

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
March 23, 2015
7:00 am CT**

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. This is Chuck Gomes and this is a Design Team M - our third meeting. This is the 23rd of March 2015 and we have Staffan Jonson and myself on the call along with Berry Cobb, and Marika is at least on listen audio if I understand correctly.

Hopefully she's trying to get in so she can join us. So she's going to try - still trying to get in. Notice on the Adobe screen that we have the same outline of escalation steps that we had going into our last meeting.

And so it doesn't include the changes that we talked about in that meeting. We'll talk about them - that in this meeting now. I think we have just one main agenda item for this call, although it's perfectly okay to talk about some other things that anyone brings up, and that is to finalize what we want to deliver to the full CWG today before the deadline in terms of draft escalation steps for discussion in Istanbul later in the week.

Let me pause there. Anything anyone else thinks we need to cover on this call today? Okay, not seeing or hearing anyone thank you for doing the live editing there.

I assume that's Berry doing that. And so we - now I guess my first question on the document is are we okay with the basic structure for now, understanding that it may change as we go further, in other words showing the two divisions of the escalation steps, one for incident management, one for problem management.

Any questions or comments on that? Go ahead Staffan. And by the way Staffan I don't even - you're welcome to raise your hand but because there's so few of us feel free to just speak up.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Yes I just noticed. So thank you. Yes the - it's a good starting point, this - a structure for further discussions. I have no idea actually how this will be received yet since we haven't drilled into it too deeply yet.

But there's a proposal at the table and that's the important thing I think before the Istanbul meeting, because the worst-case scenario would be we had nothing to put forward.

And similar as we have been doing in Design Team C we tried to push something forward, which is quite in consensus just to have a starting point. So we'll hit the ground running as the metaphor is and this is a similar advantage to do this for this paper so I think it's good - a good start. I don't know what reactions will be though. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. And that's okay. This is Chuck. That's okay. I think that we don't know what the reactions will be. If we just get some really useful feedback even if it's highly critical I think that'll be helpful.

And it's not as if we're trying to sell something but we want enough feedback so that when we leave Istanbul we can quickly move to a more complete document.

Now in the first category, the Incident Management, in parens there I think it's okay to - I'm - I personally think it's okay to have individual Registry issue there, but we'd probably need more than that to deal with Avri's concern.

And I think she gave some good examples of where somebody - where a security issue or a RSAC member finds something, et cetera. So I'm not sure how to cover that but I don't think we should leave it at just an individual Registry issue.

And she - it looks like Marika has an update on that once she's on. Now I see your mic is muted. Marika are you in yet? Guess she'll speak up. Well apparently not in yet but - okay so she can't use AC audio because of the noise there.

She's still trying to get in on the phone so we'll give her a chance. Kind of hard to keep going. Let me switch subjects while we wait for Marika to get in. Hopefully she will be able to get in quickly. So now...

Marika Konings: Hi Chuck. It's Avri and Marika here. We made it.

Chuck Gomes: Oh good. Welcome to both of you. Okay so were both of you able to hear what we talked about so far, which has been very little but...?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. More or less. And I just have a...

Chuck Gomes: Okay you - go ahead please. You said you had an update in the chat.

Marika Konings: Yes and an update because that is one of the action items to follow up with my colleagues to determine whether the email address - whether that's, you know, only accessible to direct customers or whether anyone that has an issue can raise it there.

And they confirmed that basically they just look at the merits of the issue, so anyone can use that email address and, you know, submit any issue they may have although of course, you know, it needs to be noted as well that they would only be able to deal with the actual issues if they're within the remit of IANA and other issues are, you know, would be either redirected to the relevant departments within ICANN or, you know, if it's not an ICANN issue it may be directed somewhere else.

So that is something that is currently already in place, although I think they did note as well that that channel today has actually been used quite a few times. So...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...you know, one hand that may be a sign that everything is really working very well or it may be a sign of - that people don't know how to find the email address but it's a - that channel can be used by anyone that has an issue.

I also had a look through the use cases that Avri sent and I think on a couple of those - I think for example the first one deals with, you know, not having a correct address.

That is probably a contract enforcement issue so it would be compliance for the gTLD side. If I understand it I think on the ccTLD side there's actually no policy in place so there's nothing - apart from asking very nicely I'm not really sure if that's even something that, you know, we could formally escalate although again it's kind of putting the message across.

And I think on some of the other ones as well there were, you know, important issues but, you know, probably ones that will be redirected if they would end up on IANA's staff plate.

I also asked them I think about, you know, what escalation mechanisms do people have if, you know, they're not happy with the feedback they receive from IANA or they believe that, you know, the issue is not being addressed.

And as far as I understand it I don't think there's anything formally in place and, you know, people may have used different channels. You know, some people will go directly to the bosses.

They may go to the CEO or to the Board so there are ways in which people can, you know, get their issues heard, you know, in addition to the formal mechanism of the ombudsman.

But there's no - nothing formally at least as far as I understand in place that would currently provide a kind of escalation. I've sent an email. You know, IANA did respond but either, you know, I didn't like the response or I don't agree with the response or they actually didn't do what they said they were going to do.

You know, what is my next option apart from indeed the ombudsman, which I think is also flagged on the Web site as a potential mechanism? And just to know that Avri is raising her hand here and...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Yes this is Avri. The question I had - and I kind of understood in that first instance that it probably would go to compliance and then compliance would need to talk to someone.

But it still could be - if for some reason it wasn't getting registered how does compliance then deal with IANA? Becomes - a question is if - or - so IANA gets the thing; goes back to compliance.

Compliance deals with it or doesn't deal with it but whoever complained went first to IANA, so how does that whole triangle of things - and that's what I mean.

There still needed to be some kind of escalation. And even in the case of compliance, let's say compliance does get a direction and for some reason IANA doesn't update it correctly or updates it incorrectly because we've gotten into IDNs and the issue gets more confusing as time gets - goes on.

Where does compliance go? Especially if we achieve some sort of separation how does compliance actually escalate an issue with IANA if it needs to? So...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Avri and thanks Marika. Before I jump over to you Marika I have a question. Does compliance only apply to gTLDs because gTLDs have

contracts so there's something to - that compliance can base their resolution on but what about ccTLDs?

Marika Konings: Yes and this is Marika. I - and I think you are correct there. I think compliance only enforces, you know, the contracts that ICANN has or with, you know, gTLD Registries and ICANN accredited Registrars.

So, you know, just maybe first of all to Avri's question my assumption - and again I'm not a compliance expert. My assumption would be that if an issue is received by IANA that is a compliance issue they would basically tell that person, "You need to go and follow this process," so - which is opening a ticket and that, you know, has a specific escalation path associated with it.

I don't think that they would do it for that person keeping them abreast, so I think they basically would send them to the different channel. For ccTLDs - and again, I mean, Staffan is probably a better person to comment there.

But my understand then is that it's a, you know, a ccTLD Registry issue that probably needs to be addressed at the local level because indeed there's - as far as I understand there's no way that ICANN can enforce any kind of policies or - unless there's kind of agreements in place.

But I'm not aware of any of those so it would really be, you know, IANA would be able to deal with issues that IANA is responsible for, but I don't think they can enforce things on parties that we don't have agreements with or that are not set in policy. But again I'm happy to defer to Staffan to confirm or deny that.

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: So a question. Just a second Staffan. Just a...

Staffan Jonson: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: So is this something that we ought to contact Design Team B about or are they even looking at issues like this?

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: This is Marika. And my understanding is that at this stage the only thing that Design Team B is doing is to ask the question whether there should be an - or should be an independent appeal mechanism.

I don't think they're at this stage yet. You know, I think they're first waiting to see what the answer is before they would actually define what it would look like.

But even then my understanding has been, and again I'm happy to be corrected there, that it relates more to where the decisions are being taken or steps are being made that they believe are not - conform to policies.

So again that's more of an I think, you know, escalation mechanisms at the end of the day where you can launch an appeal. But my assumption would be that for some of those issues they would probably first go as well through some of the normal escalation steps before resolving to an independent appeal mechanism.

But again that's I think very ccTLD specific so would rather someone from the ccTLD world answer on that.

Chuck Gomes: Staffan, why don't you jump in please?

Staffan Jonson: Yes please. Yes I'd like to confirm Marika's picture that since most ccTLD relations with IANA predate ICANN - almost predate IANA in itself so there are no - in very few cases formal relation to IANA or ICANN.

I think I've heard by hearsay but I - I'm not sure about that number but about seven ccTLD have a more or less written agreement with IANA or ICANN. And as I see for example we have a letter of mutual recognition with ICANN saying, "We know you're live," but there's no formal agreement.

But - so in most cases just ad hoc pairing actually that binds the CC land together so - and that is the initial process for actually setting together the Internet.

So - and this is of course key for some ccTLDs, especially the ones that are relying or dependent on this specific relation to IANA rather than to ICANN. And this is what makes the escalation process both sensitive and complicated, not forgetting that in some cases ccTLDs are also part of the public agency that is a government.

So in some case countries believe that the ccTLDs are part of a national property actually, and this is of course in conflict with what other people think.

But this is also yet another reason why this is becoming so complicated and why it's so sensitive in CC land, so that's a short version I think.

Chuck Gomes: No. Thanks. So that's good. And so we're all on the same page with that. This is Chuck speaking again. And so Marika or Berry, if one of you could - in the

few formal agreements that CCs have I guess one of the things that would be helpful if you would check is to see if they require - they have terms to require updating of the root zone information on a regular basis.

And we don't need to do that on this call but that's something - but regardless we're going to have to have a placeholder for most ccTLDs where that's - how that would happen we'll have to deal with later and get input from the ccTLD operators in that regard.

Now - so - but for gTLDs the compliance route and - makes sense from my understanding of our contract. So - and then we'll - Avri will have to of course deal with, "Okay what happens if it doesn't - if IANA doesn't do it?" and so forth.

She raised a good question there. So one more question before we start getting into some of the details here, backing up to the update that I think Marika gave and then going back to some of the use cases that Avri submitted since our last meeting.

And that is in the case of an emergency, like for example if an RSAC operator discovers something terribly wrong, I know they can use the emergency number.

Could anyone else in the community use the emergency number? I'm not talking about the regular customer service number. Do we know the answer to that? Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. My understanding is that the number is only intended for direct customers but I would, you know, and again this is me personally speaking.

I would seriously doubt that they would, you know, hang up the phone if someone calls and says, you know, "This TLD has gone off the Internet." So, you know, in principle it is for direct customers but my assumption is if indeed something is flagged, that it is a real emergency, that that will not be ignored just because the person calling is not a direct customer. But again I don't...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I think -- this is Chuck -- they would have to have some means though of validating who the - who was making the call. You don't react to an emergency just from anyone so...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Right. But - this is Marika. So my understanding is is that the phone number is not, you know, publicly posted as such and that, you know, basically what happens I think is that the call is kind of rerouted to the, you know, staff members on duty.

So there's a kind of, you know, everyone holds the phone for a day or I don't know how they do that but assuming then the person picking up the phone will be able to ask the questions of, you know, indeed where you're calling from.

You know, and I guess - again because usually they're dealing with direct customers they will know who they're speaking to. And again, you know, I presume a staff member wouldn't ask them something that they first haven't verified that there's actually an issue.

I think no one would suddenly start taking things down if they haven't independently verified that indeed something is going on because it's - indeed they're speaking to qualified staff.

It's not I think a - as I understand it it's not a call center where people have authority to just start doing things left, right and center and could indeed have a prank caller coming up with a prank scenario and then as a result, you know, having things pulled from the root zone for example. I don't think that's a very likely scenario.

Chuck Gomes: Okay before we - this is Chuck again. Thanks Marika. Before we get into modifying the document that we're going to present to the CWG this week or today, I'd like to go back to a question I raised.

In the Incident Management section and - we have right there in parentheses right now individual Registry issue. And Avri of course in our last meeting was the one that raised the issue that it might not only be an individual Registry issue.

It might - and she gave some use cases since then on that. How should - I think it's okay to include in parentheses individual Registry issue. But should we put comma other issue raised by someone else, or anybody have any thoughts on that or should we just not show individual Registry issue there? Thoughts on that?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I obviously think we should include some reference to others. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: What would you say? How would you word that Avri because I think you're right?

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Others with relevant issues.

Chuck Gomes: Or other relevant issues? Is that what you said?

Avri Doria: Or others with relevant issues.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Staffan Jonson: Okay Staffan here.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think the one indeed comes in the title and then I think it's in the Number 1 where you have TLD Registry operator or...

Avri Doria: As I was saying or others with relevant issues.

Marika Konings: Yes with relevant issues and maybe that way you cover indeed that it's - I think the assumption is that it will mainly be TLD Registry operators.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: So - and if you leave it open for others that may have relevant issues.

Chuck Gomes: So we would...

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Let's get some wording in that. So TLD Registry operator or what? Or others that have...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: That currently have - and I don't know if you see it in Adobe Connect room because I'm trying to type along. So what I currently have is...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Marika Konings: ...TLD Registry operator or others with relevant issue - issues escalate a service problem to the IANA directly. I think we need commas.

Chuck Gomes: Is everybody...?

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Anybody not okay with that?

Staffan Jonson: Yes Staffan here. I would like to prefer a different solution actually because this is what was discussed in Frankfurt as well, the idea of separate the CSC from the MRT, separating technical supervision on one hand and the substantive actions on the other hand from a totally different body or function.

And I feel that it is key to this solution that we don't put all the mandates, all the eggs in the same basket in the CSC, but that we need to separate operational functions from whatever might become infected by all kinds of other interests like most of policy or et cetera.

So I would like to prefer a very narrowly defined CSC organization that just handle technical operations, and then with some breaks built into it or a more multistakeholder process that actually tells what the CSC is allowed to do or not do.

So I would prefer a separation because once we open up the box of any other interest then we put all the stakes - we put all the interest to capture this organization within the same box, and that is what is by the Frankfurt idea supposed to be separated just so there's no incentive to capture the CSC box. So that's my views.

Chuck Gomes: Staffan this is Chuck. I don't think we're involving the CSC yet so - and that comes in if additional escalation is needed. So what we're talking about right now is I think what the Design Team C was talking about and it's kind of internal escalation with IANA and it hasn't even gone to the CSC yet.

Staffan Jonson: Okay sir.

Chuck Gomes: Does that make sense?

Staffan Jonson: Okay. Yes it makes sense and - but if we do have the separation of a CSC and MRT then that process would be quite unproblematic in itself. It would be a yes or no answer.

I believe there's - is something wrong with IANA functions? Yes or no? So the - I'm not sure that is - if we include all kinds of issues already at this level then it might become very complicated and then we put all the same - all the eggs in the same basket anyhow. So I fear that that solution would complicate things more than necessary.

Chuck Gomes: What solution?

Staffan Jonson: The solution of having all kinds of issues allowed even before addressing the CSC. So I believe that the CSC should be involved in a very early stage almost at the same time as the first complaint comes up, and then you might add all the other issues that are relevant so again just very functional operations with the CSC and the operator of course. I still think that that's the important thing...

Chuck Gomes: So...

Staffan Jonson: ...to not make...

Chuck Gomes: Okay I - I'm missing something. This is Chuck. So...

Avri Doria: Yes and me too.

Chuck Gomes: ...how would you suggest that the use cases that Avri communicated I think over the weekend be dealt with if they're not - if there's not an avenue to report those before you...

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...get to the CSC?

Staffan Jonson: Okay so then I have to back off a bit. Sorry about that because I had to look at them better in that case so sorry. I'll back up.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. I actually made a suggestion in Point 1 that may address Staffan's concern to a certain extent because it basically says, "TLD Registry operator or others with relevant IANA operational issue escalates a service problem to the IANA directly," so that it really makes clear that, you know, the issues that are expected to be dealt with as part of this escalation is related to IANA operational issues.

However if any other issues come in, you know, those will get redirected as appropriate or, you know, feedback provided as to why it's not a relevant IANA issue.

But hopefully maybe this addition will at least, you know, make sure that people understand that this is really intended for mainly direct customers, for anyone else that has noticed a, you know, operational issue that, you know, needs to be addressed that they can flag that as well.

Avri Doria: And this is Avri. The thing I'd like to add is that we can't block off all reporting of IANA issues saying, "They either go through CSC or there's no place else for them to go."

So if the CSC is going to only concern itself with technical operational issues that's fine and, you know, I have no disagreement with that. But if they're going to be that exclusive then there has to be another path for other issues to be dealt with. Thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Agreed. Agreed.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks Staffan. That's what I was looking for to see if that makes sense to you. Okay so I think we're together now. Now what I want to do real

quickly and I don't want to - I want to make this happen within the hour so I'm going to keep pressing ahead.

But in listening to the Design Team C recording and looking at the Adobe and so forth over the weekend, they emphasize the process that Kurt Pritz had suggested and that I sent around to this last week, which basically is you start off using the regular I think customer service channel and then it's escalated to the IANA manager, to Elise in this case, and then it goes to the Head of GDD and then it goes to the Board.

So in other words it would go from - if we use current personnel right now it would go to Elise and then Akram and then to the Board. Now we - one thing we could do and I'm not necessarily advocating this, but underneath Number 1 on the outline right now we could put those three steps and I'm not saying we need all three of - all of those three steps.

But if we're trying to coordinate with what they're doing is that helpful? And let me be quiet and let the rest of you react.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. I've got a question in terms - or rather a comment. That works really fine as long as we're staying in the fully integrated, you know, one organization model that we've got now.

If we deviate from that model at all then that escalation process no longer works. So the Pritz model there is really only a model for a pure internal solution.

If we have anything other than a pure internal solution then GDD or Fadi may not have anything to do with it in that direct line of responsibility.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. No. Absolutely correctly. Staffan go ahead.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Yes I know that in CC land we're a bit divided in this but it will be contested as soon as you mention ICANN for some ccTLDs. So some ccTLDs argue that this is solely a relation between Registry operator and IANA and no one else.

So the Kurt Pritz proposal of course raises issues for several CCs. That is the case already today so it will be controversial if we put down the steps. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Just a question for you. Did - I don't think the Design Team C talked about that concern. At least I didn't hear it I don't think on the...

Staffan Jonson: No.

Chuck Gomes: ...on your last call. So how do you guys think we ought to - should we just leave this as we have there in Number 1? I think it would be helpful if we at least put underneath there the customer service number - the IANA customer service number is the first line of attack. Is that right?

Staffan Jonson: Staffan here. Yes I think it might be a good idea to actually outline the potential directions of things. So if you put the Kurt Pritz idea out you might also put a little deviated course.

We're not - and not including ICANN Board as the final solution so we might call it a placeholder so something for development. But the most constructive thing we can do when there is no consensus in things is actually outlining two potential ways forward and not three and four potential ways but just two ways.

So yes it's a good idea to outline it but it will be controversial and we will - and therefore we could have several ways forward. And just to go back to your question, no we didn't discuss this at the CC at the last meeting.

You're quite right but I know that several CCs have views on this or issue with this.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Staffan. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I'm just trying to get a clarification because when you talk about that escalation model is it the individual complainant that can then, you know, first go to the CSC or first to the manager and then to, you know, Fadi then to the Board?

Or is the idea that the - that if the CSC is in place that they would basically take then that role on of escalating? So the CSC would first go, you know, to the manager of IANA and raise the issue.

If they believe the manager of IANA is not responding appropriately they would take it up with Fadi. If Fadi doesn't, you know, is that what is in feud with that or is it really the individual that will be going through the, you know, different paths?

Chuck Gomes: Okay so this is Chuck again and first of all I don't think we're at the CSC yet. We're - the first escalation step there in my opinion, number one, doesn't involve the CSC except that - until you get to Step 2 where they just get a record of what transpired in the customer service process.

Staffan Jonson: Okay. Staffan here. What is redline to some is that ICANN is involved in this decision regarding TLD - ccTLD delegation at all in the first place. So that is the - what is contested so to say that since relations between some TLD operators and IANA predate ICANN, the issue is that ICANN should have anything to say in this relation so that is the common issue with this aspect. I hope that's...

Chuck Gomes: Okay so we have - we're going to have to differentiate between ccTLDs and gTLDs, okay.

Staffan Jonson: I believe so. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And we also have to eventually word this in such a way that it's not ICANN dependent, okay.

Staffan Jonson: Yes. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: But the reality of the matter is when we - the plan right now when the transition happens is that ICANN will be the IANA operator at first. At the same time we need to word our - what we present in such a way that it could easily be transferred to another organization if and when that would ever happen.

Staffan Jonson: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: So in Number 1 - let's try and narrow down what we're going to put underneath Number 1. I think the - regardless if there's an issue, anybody I think, CC or G or a third party, could call the customer service number. Isn't that Substep 1 under Number 1? Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I think - and maybe just to kind of repeat what you wanted under A. But the one thing I wanted to add is now that I understand better what, you know, the Kurt Pritz model proposed as well as some of the concerns that Staffan has raised, couldn't that just be an optional escalation passed. And they could say like that the person raising the issues would choose. So they could - if they believe IANA hasn't you know, responded appropriately escalate this issue by going to the manager, the president, the board. But basically making clear that's an option people can use if they want to. If, for example need a CPT (unintelligible) registry doesn't want to involve ICANN in this conversation they can just skip that step. And go straight to the (CSC) to get them involved or the ombudsmen.

Maybe that's a way of getting around that and saying "look at this. It is a path that is available if people want to use it. But if not people shouldn't feel forced either to go through that step if they believe that is not in line with how they view the relationship between them as a party and ICANN.

Chuck Gomes: Right. But - and I understand that this is not really an (escalate). And I understand the first step that I'm talking about really isn't escalation. But we want them to go it first. Don't we want the first thing to happen is to call the customer service number?

Marika Konings: No. The customer service number is an emergency number. So you mean contacting the customer service email address.

Chuck Gomes: No. I don't think so. Unless I misunderstood something. There's two numbers. There's a customer service number and an emergency number.

Marika Konings: I thought the first (number) was just an email address. But I...

Chuck Gomes: Oh. Is that all it is? It's just an email address. I mean that's okay. Then that would be the first step.

Marika Konings: I believe so. But I can double check. But I think on the page you sent me for the call I think it's an email explanation.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That's all right. But I think that's where we want them to start. Right? Because that'll set the stage. Berry go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thanks Chuck. I think we need to be very precise about which numbers we're talking about. So IANA has their set of numbers which I think is an email address that's only communicated online. There is a phone number for IANA that is communicated to the direct customers. And then there's that. And then the use of a customer service phone number.

There is a whole another universe of a front-end for customer service for ICANN. That's in the process of being even more matured that is separate from ICANN contractual compliance. And that entry path by which you submit complaints to. So there are three maybe even four this distinct entry route into ICANN. One of them IANA as an email address and phone number. There is an overall customer service number for anybody to contact ICANN that again is in the works of being matured.

Then you have contractual compliance that I believe is only through the Web site and submitting a complaint ticket. Again, I don't believe they have a hotline or a phone number to answer calls. And there may be a fourth entry. But I'm not so sure about - I know that one.

Chuck Gomes: So Berry should we put a Step B? Calling the customer service line which is then under development. It sound like.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I mean to me I think we need to be very specific that you know (CSC) is really only dealing with IANA issues. So you know I think 90% of what we're really talking about here is entry point through IANA. Either through the phone number or through the email address.

There is these other 10 maybe 15 percent. I don't really want to put a percentage on it. But that have to deal with the use cases that Avri provided. And it seems unless it's truly an emergency it seems to me all of those should either - should find some sort of entry point other than IANA. Only to the fact that you know if it does get escalated in a way. And it's truly an emergency issue. Or truly an IANA issue on the back end. That there is that connectivity back to IANA.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. But all we're dealing with is IANA issues in the escalation procedure. So I'm a little bit confused. Obviously somebody could call in on something that's not IANA related. But that's like I forget who said that earlier that will be redirected. Right? If they do.

So is the then call customer service? Again we're not the (CSC) yet.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. And this is where I kind of am so concerned that we're apt to call to something that doesn't currently exist. Are we saying there should be a call - a number that people can call? Anyone to raise issues. Or...

Chuck Gomes: Well if they don't get an email response they need to do something. Right?

Marika Konings: Right. So you're basically saying that there's a next escalation. If no response is received from the customer service email address.

Chuck Gomes: I think so. I mean that's what I'm thinking.

Marika Konings: Right. And sorry...

Chuck Gomes: And whether they exist now or not it - we can propose that.

Marika Konings: Right.

Avri Doria: So for as long as it's still part of ICANN which maybe be forever or may not then there's the ICANN customer service to go to. If in deed there is a split at some point whether it has a subsidiary area or as something different. Then by implication it would mean that IANA would need its own customer service access point.

Chuck Gomes: I think so Avri. I mean whether isn't ICANN or not if for some reason it was separated from ICANN. I think we would want the IANA service provider to have a customer service email address and phone number.

Avri Doria: I'm comfortable with that.

Chuck Gomes: So now moving ahead and we're not going to be able to refine this perfectly I think everybody understand that. But we need to get a deliverable document. And so the - I mean do we need to say anything else under Number One? That's kind of the preliminary step. That's the internal escalation. Do we want to say anything about the ICANN internal escalation steps that the Design Team C talks about? That (Curt) proposed. Or do we just leave that alone?

Avri Doria: Leave it alone.

Chuck Gomes: We can talk about it if they bring that up in Istanbul. Anybody not comfortable with that? Okay. So let's quick - let's go to Step Two then. The - and I am assuming anything we deliver will include some end-to-end indenting so that the A's and B's are indented et cetera.

So if resolution at that first level is unsatisfactory then we have right now A reports to (CSC). That's for record only. So that the (CSC) has the history. And then escalates to the ombudsmen. Is that okay still? Any problems with that? Okay.

Then - Number Three. Ombudsmen reports results to the operator and (CSC). If that's a failure we go to four. And then that's where the (CSC) gets involved. Are we okay to there?

Avri Doria: I have an issue at the (unintelligible). This is Avri. I think that that's where the ombudsmen has a certain amount of discretion in terms of for example if it's not. Remembering that we want to keep the (CSC) pure technical you know operational. And nothing that smacks of policy in any way.

If the ombudsmen in going through their mediations steps decide that this is not a pure technical. Then the ombudsmen can have discretion to send this off to either (MRT) or you know dispute resolution. Or whatever other mechanisms exist. That giving the ombudsmen a sort of ability to not only mediate. But to make sure that it continues on the right path after failure is perhaps one way with dealing with the ambiguity of "is it technical?" Well we may not know the full depths of whether it's a technical issue until after we've gone down the road a bit.

And if it's not then let the ombudsmen send it to the right place. To the you know the - what is it? The independent appeal. The (IAP). Thank you. Sending it to the (IAP) or what have you. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: So parenthetical maybe after Two B could address the flexibility that the ombudsmen have - has. Marika. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I had actually as in Three. I put ombudsmen reports results to operator and (CSC) with question to redirect reports applicable and to see if issue is not limited to IANA operational issues.

((Crosstalk) :

Woman: Yes. Give it a "thumbs up. Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. (Kate) I can't see that can I?

Woman: That's right. We're in a room together so we have those different communication (paths).

Chuck Gomes: It's early for me. I was a little slow. Okay. All right. So that's fine there. Okay Marika?

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. I'm just noting the phones (competent to chat). I don't know if we need to make clear that you know there's the option for someone to go to the ombudsman. But if they don't want to they can go straight to the (CSC). If indeed there are people that don't feel comfortable using the ombudsmen. They can see it as part of ICANN's structure. If that's something we need to make more explicit. That (basically) to B is optional. And that someone can as well report you know to A is required. You always need to

report to the (CSC). But you have optional option to go to the ombudsmen.
And I like to go you know basically to Four A.

Chuck Gomes: So why do we want to give them that option unless it's an emergency?

Avri Doria: Because they might be a (ccTLD) that hates all things ICANN. And ombudsmen is ICANN.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Okay. All right. You got me there. Okay. So that's optional. Okay. Go ahead.

Staffan Jonson: Sorry. This is a minor thing. But still it's - it will be contested if it's not noted. So I might as well say make a point of it right now. It's a good solution as well. I'm sorry. Just an issue (order). I had my next meeting at the hour. So I need to drop off quite soon actually. So I just want to let you know that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks. All right. So how can we bring this to closure before you get there? So now we need to have a qualifier I think in Number Four where it says if ombudsmen fails to resolve problems that's assuming it's not redirected. In other words it's based on what we say in Number Three. It may not even - it may be - if it's not redirected. So we just need to add that there. Staffan are you okay for now understanding that we have a lot more work to do? With Steps Four, Five and Six and Seven.

Staffan Jonson: Probably. Let's say probably.

Chuck Gomes: And so it's probably for all of us right? So we got a lot of work to do.

Staffan Jonson: Sure. Yes. Has to be constructed. I hope so.

Chuck Gomes: So and then jumping ahead. And for the rest of you we'll if you've got a few more minutes we can talk about it further. But what about the problem management steps that we list there? Below. Are you okay for now putting those in the front of the broader group in Istanbul?

Staffan Jonson: Staffan here. To me I'm satisfied with it. Because it's a proposal and it specified in a two part detail. And that's a good step. So yes. Why not?

Chuck Gomes: And we'll put some qualifiers at the beginning of this thing saying "it's a work in progress" and we want feedback in terms of the direction we're going. So you're okay. I wanted before you jump off to make sure that we at least had a tentative agreement for those on the call in terms of the basics we're going to present. So thanks for that. Marika. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. The question I had (the issue) to the mention of the mediator. I see that's (a vote) into the management as well as from the problem management. Just wondering. Is there anything specific you have in mind already on who could serve as that mediator? Is it something new that would need to be created? Just trying to see if there's any more detail that we could put into relation to that.

Chuck Gomes: I don't think we have time to put in more detail. That obviously that idea came from the group of registry operators (C's and G's) that put the (Chris) (unintelligible) their proposal forward. That was out of there. One of the questions I had. Over the weekend as I was thinking about this okay. I mean - I'm not sure that all - you know, it might work. It might not. If it's an expensive process to involve a mediator does it even make sense to do it?

But we can talk about that later. And it may come up when we have the broader discussion with the (CWG). But I just don't think we have time to

start talking about the implementation details. If there's support for that as a step as well as other steps that are in here. Then I think we can deal with the implementation afterwards. Understanding that we'd probably have to deal with that before we deliver a proposal to (NTIA). So or eventually the (NTIA). So Staffan.

Staffan Jonson: Staffan her. Sorry. I have to drop off. It's a good start. So let's (say) that. Thank you very much.

Chuck Gomes: And we'll see you in Istanbul.

Staffan Jonson: Istanbul. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Now I want to come back to another point. (Chuck's) speaking again. I think we need to - because ombudsmen is an ICANN institution okay. It seems to me to make the proposal fit all possibilities. Should we say "escalates to ombudsmen or equivalent with a different operator?" Or something like that? I'm not - you see what I'm getting at. In other words, we want our proposal to fit whether it's ICANN or not. Understanding that ICANN would be the first operator or first provider. Is that okay?

Yes. Thanks for fixing it everywhere. But that'll cover the question of what if we change? Do a separation or something. Okay. So but the principal the basic process could I think be transported whether it's an ombudsman or not to a different operator if that every happened. Does that make sense? Any problems with that?

So is the incident management - are the incident management steps okay at this stage to present to the broader group? Anybody have - see any more problems that we want to fix before doing that? Let's look at Step Seven real

quick. The (TLD) Registry Operator may initiate any kind of appeals panel on its own. I personally think that needs to be there. What do you guys think?

So the (CSC) could initiate the (IAP) or an individual registry operator could.

Avri Doria: It's Avri.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: I guess what bothers me about this one at the moment is it really is so based on that proposal. I mean at the moment there's this whole (IFM) notion. And we don't have an (MRT) in here being involved in any of this stuff that might be systematic or go beyond it. So I'm not sure that I'm completely comfortable with it at the moment. Because these things if they're systemic you know then they're definitely larger than the (CSC) in a sense. Or could be.

Chuck Gomes: You think there's going to be an (MRT)?

Avri Doria: I have no idea.

((Crosstalk)):

Avri Doria: But it's still on the drawing you know so and has the (IFM) been defined outside of this (DT)?

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry. Has what?

Avri Doria: Has the (IFM) or whatever we're calling it - the IANA Function Manager been defined outside of this particular small effort?

Chuck Gomes: I don't think so. And that's one of the problems we have.

Avri Doria: Then we shouldn't be creating something new.

Chuck Gomes: Well the - I think it's just another term for the IANA Functions Operator.
Right? That's what I was interpreting it as.

Avri Doria: Right. So should we just use that for now then? Just to avoid confusion. Right.
And if there's an (MRT) then that's who would handle it if there isn't there'll
be some other mechanism.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I think I would use a different term than IANA Functions Manager.
Because that's the new term. That's right. That's a good point.

Avri Doria: Could we just use operator as we have been.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. The IANA Functions up. Just like we've been doing.

Avri Doria: Right. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And we don't need an acronym necessarily for that.

Avri Doria: We have plenty of those already.

Chuck Gomes: That's a good point. And Avri one of the problems we have of course is we
don't know what's going to come out of Design Team C on the (CSC).
Because I think they're dealing with the whole issue of "well, should it just be
registry operators? Should there be liaisons? And you're right. We don't know
at this point on those things. So we're - we're dependent upon what comes out
of some other design teams.

Avri Doria: Oh yes. And some of the issues may go beyond the (CSC). Because when I started thinking about you know what protocols IANA runs. And what revision of a protocol? And which options of the protocols they're using? And the fact that we have no one other than IANA itself or I guess ICANN as IANA deciding which of those are implemented and which aren't. And so those kinds of issues which could be systemic. We could find a fault in the system. Simply because some people have implemented a new (RFC) and IANA hasn't. And vice versa.

So those - and I'm just speculating. So those kind of issues could be far greater than just the (CSC).

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And in fact one of the things I picked up on the listening to the Design Team C call over the weekend was that they're not seeing the (CSC) making decisions beyond the operational and oversight issues. So what I've picked up and unfortunately (Stefano's) not on anymore. Or but Berry you were - I don't know if Marika was. But Berry I think you were on that call.

So I think they're seeing the (CSC) as limited. They're not going to get in - the (CSC's) not going to make it in where they're at now. What I understood. They're not seeing the (CSC) making a decision about separation or something like that. That's got to involve a bigger community. Whether that's an (MRT) or some way where there's public comment. And - or some other thing. We don't need - that's not our scope. But I think they're not seeing the (CSC) go beyond the operational oversight role. Did I get that right Berry?

Go ahead Avri. You can speak. Okay thanks. I see the check marks.

Avri Doria: There's a question whether they have implemented a protocol. Or implemented a protocol correctly. Is that operational or is that policy? And I'm not suggesting we get into that discussion at the moment. But that discussion is ambiguous.

Chuck Gomes: And you say my responses on those. Good. Okay. No. That's absolutely right. And I think we're going to have to do a little more work on that to see how that fits into this process. Or whether it's a - maybe that's even a problem management issue. It almost sounds like a problem management issue to me. But we have to address that. So would it be helpful? I'm going to digress just a little bit here. Would it be helpful to maybe as an attachment to what we do? Put (Aubrey's) use cases and maybe even some of the questions that that generates. In addition to what we submit here. Because they are valid issues. What do you guys? What do you think? Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I'm slightly concerned that the use cases may straddle from the actual conversations. As people may have arguing where it doesn't belong. I wonder if it's more helpful to just prefix this by saying that you know the Draft Team recognize that in addition to you know write clear cut IANA operational issues. There may be also be other issues that currently don't have an obvious home. And you know did Draft Team one make sure that there will be an escalation path also for those issues? And you know may pass those use cases on maybe to ICANN to assess how they're currently being dealt with or what their recommendations are.

Or indeed if there are anybody recommending here that there will be a general kind of phone number where people can call to. Of course, they would need to have to have directions on the way things need to be sent to. But maybe it could be a more kind of general statement instead. I'm just worried that the kind of use cases. That may just become focus of conversation while now I

think we wanted people to focus on the escalation path. Recognizing that there are maybe cases that are left here (unintelligible) that also need to find their place. And they're getting addressed.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I think you're right there. And if you can capture that - a one sentence statement to that effect. That could be made a part of our preface to this. I think that would be good.

Now, can we remove the question mark in Number Seven? Is that Seven? Okay. Thank you. And I'm sorry for going over. But thanks for bearing with me here. Are we okay - are the rest of you okay on the - what we have for the problem management steps for now?

Marika: Yes. Just one question. This is Marika. I saw (Bangdor) in the chat as well. I think we spoke about it last time too. That we now have problem management systemic or critical failure I think. Berry made a point last time as well. Systemic may lead people to think that there's a problem with the system. So I think he was suggesting using another term. I know he's suggesting processes or escalation. I suggested maybe persistence. Just trying to see what people...

Chuck Gomes: I'm okay with changing that. What do you suggest? Persistence? Persistent problems? Persistent.

Avri Doria: I have no problem with keeping systemic. Because the problem may be systemic. It may be a problem with the system. And that is one of the questions that needs to be answered. If there are many problems occurring that seem related then you have to basically check to see if there is a systemic problem. So perhaps you want to soften it by saying "checking to see if there are systemic problems." Or "confirming that there are no systemic problems."

As opposed to indicating that there are. But the point is even if something as perfect as IANA there could be a systemic problem.

Chuck Gomes: How about if we put three things in there? Systemic, critical or persistent failures.

Avri Doria: Right. I would put them the other way. Because systemic is the worst of those. So there's persistent, there's critical and then there's systemic. Critical, persistent, systemic.

Chuck Gomes: That's good. Yes. Okay. We can remove that one...

Avri Doria: Actually critical could be systemic. Critical could be really serious. But just one that's really bad. Systemic is deep, deep, deep.

((Crosstalk) :

Chuck Gomes: Can we all turn to problem management?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just a note that I've added a sentence at the end. Just wanted to read out to you to make sure...

Chuck Gomes: I like it.

Marika Konings: Good. I'll read it (Abbey) because she's not there on the (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marika Konings: I recognize that there may be issues that I'm not clear on IANA operational issues. But maybe IANA related and would need a clear path escalation and

redirection if we reach proposed escalation steps. All right then if somebody asks?

Avri Doria: But what are these? Then I can be called on to start about the effort that's started to collect those and give examples. I don't mind being "put on the spot."

Chuck Gomes: Anything else on problem management before I go back to preface statement? Okay. It seems to me we should have a one or two sentence intro to this that basically starts off probably by saying "this is a work in progress." However we want to word that? And but we would very much like feedback in terms of the directions we're going. We understand that a lot of implementation detail and so forth would have to be added if we go with these steps. And we'll continue to work on that. And I was talking about an intro statement to the whole document. Not just the problem management. Does that make sense to have something like that at the beginning - very beginning of the page?

Woman: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Again can you draft something like that one the (WEEDI). We don't have to draft it on the phone. I'm comfortable with you guys drafting that.

Woman: Okay. I can put something together.

Chuck Gomes: Now what's our deadline for - what's the time deadline today?

Marika Konings: This is Marika 18:00 (UTC).

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So...

Marika Konings: Would you like me to go ahead and put this into the terms of the data language and send that back to you (unintelligible) for review? And leave that one there.

Chuck Gomes: That would be great. Time converting. So 18:00 if 14 so that's 11:00 a.m. for me. Yes. I'll have plenty of time to look at that. I've got a follow-up doctor's appointment this morning that I've got to go to. But that'll be brief I think. So that should be fine for me. And anybody. You can put it to the list. So that anybody else can comment. Let's not make substantial changes to what we've agreed to on this call. But minor things we could fix. Okay.

Marika Konings: And I'll just make the - because I think the only thing I need to do for my side is just update the times that we already had. And I think that the prefix is probably the transmittal notice. You want to send it with to the (CWG). Did I get it right? Did I understand it correctly?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Marika Konings: I can get that to you shortly.

Chuck Gomes: That sound good Avri?

Woman: Avri just stepped out to go back to her other meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. All right. Very good. All right. Hey. I think we've got something that meets our objective and provides good points for discussion to get some direction from the broader group. In terms of our ongoing work. So anything else? Okay. Thanks very much for dropping out of the other meetings. And helping on this. I'll watch for the versions - a draft final version. Then we can finalize that. And Marika you'll be responsible for distributing. Correct?

Marika Konings: Yes. I'm happy to do so. So as soon as you give me the word it fine to go I can send it out.

Chuck Gomes: I'll do that as soon as I can. And so that you'll have it. And sooner probably better than later on that. So we - do you think we need to allow a little bit of time for other people in like (Erik) who's not on this call and Staffan to look at the final version before sending it. I'm okay waiting -a little bit for their input. We probably should wait an hour or so after I respond. Does that make sense? Assuming we have an hour.

Marika Konings: Yes. But I said that I'll push it out to the list now. And maybe I can just add in a note to the draft. And if you have any concerns or your questions, respond as soon as possible as we're aiming to get this out to the list...

Chuck Gomes: Why don't you be a little more specific than as soon as possible? Why don't you give them a deadline by at least an hour before - if you want to do it? Whatever works for you logistically? But give them a specific time. I'm going to - if I see it in the next hour plus. I'm going to respond right then.

Marika Konings: Yes. All right. I'll totally give people an hour from when I send it basically.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks. Okay. Thanks all and we'll talk later. Okay.

END