ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
April 1, 2015
8:00 am CT

Coordinator: Recordings are started.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. This is Chuck Gomes and this is the first, I guess the inaugural meeting of drafting Team O on the IANA budget. Thanks for all of you who have joined. It looks like for ICANN staff, we have (Brenda), of course, helping us out as always and Grace and Marika and (Barry) and (Bernie) and in addition, myself, Chuck Gomes, James Gannon, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond are all on. We're hoping some others will join shortly. Let's go ahead and get started.

As all of you know, I think, as we're a brand new design team that was created in Istanbul. So we have a new template that has been tossed around a little bit internally by some of us. Some of you haven't seen it, I don't think, until now but let's go through it and see if we can't agree on finalization and agree on what things mean and so forth. We don't want to make this - we don't want this to turn into a budget group but to do our job, a certain level of familiarity, I think, is needed with the budget and there are two key documents there we'll talk about later but let's take a look at the background and the current state section there.

It contains, I think, the latest data that's proposed by Marika and I think some by others as well before Marika did it. If you would, for those that haven't seen this yet, please take a look at the background and current statement and then I'd like you to comment if you have any comments or questions. Let me just pause for a minute or two and let you do that. James, go ahead please.

James Gannon: So James Gannon. I think it's a great paragraph, it's a great piece of work. I think we might need to kind of even more pull out the fact that functional separation is a current requirement. I think we need to pull out that this is not something that we're inventing. This is an existing separation requirement that we want to just build upon as opposed to something that we're coming along and saying, okay, we need this to be sufficiently separate because if I'm just looking at that first line under it's agreement, are not sufficiently separated.

I think we need to possibly put another line or two around there about how the current separation is identified in the contract. I don't know the specific wording within the contract at the moment or possibly even bring across language, as per section, see whatever, separation is required.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks James. Let me ask you a question. This is Chuck again. You're referring to the requirement for separation of policy and the IANA functions or are you referring to something else?

James Gannon: Yes. Correct. So obviously financials is a part of that separation and one of the basis that we're going on here per that line is that it's not sufficiently separated. So I think if we just have more, not necessarily, factors and opinions but if we have something to outline, okay, here is where it says that the IANA functions as a whole must be separated from ICANN corporate and

we believe that the current information that we have around financial separation is not sufficient.

Chuck Gomes: So would adding a second sentence because the first sentence talks about the fact that the budget itself is not sufficiently separated. Are you suggesting something like this would be in line - this would be in line with the current requirement to separate policy and...

James Gannon: Exactly. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So that's what you're referring to.

James Gannon: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Other comments on that? Anybody opposed to that addition as something like that as a second sentence there? Okay, and so is that you Marika that is writing? So if we can get that sentence - let's see. Just looking at the writing there.

Marika Konings: Chuck, this is Marika. We're actually doing live edits but if you want to I just need to switch my screen and then pull it up.

Chuck Gomes: No that's okay. Is everybody comfortable with what's written in the notes to the right? Anybody have any concern? You can actually do the actual editing later, I think, as long as we're in agreement. We do need to try and finalize this if at all possible today so that we can focus on other stuff. Any other suggested changes to the background paragraph? I need to look over at the chat. Cheryl welcome. Glad to see that you've joined us.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: My pleasure sir. Sorry. There was a delay in getting (unintelligible) done.

Chuck Gomes: Then I see your minor edit there Marika. So that's good.

Grace Abuhamad: Chuck, I'm actually - this is Grace. I'm taking the notes. So if you need any edits and if you want to...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: No. It's good. Grace, I wanted to compliment the correct person.

Grace Abuhamad: No, no. That's fine but if you have any edits, I'll get them. I just...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Grace Abuhamad: I didn't speak up earlier.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Grace. Olivier, please.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much Chuck. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Excellent. I'll reserve judgment on the adding the second sentence to note that there is an existing separation in the budgets until we've added the sentence and I think the wording will be very important on this due to the various forms that separation means for some people. So the wording will be important on that.

On the rest of it - the rest of the list is entirely fine. This is what we need to put together. There certainly is - for those people who are not aware of the budget at the moment, I think the problem we're faced with is that we appear to have a separate budget for IANA and yet, on the one hand, we're told X number of people are working in IANA and then they're paid this amount.

Then why do we have full-time equivalent numbers which are not amounting to that number of people? So there are certainly discrepancies here and if we want proper separation, an independent budget there, we're certainly going to have to ask that these figures actually work with each other rather than having full-time equivalence with 0.5% being added to a wholesome figure.

Secondly, one of the concerns I have is with regards to - let's see. Which point was it that I flagged out under - itemization of all IANA costs in the FY15 draft operating budget, plan and budget, to the project level and below as needed and that one I know at large has asked in the past for itemization all the way down to project level so that we could have an idea of how much it costs to run at large and what we were told was that the system itself doesn't allow for things like that because of the staffing shared all around the place and resources being shared resources.

So I'm just a little concerned about the amount of time we have to get that information back from finance and how quickly we need to come back to the working group, to the cross community working group, with our results. That's what I wanted just to flag at this moment. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Olivier. Now, first of all, I don't believe that there is a separate IANA budget just like there's not a separate ALAC budget that's not mixed in with a lot of other stuff. If that's what you said, if there is one section of the

spreadsheet that is the IANA department then there are IANA expenses mixed in other places as well.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes. That's what I meant Chuck. Yes. Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks. I just wanted to make sure...

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond :   Sorry. I wasn't...

Chuck Gomes: ...we're on the same page.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: We definitely are. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. With regard to getting the language right in that added sentence, let me make a suggestion there. Looking at the notes here, does it work to essentially say this, that as a second sentence, so it's a follow-on to that first sentence about the need for better separation to say the existing agreement between NTIA and the IANA functions operator - excuse me.

Let me start over. This is consistent with the assisting requirement - the need - I'm sorry. I'm thinking out loud here and I'm not doing a very good job, but I think we need to say a little bit more than what's in the notes and am trying to see if this is what you're getting at in that regard Olivier.

The need for a clearer separation is consistent with the current requirement between NTIA and the IANA functions operator to separate the policy and IANA functions. Again, that can be fixed further, but I think those are the main point. Does that work for you Olivier because you said...

((Crosstalk))

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes Chuck. Chuck, yes, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: To some extent, yes. We'll just have to see that - I'm wary of the words separation and separate because we've also had supper ability and all of that and I don't want this word to be translated into a case of us saying or moving this function out, where preparing for chopping that department out. The idea is I know what you mean by separation. We have to work out how that word gets used in the sentence so as to make sure what we really mean is to have financial independence there. I would even call it independent accounts but going as far as being able to have an itemized part of saying all of that relates to IANA and if one day that needs to be moved, we know exactly how much that costs. The IANA function costs X.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Olivier. Now - Chuck again. Let's make sure - we are just talking about a background and current state here and will get more specific one were talking about the issues in the next section but what word would you use instead of separation?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Itemization maybe. I'm not sure if it works. I'm just thinking on the spot as well by the way

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well, let's keep that on their. There are other people that want to talk so I'll let them talk. Maybe they can make a suggestion there. I think James was next and then Marika.

James Gannon: (James Cannon). Identification of IANA costs? Just throwing that one out there. Basically what - I'm a bit confused as to why this is so complicated.

Essentially my understanding of what should be happening or even if it's not happening at the moment, what we should be asking for, is that there is IANA cost center. That cost center is the cost center that is built regardless of whether it's - okay. I can understand somewhat unstaffed but if there's any capitalized costs, they should be billed to an IANA costs center.

Okay. That IANA cost center can be rolled out into different functional areas for budgeting matters. It's not rocket science to have a separate cost center within an entire business unit in order to be able to easily identify individual costs.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks James. Chuck again. Let's hold on to that because I think that gets into a possible recommendation that we can make with regard to the budget. Keep in mind, like Olivier said, that they're not going to - finance is not going to be able to change the way they capture costs over night. It's going to take a while and just to my own view and what I've seen, I think it's the less amount of the system they are using then it is the way they have decided to capture cost which is what you're getting at. So Marika, you're up.

James Gannon: Yes. Understood. Yes. Yes.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika and just to note on the (unintelligible) on our one and two, I mean, I didn't have a close look at the budget to see what was actually there but my understanding was more that looking at the current budget would give the design team a starting place or this is what the current state is. What do we want the future state to be? I think you see that as well in my edit.

I don't think it should be as much the focus on how much money is being spent because I think it's probably difficult to accept that at this stage and as several people have noted, it may not even be possible to get those numbers

accurately in the short timeframe we're working on but I think it may provide a good starting point of trying to assess what information is currently available and what does the community expect to see after those transitions and kind of using this as a baseline and maybe for the one and two need to be rewarded because if there is no itemization, I guess we cannot really review it either.

It may be one of the things that would then actually be a recommendation and moved in as such. So at least that was from my perspective a little bit of the thinking about some of the changes made and some of the things the design team may want to think about.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Marika. That was well said. In that regard - this is Chuck again. What has happened with regard to enlisting a member of the finance team on our drafting team?

Grace Abuhamad: Chuck, this is Grace. I can speak to that one for you. So we - the plan right now is that finance will liaise with me or Marika and will get the questions to them and liaise with them that way but I don't know if they have their resources at this point to dedicate a full-time staff to the DT. So we're going to discuss that a little bit further today but I think the plan for now is to have the CWG staff support and liaise with finance.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Grace. My concern there -- and I guess I wonder whether they are aware of this -- we have a week and a half and we are not going to have the luxury of waiting for answers from finance I don't think unless we work every day, have calls every day, and I don't think that's possible for most of us, if not all of us. Anyway, I'll let you work that with them obviously. Just make them aware that were not talking about a long-term effort here. We're talking about trying to wrap this up by the 10 of April. So were going to have to -

liaising is fine but it's going to have to be fast liaising if we're going to succeed. Grace, do you want to respond to that?

Grace Abuhamad: Yes. So will do our best but, I mean, it may be since I'm speaking to them later today, could you let me know what you expect from finance in particular and others. I know Olivier mentioned being able to answer calls and answer questions right away on the call.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That's a fair question this is Chuck again. Thanks Grace. Let me - I know - of course, they know this too. I understand the complexities of what they're doing very well and there are aware of that. So we're not going to be asking them to answer questions that they can't answer. Were fully aware of that. For example, the projections for the IANA costs are so high level and big guesses, we get all that.

So we're not going to be pressuring them for information that is just not possible for them to get and I will - I think I will be very consciously aware of that so I can help guide that and limit our requests just like I did on a comment a little bit ago where the way they enter data into the budget because I'm pretty aware of that but there will be things that if we can get an on the spot answer when it's possible on the call, that would save us waiting in making a decision.

If we have to wait and then the next call get information from them, it's going to cause delays that are going to make it very difficult for us to meet that April 10 deadline, unless like I said, we have a call every day which I suspect isn't feasible with everything that's going on for all of us. So anyway. Marika, you put your hand down so I don't know if I covered what you were going to say or what but feel free to put it back up if you want to jump in. Grace. Okay. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Maybe just to reemphasize I think what Grace was saying is I think (unintelligible) finance to be able to identify who will be the appropriate person to answer those questions. I think it would be really helpful to have an idea of what kind of questions you expect to have and I see Olivier already made some in the chat and we can definitely take those back but I think it's really important as well the to focus on what the task of the design team is and leave more kind of the budgetary general conversation as well to the separate conversation.

That is, of course, going on in parallel as well in the public comment forum that's open. I think it also relates to some of the suggestions that were made in the template like this group also prepare a submission to that effort but I think as you already noted, the timeframe is really short. So it's really important to focus on what's most important and indeed, determine what are the questions that you need input on to be able to provide those recommendations to the CWG.

So again, if there are any specific questions that you have now, Grace and I can already take note of those or if you foresee what kind of conversation you would like to have with finance because I think that will help with them as well to speak to the finance team and identify who would be best suited to either participate in the conversation or respond to the email questions that we may have.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Marika. Chuck again. I think Olivier has given some examples, not just examples but I think questions that you can take back in the chat on the full-time equivalents. If you're not clear what he's asking on that, please do that. I think another question is this one and that is, are they working on a breakout as best as they can do of the current costs, of all the current costs, of

the IANA services right now and if so, when do they anticipate being able to provide that estimate to us and to the community? So there's a start on the questions. Grace, go ahead.

Grace Abuhamad: Thanks Chuck. It was just to note that we'll go ahead and take that back to finance and see where we can go from there but we'll make sure we transfer the request and some of the chat elements that Olivier and Cheryl have put in there.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much.

Grace Abuhamad: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: So let's keep moving here. I think we covered that first section well and after this call, at some point, we will see another group of - another version of this with the latest changes and while I don't want to spend much more time on this document itself after today, I do want - we can make any additional edits if there are some tweaks that we need to make on that.

Okay. Going to the issue section there and I'm just going to - since it's a larger section will break it up into bits and go through it in order but notice it starts off in order to determine the appropriate information in detail expected. The drafting team or design team will consider the following information and I'm going to just jump ahead to number one. Itemization of the most current forecast of all IANA costs in the fiscal year '15 operating plan and budget to the project level and below as needed.

Now, I want people to comment on that start including number one. Let me point out to everyone that this is the first time ever that they've provided project level budget detail for every one of the over 300 projects. So they're

moving in a very helpful direction in that regard and the reason - I awarded that number one. The reason I said project level and below, in some cases with regard to IANA expenses, the project level may not go quite far enough. Usually it does in their budgeting but there are some cases where a project may overlap with several departments.

So that's why I said as needed. We're not looking for the - were not looking - I don't think we want to - we don't want to micromanage the budget but we need to get an accurate picture of the IANA costs. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Based on what I said earlier and looking as well at some of the other elements that are in here -- which I think several people already indicated that may not be available and again, may not be necessary for the path that the design team is looking at. I'm wondering if we can just replace one to five by saying something more along general lines considering the current information that is available in relation to all IANA costs.

So that will basically, I think, cover what is in the current budget and within the FY15 budget, what's in the FY16 budget and the additional information that we may get from the finance team. It's kind of a catch-all category because I think here there are some things in here that are more a project of any new cost elements that may be incurred as a result of the transition and I think there are some comments in there as well that may sound as if it's really gone beyond what I think the mandate or at least the idea that this design team would look at.

Also, of course, as that we're not clear yet on how the whole picture will look, I'm not really sure if it's even something that is possible to do at this point in time. As I said before, at least my assumption is, the reason why we want to look at that information is to establish what the current baseline is to be able

to make a recommendation on what the design team and the CWG believes should be the future state post transition. So, again, it may take away the need to have all those items and instead, maybe a more general kind of review all currently available information may cover, I think, the same objective if that indeed is the commonly understood purpose of this design team.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Marika. James, go ahead.

James Gannon: I have no - I'm sorry. James Gannon. I have no philosophical issue with rolling up some of the items but I don't believe rolling them up into one item that has a catch-all of everything that is currently available because look at the current, what is currently available, it's extremely difficult to only try and bring up a full idea of what the entire IANA costs are. We have one section that has some of the IANA operation costs such there were a number of other areas, as you had answered in the budget, that would be considered part of the IANA costs but are captured under other headings.

So at the moment, we don't have an idea or in my opinion, we're unable to get a comprehensive idea of what the overall IANA costs are. So by putting in a catch-all based on current information, we're kind of doing ourselves a disservice by assuming that the information that is out there is actually sufficient for our needs.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks James. Let me respond, Marika, to what you said and a little bit it is along the same line as James is saying. First of all, let me say, I think it would be very good to put a prefatory statement that we're cognizant of the limitations of what they can do and what they can do in a short period of time especially as busy as they are right now and leading up to the approval of the budget in June.

So I think that's a good idea according to what's available but my concern about rolling all of one through five up into one statement is that I think each one of those things are things that we're going to need somewhere down the road. I'm not saying we need them before April 10, but I think they are - every one of those seem to me like possible requests that we're going to make of information we're going to need. So what I would like to throw out for everyone to talk about, are there any of those items, one through five, that wouldn't be helpful for the IANA transition and the ongoing IANA services? Okay. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Just to note that when I was first making my edit, I had actually moved the items one through five to the proposed recommendations because to me, there was really indeed, that is what you want to recommend and, again, it's a discussion, of course, the design team needs to have in response to CWG but many of these read to me is the kind of requirement you may think of putting forward as saying this is what we expect to see.

To (Cheryl's) point, of course, some of that may already be possible within this budget cycle and I don't think there's any problem in already asking for that but I think what the design team really should be focused on is what needs to go into the draft proposal or I think that's another question we may get to. Is this guidance that needs to be - instead of going into the proposal, guidance that needs to be provided to the CCWG as their also specific in looking at processes in and around the budget.

So I think that's probably a question that comes up in the second round but I think it's really important to focus on what the expected outcome here is and there may be a need to cite effects of this effort which will be really helpful but the immediate goal is to have draft language go into the draft proposal so

that the CWG can consider that ahead of the publication date for initial, for the next round of public comments.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Marika and by the way, I like - I very much like your suggestion to move it into recommendations. I don't have a problem with that if nobody else does. Now, we probably want something, say, to the extent that we could get any of this information sooner, then next year, that would be very good. So I'd be helpful if we could get some of this in the near-term and I think the question of whether - the idea of a current estimate of costs of all of the IANA services, a reasonable estimate, is something that we would like soon if possible.

Now, secondly, I want to say, I think - because we don't know exactly what solution the CWG is going to recommend, the idea of pushing some of this off to work stream two in the CCWG concerns me. Again, I understand that they're only going to be able to do so much with regard to the way that the budget is done now and the way data is entered into the system and so forth.

But, I think the CWG is going to need more cost information than we have now and possibly finalizing its decisions after we get public comment and so forth, because maybe something that we're considering is just going to be too expensive or maybe it's irrelevant because when we find out the actual cost of doing things, so I think we have to be careful.

I do believe that the idea of giving direction to the CCWG is right, and we need to do that. But, I think we're going to, it's going to be very hard for the CWG as a whole to make some decisions without a better picture of cost for IANA than we have right now, so I just think we should be cautious there, but I really do.

Now, let me ask real quickly before I go to Cheryl, does anybody have a problem with moving one through five down into the recommendations section? We can tweak them later. We don't have to worry about that. We can word them to fit that. But I think Marika makes a really good point there. Anybody have a problem with that? Would you speak up, just speak up verbally if you would? Okay. Nobody seems to have a problem with that, so that's a very good idea.

And, by the way, before I go to Olivier, it sounds like we may have solved Cheryl's comments or covered them, the breakout of those five I think they're all important; like for example, I think we need to know the fiscal year '15 costs, the most current as to forecast, okay? That gives us a basis for fiscal year '16, so I think each of those are significant, so I'm going to quit talking on that and turn it over to Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much Chuck. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking, and I noticed that Cheryl has put her hand up. She might have dropped off, so I can pass the hand over to Cheryl if she can?

Chuck Gomes: Okay, Cheryl would you like to go first?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I will. I'm going to take that gallantry. Thank you very much Olivier. You are correct, as I put up my brain checkmark, my hand managed to get dropped at the same time, as I did want to stay in line. But, in answer to that last question, yes I agree with that. I do think, however, we need to use the terms, as I think you are alluding to. Our desire from a design team point of view, is to have a good, I've lost my word.

What we need is clear and well-covered report on the actuals from 2015, as well as what we're talking about as desirable into 2016. So, you know, there's

a difference between those two things. Why I put my hand up however, was with the work stream one and work stream two part, you are rising Chuck, and to that end I think it's important that whilst just for the sheer timing of it all some of the desirable stuff will obviously be in work stream two.

But it needs to be in work stream two in a priority one position, so I think we can make that clear. I think just as to ensure that something that is critical for IANA transition belongs in work stream one. It seems that desirable on a general accountability, but also specifically for providing to IANA transition can belong in work stream one.

But, what happens in work stream one is it makes clear recommendations for work stream two and gets in work stream one's recommendations agreement that work stream two activity will go on ahead. I think then, I know that's a multi-layered approach but then the CWG can be more comfortable with this allocation to a lot of our desirables being focused on NCCWG work stream two, but it has to be work stream two priority one.

Chuck Gomes: Well said Cheryl. And now you see why Olivier let you go first because you did such a good job. Okay. Olivier, you're on.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much Chuck. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking, and I have been thinking about the questions for the finance department, and recognizing we have so little time and it might take a while for them to come back to us. I wanted to suggest that we perhaps leave a couple of tasks for the finance department to start work on now.

The first one being to identify all of the costs shown in the budget that pertain to the IANA functions, so that includes items covered in other parts of the budget and that are shared with other departments, any resources that are

shared that would need to be covered. And then, as a number two, for the finance department to make suggestions as to how these shared costs could be itemized and allocate them on a per department basis.

In other words, itemizing the IANA functions equivalent cost, so as to be able to have the separate listed costs in the system. I don't know how they will be able to do that, but I guess its they know their systems better than we do and of course their internal software and processes better than we do. And it might not be just a simple press of a button. It might be something a bit more complicated and hence since we only have ten days ahead of us, we might wish to launch them and them thinking about this right now. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks very much Olivier, and I think it's very good that we make a list of the questions. This is Chuck speaking again. What I'd like to suggest to put before those questions is the question I raised earlier, is are they working on a breakout of current IANA costs that will provide a more reliable picture of the total costs? And the follow-up question is, if so or even if not, when do they think that would be available?

I think that is something that they can answer in a short order. I think what is now question number two there or task two, identify all costs, that's going to be a time consuming task. But, it's related to the first questions, so some of these things it's going to take them longer than others, so but that's very good. While we're on the questions, let's very quickly, because we've got about 15 minutes until our hour is up.

But, what other questions would anyone like to add to our list? And did this, let me ask Olivier, did this include the question or questions you put in the chat, or do we need to capture that as well? Olivier? If you could respond to that I'd appreciate it.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank goodness I checked. I was muted. Thank you Chuck; Olivier speaking. I'm typing the questions in the chat we'll probably sort of put them together afterwards.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That's fine. That's good for time. I appreciate that. So, I just wanted to make sure we didn't miss those. James? Let me ask you, do you have a question to add? If not, I want to hold off and then I'll come back to you. But, if you have a question to add to the list, please speak up.

James Gannon: Can I add a qualifier to a question?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

James Gannon: I am on the identify all costs, they need to be not only the operational costs, but I need project-related costs that are either driven by the IANA functions or are directly impacting the IANA functions.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks James, but I'm not sure I understand the difference between operational or project. Project could include operational costs, so what do you mean by the operational and project costs?

James Gannon: So, I can give an example, at the moment in the budget there was a section on projects related to security, stability and resiliency of the Internet identifiers.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

James Gannon: So, that is something that would have an impact. That budget line would have an impact on multiple areas of ICANN. But, there will be a portion of that project cost that will be directly impacting IANA. So, for in order for us to be

able to get a comprehensive idea of what the IANA costs are, we need to know what portion of currently ongoing projects will be coming out of the IANA budget, or would be required by a separate IANA in order to facilitate us. So yeah, as Olivier said, it's recurring costs versus operational costs.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, recurring okay, okay. Gotcha. That makes more sense to me than operational versus project, so that's helpful. Thank you very much. And, by the way, if you didn't get a chance to look at James' questions that he asked and my responses, my own personal responses, okay, I'm not a finance person, on the spreadsheet, take a look at that.

And just to let you know, you don't have to go through all of the details of that huge spreadsheet to be able to do that because his comments are highlighted, and my responses I gave in emails, so you can see those in email. But, it gives you an idea of what he's talking about, and if you haven't seen how IANA expenses are kind of mixed into other things, and there are questions in there.

Now, some other questions, and we won't do this on the call, but Grace, if you'll take a look at the email exchange, my response to James, there are several questions that he asked that we really need to ask them. So those could be added to the questions for finance. If you have any questions on that, let me know, but I think that's a fairly easy task to do offline rather than trying to do it on the call.

James Gannon: Sorry, can I just do a quick follow up Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I was going to give you that chance.

James Gannon: We didn't actually have a mailing list when I sent that, so I am going to forward that to the mailing list now.

Chuck Gomes: Are you forwarding with my responses?

James Gannon: Both. Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Good. Thanks. I meant to ask that to see it because I couldn't recall whether that was sent to everybody or not, and thank you very much for doing that. That's very helpful. And that's probably what Grace was going to ask for. Go ahead Grace.

Grace Abuhamad: Yeah. I was going to ask if in that case James if you want to pull out the questions that you think are most relevant. You know, if that's easier than me making that judgment for you. If you want to pull out the questions that you think are most relevant for finance, I can compile everything. Either way, but I just figured if you're going to forward the thread anyway, you might want to highlight the ones that you think are most relevant.

James Gannon: I think you'll see when you look at the spreadsheet I was merely identifying areas that could potentially have IANA costs that are currently captured in other line items.

Chuck Gomes: And Grace we can't tell whether they have IANA costs or not. So most of those things can be converted into questions if they're not questions right now. In some cases he was very explicit and said does this include IANA costs? Those will be really straightforward, but feel free to turn them into questions if it's something that they might be able to clarify for us.

Grace Abuhamad: Okay. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Grace. That's very helpful. All right. Again, time is getting away from us here. Marika I assuming that with regard to the general statement that we're going to replace in the issues section, you'll draft something that can be put into there, and then one through five will be moved down and reworded as necessary, I don't know if it is or not, down into purposed recommendations that we can refine later on? You okay with that Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I can do so, no problem.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I figured you could, but I just wanted to confirm that, so as an action item after this call. So, let's go down to based on this assessment that the drafting team has expected to and then now I guess I should pause and back up just a little bit. Is it safe to conclude that everybody was okay with one through five? I didn't go through those item-by-item, but if anybody's not okay with anything in those, speak up now.

Now, we can refine them more as we complete our work, but I realize I read one but I didn't read two through five, so if nobody speaks up I'll assume those are okay for now. Okay Chuck continuing, and number one then under based on this assessment, number one says make recommendations to the ICANN finance team and board finance committee regarding budget needs to the transition and ongoing support of IANA naming services by specifying the sufficiently detailed level of requirements by budgetary transparency post transition.

Now, I welcome comments or questions from anybody there. I wonder whether we want to include in here or maybe separately Marika's suggestion about communication to the CCWG. Should that be added in addition to the ICANN finance team and board finance committee? And should we say and

the CCWG as related to accountability there? And maybe, you are the one I was going to pick on Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. Again this is one of the things I didn't change because I didn't want to touch too many things in your original draft, but as I said before, my understanding is that this design team is expected to make recommendations to the CWG for inclusion in their proposals. So, and, you know, eventually I guess those recommendations will, of course, go to the ICANN financing and board financing committee if the final proposal, all wrapped up is accepted as is.

So, I don't know if we should reword that as well to make clear that is what this design team recommends, you know, as a first step we'll actually go to the CWG for their consideration. And if it's accepted there, it will go into the draft proposal. Of course, not withstanding that, you know, that if either as a group or as individual members you already want to provide that feedback for example as part of the current budget process, I don't think anything is preventing you from that. But, you know, maybe just to make clear what the main assignment is and to whom indeed the design team's recommendations are in the first instance directive.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Thanks Marika. And maybe we need to separate the two. But, providing things to the CCWG will not have any impact on the comment period for the budget, so I think we need to do that. But, the reason I put in there ICANN finance team and board finance committee is because they will be looking at the comments in the current comment period, which ends May 1. And the CCWG will unlikely not be able to respond to anything we send to them by then, so I think we need to do both unless, we decide we shouldn't comment in the current comment period, but we'll come to that in number

three in the section that we're in right now. Did you want to say something further Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah. This is Marika. And maybe, you know, just to clarify because I think what my concern is, and the way it's worded currently is that the design team will directly make recommendations to the ICANN finance team. And I think the step that's currently missing is that, you know, the design team will make the recommendations to the CCWG.

And I think one of those recommendations can be, you know, in addition to, you know, putting these requirements into the proposal we also suggest that the CWG as a group, you know, provides this as a comment to the current budget process that it opened. You know, from a sequence perspective I just want to make sure that, you know, we have the different levels appropriately reflected here.

Chuck Gomes: Feel free to make adjustments, and you can do it offline, you don't have to do it on the call, to the wording to reflect that because you're correct there. And then so yeah offline you can provide some recommendations with regard to the wording on that. Unless anybody objects to anything you said, I don't, but we can fix that accordingly. Okay. And that's going to, we're going to work on recommendations after this call so that will be helpful. Okay. Thanks Cheryl for the agree there.

And let's go to number two, draft CWG comments regarding the plan and budget for submission in the public comment period. So anybody opposed to that, again we don't have to do that, but I think to the extent that we can impact any changes in fiscal year '16 budget when it's modified. So what will happen in the process, for that didn't attend the Webinar or haven't reviewed

the budget stuff, what will happen is after the public comment period, the public comments will be taken into consideration?

And any modifications will be made to the budget based on public comments before it goes to the finance committee or the board and ultimately the full board for approval in June. This'll be the first time that there will be opportunity for changes to be made to the budget before the actual budget is approved by the board in June. And so, there is the opportunity of impacting some changes in the fiscal year '15 budget before it's approved. So, that's why I personally think this particular, the opportunity to submit public comments is one that we may want to take advantage of. Grace? Go ahead.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi Chuck. So, I think that, you know, it's a good idea, but I don't think we should. I mean my suggestion would be to not distract from the work of the DT. So, you know, within the way that the DTs are formed and scoped their goal is to make recommendations to the proposal specifically. So, I think maybe this can be an additional point for the DT to work on or to, you know, consider as sort of an additional submission whether that's to the CWG or tot the public comment period.

But, I would take it out of the scope of the document because this is a scoping document, and it's not really in the scope of the design teams to be focusing on anything other than the proposal itself. So, I guess I just want to make sure that the focus of the design team sort of stays on the CWG proposal. But I agree with you that it's a good opportunity.

Chuck Gomes: So, thanks Grace; we actually talked about it, in the meeting in Istanbul, so I think it's okay to have it in the scope. But, I agree with you that the priority should be on recommendations for the proposal itself. And that's what we'll work on first. Okay? Then, we will work on, and actually we could actually

work on that piece after the tenth as far as the public comments because we'll have more time out of that.

So we don't have the deadline of the tenth for any public comments. But, we can take from our recommendations that we work on first and then develop possible public comments for consideration by the working group, the full working group after the tenth, so good point on that. Let's go to number three, very quickly. And that's related to what we're talking about right now.

So, actually we probably need to switch two and three, don't we? We should put three ahead of number two there, and we might even want to put a parenthetical on number two, what is now number two that that can be done after the tenth. Anybody opposed to what I just suggested? Okay. I think we've covered enough so that this document can be put into a form.

And for those that haven't gone along, I suggest we do a clean ANA. First of all, I suggest we accept the changes, the redlines that are in this document as they are so that it's clean there. And then let's, if it's not too late, and then do a redline of the changes we made on that clean version for everybody to see and review.

So, the last thing we need to do I think now, you'll have to forgive me but I'm confused considering how many doodle polls I've been doing, and like the rest of you different design teams and working groups and so forth that I'm involved in. Did we do a doodle poll for drafting or design team O yet?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. We did one for this call, but I think it was only done for specifically for this meeting, not for any future meetings.

Chuck Gomes: So, let me ask on the call if there's anybody that can't do another meeting this week? We really need to get in at least one more meeting this week. In fact, I guess it's kind of hard. I'll throw that out as a general question and then I'll suggest a specific action. So, I don't know I'm just looking. Good. I am too Cheryl, and James can. So let's do a doodle poll for meetings. In fact, let's just go ahead and if it's easier to do two doodle polls that's okay, but let's at least do a doodle poll for the rest of the days this week, for Thursday and Friday.

And also do a doodle poll for all five days next week, not that we're going to meet every day. But I think Marika I have sent my availability for the design team M listed and that would apply less any design team M meetings we schedule for me. And if you want to do two, one for Thursday and Friday this week and one for next week that's okay, if you want to combine them, I don't care. But let's get that out as soon as possible and let's get at least one more meeting in this week.

And what we will do, hopefully is just a brief amount of time on this scoping document and then we'll jump right into recommendations. Now, we didn't have time to talk about the budget including the spreadsheet. I was only going to just briefly talk about structure. If you have any questions on that, let me know, and I'll try and answer them on the list so that we don't have to spend time going over that. I wasn't going to go over it in a lot of detail anyway, just maybe with regard to how things work with regard to objectives and goals and projects, et cetera.

So, we have then I think we've covered as much as we can today without going too much over our timeline, which we already are; so, anything else that we need to cover today?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Chuck? Sorry to jump in, Cheryl, you know, I'm in two screens and actually have two phones in two ears, so forgive me for not putting my hand up in the right room.

Chuck Gomes: That's okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I just wanted to suggest that what we do make sure we have at least a 90 minute, maybe even a two-hour block for this next call. I think one hour is far too short. Ninety minutes is possibly manageable noting that it will be for some people what they would see as a public holiday, it's on a Friday. I think 90 minutes is fine, but in future for calls I think we should at least block out 90.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And if that's the case, I'm going to have for this time an issue because this would normally clash with my stress test weekly call. All right? So, we might need to tweak this call on this day a little earlier or a little later that I obviously have to run my stress test call, because stress tests are kind of important as well.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I like the idea, but because of the last point you made, and it definitely impacts me, my availability would change if I go to 90 minutes from 60 because I've got back-to-back meetings in several cases in the next few days.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If we're doing more than one call a week, sorry, just back at you there, Cheryl for the record, if we're doing more than one call a week, and I believe we probably have to, like at least two, let's make, you know, the first one in the week and, you know, let's do a 60-90 and, you know, if we need another

one, they don't have to both be the same but I'm just lagging for this call time I couldn't go to 90 either.

Chuck Gomes: Right. So, I'm trying to think logistically how the best way to do that is, do we want to do a poll? Let's do a separate poll for 90-minute meetings, and let's do a 60-minute meeting one, two. We have so little time to schedule these that let's, I know I hate to ask for doing two separate ones, but I'm going to actually have to provide some additional information for 90-minute calls to show my availability.

So let's start with 60, not that we're going to do it at 60, because if we can find 90s we should do the 90s I agree. But, we're going to have to have at least another call this week and at least two next week I firmly believe, so let's start off and do doodle polls for 60 and then do a separate one for 90. Go ahead Grace.

Grace Abuhamad: This is Grace. Sorry. I just wanted to jump in really quick. What we'll do, Brenda will send out doodle polls at 30-minute intervals so that she can find a slot that works for 90 minutes, that way you don't have to fill out two, you just have to fill out one, but you get 90 minutes. She'll do them at 30-minute intervals so she can find a time that works for 90 minutes for people and 60 minutes. We've done that for other groups and that worked out quite well. So we'll do that and that way you only have to fill out one for the whole.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Grace. Great idea. I knew there had to be a better plan than what I was suggesting, so good.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, I've got to say, as is usual.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry Chuck. I had to do that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks everyone. I think this has been a very productive first call. Remember ask any questions, make any suggestions, let's take advantage of the list, we now have a list. And so that when we go into our next meeting, hopefully that'll save us some time. And hope to talk to all of you another time this week. Have a good rest of the week, and the meeting is adjourned.

                                END