

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
April 10, 2015
8:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recordings are now started. You may proceed.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. This is Chuck Gomes, and this is Design Team M meeting on the 10th of April 2015. We have on the call Marika, Avri and myself, and we're hoping others will join as we get going.

Our goal today is to complete a document to submit to the full CWG today. So we will walk through the issues that were left remaining the other day. It - I think it might be helpful to discuss the comments -- there are two sets of comments that Stephane submitted to our list yesterday -- and make sure were all on the same page in terms of the concerns that were expressed.

I submitted some personal responses to those, and Avri and Marika I'd like your thoughts on those as well. Did both - did either of you not get a chance to look at those?

Avri Doria: Yes, I did not take a chance to look at those. I'm looking at them now.

Chuck Gomes: Okay great. That's great, because they're very significant in terms of what we need to do in this call, so. Let me just allow a little bit of time for you to do that, Avri. And Marika...

Avri Doria: That's okay.

Chuck Gomes: Is that okay? All right, okay. Well...

Avri Doria: Yes, yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...let me see which one I want to - I guess I'll start with, you know, obviously they're concerned about the CSC role in the escalation process.

Avri Doria: I have a question on that one.

Chuck Gomes: Please, and I don't...

Avri Doria: The...

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes I didn't do the hand thing, sorry. They're complaining about the customer service complaint process being open to other people. Even if they want the CSC to be a very exclusive little club that does as little as possible -- you can tell I'm not happy with what I'm hearing from CSC -- but anyhow, I don't see why that would mean that that whole process would be accessible only to them.

Chuck Gomes: Well, you know, this is Chuck. This is Chuck. I'll comment on that but Marika had her hand up, so let me go to Marika and then I'll share my comment on that. Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So the question I had in relation to Stephane's responses is that I was wondering if that actually factored in, you know, the proposed change that we had made to, you know, accommodate the concern he shared on the last call to not make it too accessible, you know, directly accessible for non-direct customers.

So I'm, you know, I'm wondering if the concerns are still the same if we make clear that the idea that anyone can indeed submit a complaint to, you know, the e-mail address and go through those first steps of that process, but the CSC, you know, for the step two that that could only be initiated by direct customers or, you know, through liaisons on the group or the ombudsmen, you know, I guess could bring something to the CSC as well, based on the issues that are raised by non-direct customers.

So I don't know - any again, to me it wasn't clear whether that was factored in and they still object to, you know, the role for the CSC or whether that wasn't, you know, conveyed yet to them that, you know, this group has made that accommodation to address that concern.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. Good - very good point. And unfortunately Stephane's not on the call to answer that question for us. But another observation is -- and by the way, this is Chuck speaking -- another observation is that I didn't think he was very explicit on whether they still - he still wanted the change from anyone to direct customers. He didn't address it explicitly.

The implication is they - he may still want that, but my sense -- and this is what I was going to say in response to what you said, Avri -- in our previous call, I didn't detect anyone else that supported that approach. And for me personally, I don't think it can fly.

You know, I mean it's a process that's available right now that anyone can issue a complaint via an e-mail and for us to change - it's one thing to take the CEO out of the loop, in my mind it's totally other thing to now all of a sudden not allow anyone to file a complaint if they see something that they think is wrong. And I don't think it's been a problem.

And I get their concern about it being, you know, it being overloaded with complaints, but it doesn't get to the CSC until the IANA team has gone through several steps of trying to get it resolved. So I really don't think it's a high risk or even a medium risk of the volume being too much, but that's my opinion.

I think even if Stephane was on the call and still took a position that he - that they wanted it to be direct customers, I couldn't support that. And my sense from the whole group, which is much smaller on this call, felt the same way, so. Avri, please.

Avri Doria: Yes I think that that hopefully that is the sort of line that the group can take on it, especially since, as Marika said, we did, you know - but we're talking about zero cases at the moment, right? We're talking about something historically that has not happened, that it's gone beyond IANA to something greater. So them being overloaded seems like, I don't know, not too big a fear. So, you know, I think it's important to remember we're talking about zero cases.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Thanks, Avri. And I think you're right on that. And so my recommendation is, for handling this, if both of you agree, is that we leave it as anyone and that we either put a footnote or we explain it in our transmittal message that there was a suggestion to change this back to direct customers but that most people in the group felt like that would be reversing an existing process that's not problematic, hasn't been problematic historically, and so just handle it like that.

Does that - go ahead, Avri. You're on mute, Avri, if you - oh, okay that was an old hand, okay.

Avri Doria: That was accidental, sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Okay no problem. So is that approach okay? I mean - and Marika's really good at drafting explanations of things. I don't think we need to do that on the fly here, although she'd probably like to so that's she's ready to send this out at the end of the meeting but - and if you want to that's fine. I just didn't want to put you on the spot for that, Marika, on the live call, unless you want to be on the spot there. So is that approach...?

Avri Doria: I..

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes, no I think part of the reason that we had the live doc up was so that it could get edited, but of course if Marika didn't want to. But I thought that's why she brought it up, but then I see she has her hand up.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So I'm happy, you know, right after this call to also prepare a transmittal note, and I can send that to, you know, design team and list before sending it the groups so you have a chance to look at that, you know, try to convey that there are some issues that the group, you know, did discuss and make changes as a result, you know, from the earlier draft I think explaining maybe as well that - and that's something I wanted to add there as well.

So step two would be reserved for direct customers, is that right? So that to accommodate the concern that, you know, CSC doesn't get overloaded...

Chuck Gomes: Yes exactly. Yes. It was...

Marika Konings: So I explain that in the transmittal note and send it to the design team before I send them to the group.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And this I Chuck again. And let's give a specific time response for people on the team to respond. Maybe we give - is four hours okay, maybe, from the time you send that out? And after that we go ahead and finalize it and sending it to - and send it to the full CWG. Is that all right? Any problems with that?

And the reason I didn't suggest live editing on this is because I think it's a little lengthier statement that she's got to - probably a full paragraph, maybe more, to explain this adequately, so. Okay. Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: No I was just saying okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Is that all right? Okay good. All right now let's see, let's - so that's the one thing. Now he talks about their - oh let's see, he definitely agrees that they

should be aware of individual complaints. Now let's - he then goes on to talk about the CSC involvement in the dispute resolution process. Now as you saw in my response, I didn't think that they're a full dispute resolution provider. They do need to make some decisions, he's right on that.

So they do need to decide whether further action on the complaint is warranted or not. We've got to have somebody make that decision, and in other words - so I sympathize with him on the mediation part. As you can see in my response, I'm okay with them - with us dropping the step that has the CSC actually trying to mediate, but let's talk about that.

And first, Marika, you had your hand up, so let me let you jump in first.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I'm wondering if we add to the Step B something like if deemed appropriate, the CSC should mediate directly with the IFO, as that might give them, you know, the flexibility because I can imagine in certain cases they may say well yes, we can facilitate a conversation.

And maybe having, you know, our weight behind it will get us to a resolution, but there might be also certain cases where they say look we don't want to go near this one because it's really, you know, too political or there are too many angles that, you know, we don't comfortable in getting involved. We prefer, indeed, to assign or direct them to an external mediator to assist with that.

So maybe that is a way to balance that to say leave it in the discretion of the CSC whether they feel that they could take on that role and mediate or whether they'll just skip that step and go straight to the next one.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, do you have a thought on that, Avri?

Avri Doria: No.

Chuck Gomes: I mean is it better to skip the step? And Marika, if you -- this is Chuck again -- if you would restate what you said at the beginning because I didn't fully get what - how you suggested rewording it to accommodate their concern. Could you repeat that part, just the first part?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I typed it in now as well on the screen. (Unintelligible) I wanted to write if deemed appropriate as the CSC to mediate directly with the IFO.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That might work. I - my guess, and I can only guess, I can't speak for them, that they would be more comfortable with it being eliminated because they're trying to keep it small and so forth. I suspect that the CSC could kind of try to mediate if they wanted to, whether we stated that or now. If they saw an opportunity to work something out. But I can go either way.

If we change it to if deemed appropriate, I think we're going to need again to add a note that the CSC we understand the CSC's concerned about not be a mediator, so we tried to build in some flexibility. The - so I - this is a case where I wish we had more people on the call to help us reach a resolution here.

My inclination is to show some clear responsiveness to them and maybe get a little more flexibility on their part would be to just to remove that step, with the behind-the-scenes understanding that they could actually try and resolve it if they wanted to. They could try and mediate, like you said Marika, without us specifically stating it.

Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. And I think part of this may be covered under A, because it says, you know, CSC is notified my complainant to take action. CSC decides to take action or not. I guess under A that action could be, you know, to get involved. So from that perspective, you know, I don't have any issues in taking out B if you think that, you know, will alleviate some of the concurs, because I think under A they still have sufficient discretion to, you know, directly get involved or not.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Okay. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes I'd actually be inclined to leave it in, partially because if there isn't step that says they can mediate then, you know, to say that behind the scenes they may decide to, but then one could decide that that was an inappropriate thing for them to do. So I think Marika's right. In condition A, they could have just thrown it and never gotten to B. They only get to B when they decided hey, you know, this is something we have to do something about. We're onboard that they deal with the rest of it.

So, you know, I would - so I would be inclined to keep it in, and yes thanks for the change because, you know, who's deeming it appropriate for them to do it. It's they themselves, and so perhaps indicating that explicitly might make a difference.

Chuck Gomes: And as you probably know -- this is Chuck -- I was hoping you'd break the tie, and you did, so thanks. I'm very comfortable with that and I do like the additional change. Should we - I wonder if we should qualify it even a little bit more. If deemed appropriate by the CSC and -- I've got to figure out my wording -- and maybe if deemed appropriate by he CSC with relatively minimal effort, CSC could mediate directly with the IFO.

Now that I'm trying to cushion it a little bit more that we're not looking for them to become a full-blown mediator, but - and I'm not necessarily terribly satisfied with the added words but maybe you guys can help. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes I personally don't think they're needed, because that was be part of the appropriateness measure and determination that they do. They could decide that it was inappropriate because it was hard, you know, or it would take a year, or they didn't have mediation skills. We're not defining the boundary appropriateness.

Chuck Gomes: That's true. So take my comments our, Marika, unless you want to switch them with something else. But go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Maybe to address your concern, maybe it could be if deemed appropriate and feasible, because then the feasible factor you be, you know, are they able to that on, do they have the time, do they have the expertise for it. So maybe that encapsulates then that aspect of the...

Chuck Gomes: Good. I like that and so does Avri. That's good. Now I think again because we know that the CSC has some concerns on this that we either need to put a footnote or a comment in our transmittal e-mail that states that we're aware of the CSC concern and then whatever, you know, you'll do a good job of explaining what we just talked about. So okay.

Let's see, now about involving the mediator, okay, I mean he's absolutely right, some implementation work would have to be done. As you can see in my response, I think some - if this approved by the CWG, that then there needs to be some implementation work done and specific implementation solution provided for that. And of course that's going to get involved in

funding and everything else. So - but I mean there's just no way we're going to deal with that by today.

So I think we probably need to maybe put a parenthetical or a footnote or note, a different kind of a footnote or note, on this one that says if this approved by the full CWG that there needs to be - that implementation work including not only possible mediators but funding of mediation should be done after - should be initiated after approval by the CWG or at some other point but definitely before transition.

Does that make sense? Okay no objections to that. All right. And then D, they have to -- I'm looking at my - what my response -- I kind of already said that I think that, you know, I don't think we're necessarily actually asking the CSC to be a full-blown dispute resolution provider but they do have to make some decisions. And if they don't make them who does? And then we start getting into even more complexity.

So I mean that's my thinking. Do either of you have any suggestion as to who would make the decision if the decisions that do need to be made, because what has to - I mean anytime you're going from one step to another, a decision's going to have to be made as to whether you go to that next step. Now in some cases that can be determined by the actual circumstances, for example if the customer service team can't resolve the complaint first try then it automatically goes to the naming liaison and so on with the other steps.

But there are some cases where actually somebody has to decide is this thing worth pursuing further or not, and so somebody's going to have to make that decision. Who would that be if it's not the CSC, without creating another entity, which I suspect most people are going to be concerned about? Any

thoughts on - I mean are you in agreement with that line of thinking or am I off base on that?

So in this case I suppose it'd be -- thank you, Avri -- in this case I suppose we ought to probably in our transmittal e-mail, but again I guess it could be another note inside the recommendation itself, we need to acknowledge the concern about the CSC being a part of the resolution process but that we came to the conclusion -- of course it's just the three of us but that's all we can do -- we came to the conclusion that someone has to make the decision and it's if not the CSC who would it be and not coming up with a better solution, would the design team M decided to leave it as is.

Unless somebody can come up with a better solution as to who would make the critical decisions there, that's what we're recommending and then we'll let it - it'll have to be dealt with at the CWG level. Is that okay? There's going to be - Marika, there's going to be a lot of notes and writing. Sorry about that.

So I think that covers the one message that -- and probably much of the other one that staff - that Stephane submitted. I'm looking now at my response and his comments. We kind of already talked about the fact that, you know, I really don't think that very many complaints are going to get past - get to step two, but I don't know if we need to comment on that or not.

I am personally not in favor - one approach would be to totally eliminate step two, and I don't see that as an option. I think you've got to, you know, I mean that's the way this - well let me back up, because that's the way it is now. I mean it goes - they go one step further. They go up to the CEO, but if it's not resolved there, it ends. And we could do that, just totally eliminate step two.

Marika, go ahead. Jump in.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I think part of the things that you said now I think - because my assumption is as well that on the Monday and Tuesday meetings we'll be in a similar kind of way as, I'm guessing, as things were done in Istanbul where, you know, the design teams present what they're recommending and that would include as well why they're recommending certain things.

So indeed, you know, providing general feedback as, you know, (unintelligible) but I think we have it somewhere in the notes. We have a number of complaints that have been received to date. I think you can count it one hand. So it would be very unlikely that there would suddenly be a deluging of complaints coming in.

And even if that would happen because I think as well -- and I guess that comes maybe back to Design Team N I believe -- that there should be a process in place by which things can be reviewed and, you know, course corrected if needed.

So I think this is also once the area, you know, if we suddenly see that there's 100 complaints a day and all of them, you know, escalate to step two, yes obviously it won't be sustainable on the long run but then hopefully there is a process in place by which those kind of course corrections can be made and discussed.

So I think that's probably something that people will need to keep in the back of their minds as well that we're not designing this to be, you know, forever and ever and ever, there should be a process in place that allows for changes if, you know, people feel that it's not working as intended or indeed more complaints come than we thought there would be or, you know, the challenge

of finding extra mediators that could do this work or whatever the question would be.

So I think that's something as well that in the discussion that hopefully will help people as well to, you know, understand why we're recommending what we're recommending and noting that, you know, this is not set in stone forever and ever.

Chuck Gomes: So it sounds like at the beginning of - right there at the intro to step two, we probably ought to say some of that, that we acknowledge the concern of the CSC that they might get overwhelmed with complaints. Historically that has not been the case, but we recommend that the process be revisited by the -- I guess we have to decide by who -- if it gets to be a problem in terms of excessive complaints.

Does that make sense? Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes sorry, old hand.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So we should acknowledge that. Now who should that be then that would deal with the problem if the complaints become excessive? Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, and maybe Avri can comment on that, but my understanding was the DTN is looking at, you know, continuous review and improvement. So I guess, you know, hopefully before it becomes excessive, the CSC would already flag and say look this is not going to be for very much longer sustainable. And I think at that point there needs to be then a discussion on how could that be handled or dealt with.

And I'm not really sure if it's much use to speculating on that now on how that could look or how that would look, but I think at least if, you know, hopefully by having a process in place for which these kind of issues can be flagged and dealt with, you know, should instill enough confidence in the process to at least say look we can try it. If this works and we see it doesn't, we do have a mechanism in place by which can look for alternative solutions.

Chuck Gomes: Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes I mean DTN is only looking at the reviews and not, you know, actions post review because our charter was reviews. But there is a point and, you know, there's the periodic yearlies and what have you, and at some point, though this hasn't been accepted yet, is the CSC makes a report to the larger, you know, IANA community to the what we're calling the community function. It has many names these days. Once it was MRT, now it's who knows.

But anyway, so there is a review, a report that we hope would come out of the CSC on a yearly basis saying everything's fine or, you know, everything's so messed up we don't know what to do. There's too many complaints. Who knows what their report would say. That, you know, is a thing that I'm hoping we get agreement on today that that's a review that the CSC could do, in addition to all the other reviews.

And then we've talked about the fact that, you know, there is the periodic every five years except maybe two years the first time type of review that's being suggested, currently called an omnibus review to distinguish it from the others, that may be connected or could become a trigger for further action, you know, further fundamental bylaws stated action that if things have gotten so rotten at the five yearly review, the review can recommend or can trigger

the, you know, the RFP mechanism or what have you, the thing we don't talk about too much but we know is there at the end of the road.

So - because at a certain point you don't keep escalating it, you basically say okay does this need bigger action. But so - that would figure into reviews, but the reviews don't actually include, you know, the action that's taken based on them, except possibly that trigger. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Avri. This is Chuck. I think that's well said. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. And I actually quickly looked back at, you know, the input that was received from the Registry Stakeholder Group because I remember that somebody, you know, there was this concept of innovation and how to, you know, be able to improve. And that was one of the things that was specifically called out in that as well.

Basically the proposal should provide mechanisms for iterative improvements to the performance of the IANA function as well as to the oversight structures to account for lessons learned and for the potentially evolving needs of the registry community.

At that state, I think it was assigned to DTC as well as DTN. At that state I think my understanding was still as well that DTN would both look at, you know, continuous improvements review and as well this broader overarching review. But if that has changed in the meantime, it may be something that DTC is actually already covering as well, how to ensure that as things evolve or change there's a mechanism for dealing with that.

And again, you know, part of that maybe as well linked to the overall structure conversation that we're having, how would it at the end of the day look which,

you know, would factor into dealing with this kind of concept of how can you make sure that there is a mechanism by which you can have a conversation around oh well, you know, we actually said we would be managing this in this way but we're actually realizing in the past it doesn't really work and, you know, how can we change that or make adjustments.

And maybe that's something that is a more broader conversation as a group we'll need to think about. That would then also address this kind of issues like, you know, what if some of the changes we're proposing here didn't work as we had hoped to.

But as I said, I don't think we should take that as, you know, a point to already develop quite different kinds of alternatives but maybe reemphasize this need to make sure that there is a process in place that, you know, after transition and all these new processes and procedures, you know, become operational that there is a way to, you know, raise a red flag if in practice it turns out that some of these things actually do not work or should be tweaked in such a way that they do work.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Marika. Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Sorry. Yes I think in DTN I think it's one of the reasons we've called it sort of an omnibus review on that five-year cycle is because it can review just about anything. I don't think we've explicitly put in the issue about improvements, but thank you for the reminder and I will - in fact that's why I got distracted because I was in the process of making a note in the DTN document that we had to look at the process of improvement. So thanks for the reminder on that.

But I would think that that would be part of that, you know, that omnibus every five-year cycle is you can review anything, and that was sort of the notion. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Avri. And I - the one concern I have -- this is Chuck -- the one concern I have is that five years is probably not frequent enough for what we're talking about here. If there was a escalation of complaints that kept going to the CSC, it would need to be dealt with I think a lot sooner than that. But I think I hear you say there's also an annual review or - well the CSC, right, is supposed to, or somebody's, supposed to have a -- I think it's the CSC -- is to report every year. And it should be flagged in that report so that it can be addressed sooner than the five-year omnibus.

Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes at the moment that's what is being looked at is a CSC reporting yearly, but that they also (unintelligible) has a responsibility to review an annual audit report for example and such. So, you know, there are some yearly things, but you're right, there isn't an emergency escalation or an emergency let's call the omnibus review sooner mechanism at the moment.

And I'm not suggesting that we're going to try to put on in today but that might be a comment, you know, as we go forward of how do you say five years is too long, we need to do it this year. And that we haven't thought about.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, okay thanks. So one of things that's not clear to me, and we talked about this in our registry IANA team call yesterday, where is the - what is the status or where are we at with regard to this overall community body that used to be the MRT? Because that's going to come into play at the end of the problem

management processes as well where we go to this CCWG, you know, drafting mechanisms where you need the whole - nobody's suggesting that the CSC do that, in fact we don't want the CSC to be that decision maker to go to like separation for an example or RFP.

So where is that in our total CWG work? It's not at all clear to me. I think it - there needs to be something there, but I don't know what it is or where it's being addressed. Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. And I'm not 100% sure either but I think that the two potential avenues, at least as I think I understand it, is I think part of it is in the legal advisor. I think in the structures they're proposing there's also this kind of multi-stakeholder body that is in there, but I think - and again I don't know if that would then be the same or a different format of what the CCWG is discussing with their -- I think Avri was already saying -- I've lost as well what's it's currently called.

I don't know what all the names are, but again this kind of multi-stakeholder body that would then be able to recall the board and have other kinds of function that, you know, would fill that kind of same need. And my understanding was indeed that that would actually come from there.

And whether that is the same thing as what is being discussed as well on the legal model, I'm not 100% or sure or whether they could come together or whether that's, you know, two separate things, I'm not sure. And I'm hoping as well that we get some more character around that as we go into our conversations on Monday and Tuesday.

Chuck Gomes: Yes thanks, Marika. Chuck again. And I'll raise that also on the coordinators call - the call with coordinators today, so that we can do that. And I assume both of you will probably be on that call as well. So, Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes Avri. Yes I can't imagine missing that call.

Chuck Gomes: I'm glad to hear that. I want you there.

Avri Doria: Yes. What we've been calling it in DTN is community functions for, you know, since the name's kept changing on us and we didn't want to keep changing the names. It's - we've called it the community function.

But in terms of this omnibus review, for want of again of another term since there are so many different reviews, we have at least initially proposed that this would not be some standing group because we're not counting on a standing group being - but we're calling for a group that is drawn at the time according basically - and we're building on some of the MRTs, numbers of people and diversity discussions on - it would be a group of, you know, 11 people from the following constituencies or stakeholder groups or SO-ACs.

So we weren't looking at there being a standing group but actually looking at being a -- for this review -- a constituted group. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Avri. Chuck again. And is your understanding, Avri and Marika, that the CSC would - the reports that the CSC gives would go to that group?

Avri Doria: Well they would certainly go to the whole community, but you're right. There is - and this is where we've been ambiguous where we've said community function. So that yearly community function of reviewing the CSC's report is still very (unintelligible) as to how that is done. Is that just done by being

reviewed by all the SOs, ACs? And they review it and then if there's something they think needs to be done, they can, you know, have a mechanism to do more.

It's kind of a thing, but if there is - if, you know, the solution at the end comes out to community function is contained in a permanently constituted body, blah, blah, blah, then that group would do it. But we're not making that presumption here so much as just saying community function and we have to figure out yet at the larger discussions how community function is really done.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Yes, no, no I get that. Okay that's good. So Marika, are -- this is Chuck -- are you comfortable with you have enough understanding to draft some language with regard to the concern about being - complaints being excessive? Are you okay there?

Marika Konings: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marika Konings: Like I said, I'll share them with the group before sending it to the CWG so if there's something that needs to be added.

Chuck Gomes: (Unintelligible) get that. Okay so let's do this, I think we've covered the exchange with Stephane that occurred yesterday and the concerns from the CSC as best as we can without him on the call.

So let's go through the recommendations and I'll do a quick summary of my understanding. You guys correct me if I get something wrong or if I miss something. But so my understanding is we're going to leave the anyone can file a complaint with regard to the complain resolution process, anyone can

file a complaint, and we're going to have some comments in that regard as to why we made that decision and so forth. Okay.

Going on then I'm just going through now the - with regard to the (unintelligible) maintainer...

Marika Konings: This is Marika.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead. Question, comment?

Marika Konings: Yes just a note as I'm following along in the document, I just wanted to note as well that there are still some changes I had made based on the last version. I didn't receive any comments. I'm assuming people are fine. For example there is on the first page the note in relation to, you know, being able to pursue other applicable legal recourses, and that has been added.

Chuck Gomes: I would assume that those are okay. If you want to still leave those highlighted for our task with on - you know, after this meeting, that's okay. Because what I'm leaning towards, if you guys are supportive of it, is to put a - give everybody four hours to look at a redline version of this, and if we don't hear back in four hours we go ahead and accept everything.

So - and if you think it - in some cases you probably don't need the redline and they're probably pretty straightforward. But if in doubt, it's better to redline them and let people take one last look at them. But since we had such a low turnout on this call, that's especially important.

So now, Marika, you also suggested in Annex X to maybe take the - to use the term root zone publisher and then it could be RZP. I mean I don't have any problem with that. The term maintainer has been used for many years. That's

the only concern that people may have. It does get away with the confusion of RZM.

Avri, you have a thought on that? Do you think it's better to leave it, just call it maintainer? Some people are starting to just call it maintainer. It's not an acronym but it's shorter than saying root zone maintainer every time. You have a preference there, Avri?

Avri Doria: Not really.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Avri Doria: I think calling it root zone maintainer is fine. I've been calling it maintainer, and it's fine. I - it's not something I have a bone to pick about.

Chuck Gomes: Yes okay. Well it's mainly to avoid confusion. Because with the RZM is used - the acronym RZM is used for both, and we're trying to get away from that, so. Why don't we call it - just put a note there that if the - that we could change it to root zone publisher, RZP, to avoid confusion and just let the group decide whether they're comfortable with that or want to just call it maintainer.

Again my only concern there is that it's for many years been called the maintainer, the root zone maintainer so a change at this point itself might have some drawbacks. But I can go with it, if the rest of the group wants to. Let's let them decide that.

I think we got all the changes in the table and the flowchart. We should be okay with that. Certainly on your redline, Marika, make sure we get rid of the

all the formatting. Just delete all the formatting changes so that they don't confuse the redline picture.

Now going to - anything else on Annex X? I don't think there is, but let me know if you think of something. Annex Y then again we're taking the changes through that anyone can do it and not changing it to root zone maintainer. That's a global, so that was comment three in your latest version, Marika. And then comment four was to remove the ICANN or IANA function operators in order to use neutral - that's already happened, so.

And by the way, I don't think you need to keep those kind of changes redlined for this version we're sending out. I think everybody was in agreement that we're going to be more generic on that. So I wouldn't leave those as redlines unless somebody thinks differently.

Okay that's a repeat of the same thing. Just glancing - continuing through Y. Most of those don't even need to be redlined anymore, the changing from ICANN to IANA functions operator and so forth, and the ombudsmen stuff. I think that's all okay. I don't think there's any - those redlined.

And then you've got the changes we've just discussed about for the steps for under step two. Anything else on Y? And okay...

Marika Konings: This is Marika.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Marika Konings: I think you need question -- and I think this one of the open items we send as well on the naming list -- is the issue of, you know, who can make use of step

two. And I think for now we have it basically as direct customers, but I think the question was still open to...

Chuck Gomes: Oh that's right.

Marika Konings: ...what does it mean for, you know, regional organizations or for example, you know, the ccNSO or, you know, the registry stakeholder group.

Chuck Gomes: Yes I skipped over that. Thank you for catching that. So that's under who can use the process. But what we're talking about is going from - actually it's going - it's the beginning of step two, isn't it?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It's a definition, because what we've done in the step one we have somewhere, let me just see, we have here this process is open to anyone. And there we say including individuals, ccTLD or regional organization, ICANN SOs, ACs, et cetera. And then in the second one we basically say the following escalation mechanisms will be made available to direct customers.

And then we have a footnote that says non-direct customers that are reviewed that the issue has not been addressed through step one can escalate their issue to the ombudsmen all via the applicable liaisons to the Customer Standing Committee to step two.

So my question is -- and maybe it's something that doesn't need any further work here -- is if it's, you know, do we consider regional organizations as direct customers or organizations that represent, you know, TLDs are they considered direct customers?

And again, maybe it's, you know, I'm trying to think something too much through that doesn't need so much thinking through, because, you know, if the

regional organization doesn't raise the issues presumably individual TLD would raise in any case, or is it something that we do need to make explicit that a TLD organization could also do it as representing direct customers? And again, I don't know as far as going too much in the weeds here or whether that is something that should be called out or not.

Chuck Gomes: So what - first of all, I think that we should keep the footnote redlined, okay, so. That's an important enough issue that we want people to take one more look at and make sure that they're okay with it. But what about this possible edit to the footnote: non-direct customers, including TLD organizations that are of the view that an issue, instead of their issue, has not been addressed through step one can escalate their -- I guess it should be may -- escalate their issue to the ombudsmen or via the applicable liaisons to the Customer Standing Committee in step two.

That also deals with that one question that was in our scoping document. Any problems with those edits? Thanks, Avri. Okay so they look okay. You got that, right Marika? Thanks for reminding us of that. Does that work? Does that solve it or do you think we need to do something else, Marika?

Marika Konings: No I think that makes it specific so if people have issues with that they can...

Chuck Gomes: Yes okay. Anything else on Y? And then we go to Z, and I think we covered Z in our last call with the edit - adding of step seven. And I would keep that redlined, not that - just for one more look at that by everybody that's not on the call. And then we would just go ahead and give everybody, once this goes out, four hours from the time you send it out. If we don't hear anything, we accept the changes and you can go ahead and send it to the CWG.

Marika Konings: Sounds good.

Chuck Gomes: Anything else? Thanks to both of you very much. I'm sure glad you were on the call because I would have really hated to have a situation where I was the one having to make all these things without getting the thinking of a couple other people. Because it sure helps to get it - several heads together on things like this instead of just one or two.

So thank you very much for that. I think we're finished. Anything else we need to cover?

Avri Doria: Nope.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well we did it in just - in about an hour instead of 90 minutes. That's good. I - if you're like me, and I know you both are, we've all got plenty to keep us busy the rest of the day. So okay...

Avri Doria: Marika, we're you trying to say something else?

Chuck Gomes: What's that?

Marika Konings: Nope.

Avri Doria: Oh okay.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So I think we'll talk again in a little bit on the coordinators call. Let me go ahead and say though thanks and have a good weekend.

Avri Doria: Same to you.

Marika Konings: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marika Konings: Thank you. Bye.

Avri Doria: Bye.

Chuck Gomes: The call can be adjourned and the recorded stopped. Thanks.

END