to raise an issue although, you

know, there needs to be recognition as well as if those issues don't think within the IANA mandate that those can be referred to differently or to a different place or at least an explanation as to why they're not being dealt with at that level.

And again there than the escalation path needs to be there if someone still believes that it is an IANA issue, that there should be different steps in which they can maybe escalate if they believe that they either are not being heard. And again that could maybe be an ombudsman question.

Or if they believe that, you know, there is a significant systematic issue that is not being addressed that they could, you know, relay that to the CSC for example. So it may be worth, indeed, looking at what is currently there and seeing if that is indeed open to anyone who identifies an issue regardless of whether it's a direct customer or not, that may already be that path that you're looking for hopefully.

And, Chuck, I notice it's top of the hour and no one in the queue at the moment.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So excuse me if you hear kids because I'm at the school and they're getting out of school. So we have - is it possible to have a call on Monday? Is that out of the question for anybody? I know it's pretty much out of the question tomorrow, we already checked that one.

Marika, could you do a...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...a Doodle poll. Go ahead, who was that?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I'm going to be in the Accountability Cross Community Working Group...

Chuck Gomes: CCWG.

Avri Doria: So unless it's late at night - so unless it's late at night Istanbul but if it's late at night in Istanbul possibly I can.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just a note that of course the deadline to actually submit content is Monday at 1800 UTC. So if, you know, if we want to submit something and use the template and, you know, I'm happy to try and help with that. It would need to be in before that deadline.

Chuck Gomes: Well let me throw an idea out, okay? Well first of all I'd love it if anybody has any more thoughts on what we've talked about today, if you would communicate them on our little list.

And then but I will try to do tomorrow - I need it not too late tomorrow if possible, but I will try to do tomorrow is write something up and send it around to the list that you can comment on because I would like to give something in terms of where we're at. It's going to have to be draft. But I think it would be helpful if we were able to involve some broader discussion on what we're thinking about in terms of escalation.

Now let me ask you this real quickly, does anybody think that what we have on the table right now is so far off base that we don't even want to communicate it?

Marika Konings: Chuck to note that Staffan has his hand up but it was already up before you raised your question so it may be in relation to something else.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Is this - if he wants to jump in he can.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, Staffan here. Thank you. I have a couple of considerations. One is about timing and one is about the list. I believe the best thing that we can contribute within this case is an analysis comparing - we actually have this kind of escalation, the difference between the incident management and problem management on the one hand.

We will have a - some kind of idea so how to escalate coming from the ETA, for example, from Paul Kane's list. So what we could do is actually - I could try (unintelligible) Monday get together a comparison of the two ways of doing escalations, just a theoretical approach putting them side by side maybe. And that would be helpful I guess for the Istanbul discussions.

So we could pull out a paper and say, hey, this is their analysis. I think that's the best because much of this is really dependent on what is getting on in CSC and also in sub team A, B and C actually so just analysis in itself I think is the best way forward here.

I could contribute Monday to this group. Tomorrow I'm actually booked five hours tomorrow so I can't take more. So - but Monday I could contribute to this.

Chuck Gomes: So let me make a suggestion there, Staffan. Thanks for that. Can anybody else make the call on Monday? We can't do it late, it has to be fairly early so that we can get it turned in on time. But I think it'd be helpful, Staffan, if you and I

and anybody else who's available got on a call on Monday just to finalize what we're going to put forward.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Chuck, this is Marika. I'm happy to join that call as well. I can step out of the CCWG meetings.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, so why don't you do a Doodle poll for those who can make it. And it's going to be draft. It's going to be, you know, with lots of qualifications. And I'm perfectly fine with what Staffan is suggesting in terms of some - doing an analysis of some comparative things. Let's do that on a call on Monday.

And, Staffan, if you want to prepare something even before the call that would facilitate that that would be great. Okay?

Marika Konings: And, Chuck, this is Marika. Just to clarify so that would basically be a number of times before 1800 UTC, right, because the idea still that that would be submitted...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, exactly.

Marika Konings: Yeah, okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, give us enough time so we can meet the deadline, okay? It may be early for me but it won't be the first time.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay. Thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Hey, thanks everybody. And I'm sorry for the interruptions at the end of the call on my part so have grandparent duty so - and my wife and I have different grandparent duties so. All right, have a good weekend, everybody. I'll see some of you in Istanbul next week.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Bye, Chuck. Bye.

((Crosstalk))

END