# DT C Issues to raise to general level in CWG before/during Monday 13 and Tuesday 14

Two issues:

* Diverging Views DT C – CSC and DT M – Escalation: What is the role of CSC in escalation?   
  Is there one?  
  Potential overlap and divergence in interpretation of CSC role with respect o its role in escalation process ( limited view).
* The Space to innovate: There need to be a placeholder in CWG proposal for the role in development/evolution  of (new) services (e.g. DNSSCE, Key rollover, etc.).

## Discrepancy in expectations DT C to DT M – What is the role of CSC in escalation?.

DT C has redefined it’s proposal to a Charter for the CSC, defining scope, etc. The DT C charter assumes a narrow and minimal role for the CSC.

DT M has in proposal outlined a (three) process(es) (Appendix X,Y and Z) and action oriented approach to escalation. Based on the input provided by DT C, DT M made a number of adjustments to accommodate the concerns that had been expressed concerning the possible expansion of the mandate for the CSC. DT M is of the view, however, that the CSC has a role in escalation – if it would not be the CSC, who or what else would fulfil this role?

the customer service complaint resolution process is currently available to anyone that wishes to submit a complaint, but it is only used sporadically. There is no reason to believe this would suddenly change following the transition. As such DT M is recommending that to a large extent the existing approach and processes are followed, but with the option for direct customers to escalate to the CSC if the issue is not resolved adequately by IANA.

**Who should have standing to initiate complaints into the CSC - “All” or limited to the “CSC”?**

Pro All: All should have standing to raise complaints of the IF services.

Contra All: This might overburden the CSC, as is perceived as minimal in scoop, and mandate

**Customer Service Complaint Resolution Process (according to Annex Y, Step 2)**

According to DT C proposal, CSC should be kept a minimal organization. DT M Annex Y also assume CSC as a mediator. CSC acting as mediator is an issue.

* A follow up issue is: How a potential mediator role in CSC would be appointed, by who, and by what rules?

## 2) The space to innovate:

The CSC has an overview role. Overview is typically problem oriented, a reactive function to mend what doesn’t work in a predefined order. Development (innovation) of IANA functions is not necessary in the scope of the CSC (maybe rather in IETF). Where should the innovation role of new services like e.g. DNSSEC or Key rollover be handled in the CWG Process. DT C propose it not to be within the role of the CSC.