

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer  
April 6, 2015  
2:00 pm CT**

Brenda Brewer: Recording has started. You may proceed.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. This is Chuck Gomes and this is - O meeting on the 6 of April, 2015. Looks like we have Grace from our staff support team on the call and Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Mary Uduma, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, and Vika. Who is Vika? Can you tell me?

Grace Abuhamad: Chuck...

Man: (Unintelligible) as well.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry.

Grace Abuhamad: Sorry, Chuck. This is Grace (unintelligible). So (unintelligible) just - he's on the phone only line. He just - that's who just spoke now.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Grace Abuhamad: And Vika is a - one of our ccNSO appointed members. He's not officially part of DTO but I think he's joining here call today. I don't know, Vika, if you wanted to speak up. I don't know if you're on mute or not.

Chuck Gomes: Great, that's great, thank you.

Vika Mpisane: My full name is Vika (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: So Vika, welcome.

Vika Mpisane: Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I can.

Vika Mpisane: Hi, Chuck. I am one of the ccNSO counselors and we are also a part of the (unintelligible), just been quiet.

Chuck Gomes: Good, well, thank you very much. Hopefully everyone - this is Chuck. Hopefully every one saw the agenda. Any questions or concerns with the agenda please speak up now. Is there anyone who is not on Adobe Connect? Also, please verbally speak up right now so I know that, okay.

That means everyone will be able to raise their hand in Adobe Connect if you'd like to speak. On the screen right now is the red line version of the latest recommendations document, that was distributed to the list. And thanks, Grace, to getting several versions - a couple versions of that out, a clean version and the edited versions.

And I think a clean version with comments as well so those - that's on the screen right now.

I want to welcome Xavier to the call, we're going to get to him very quickly. And I think everyone knows that Xavier is the Chief Financial Officer for ICANN and one of our main purposes on the meeting today is to discuss our recommendations with Xavier.

Before we go to that I would like to ask Grace if she would give us an update on any answers to questions that we had asked the finance team. I know that she had a meeting scheduled with Xavier on Friday and was going to ask some of the questions that we had.

So Grace, let me turn it over to you for any update you have before we discuss our recommendations with Xavier and give him a chance to make some introductory remarks if you would like.

Grace Abuhamad: Thanks, Chuck. This will be very brief. Essentially I can transfer the questions over to finance and then on Friday spoke with Xavier and gave him sort of - he has the recording and the draft and sort of information, just kind of gave him some background information about the group.

And so he's on the call today to take the questions and answer and discuss with the group. So no updates from my end other than you have Xavier on the call. There you go.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Grace. So maybe it makes sense to start with the questions and let Xavier respond to those. Before we do that and before we look at our actual recommendations after that Xavier - let me turn it over to you in case you

would like to make any introductory remarks or even ask us questions, that would be fine.

Xavier Calvez: Okay, thank you very much Chuck. And within about a couple minutes I will on the Adobe room as well. Thank you for the invitation and opportunity to speak and support the group, very much welcome that opportunity and I will try to do anything I can to help.

I have to apologize but being on vacation over the past few days I was only able to touch base with Grace and (Teresa) on Friday, obtain the questions that you have, and give a little bit of thoughts in the meantime but not necessarily go very deep into answering the questions that I also thought that it would be useful to obtain background and clarification from any of you during this call as well.

Beyond the preliminary comment I would want to make is - which I'm suspecting maybe relevant to the conversation and the objectives is that this group has is that if I look at cost exercise from a financial standpoint, any cost exercise, as I say to our colleagues as well, there are as many different types of costs as there are purposes to produce a cost analysis.

And this means that there's not one financial truth or right number. There is a number that gives the answer to the question that is asked. And asking the question is nearly sometimes more complicated than providing the answer.

So what I want to be really careful in being able to adequately do for me to support the group is understanding very well what is the question that is being asked so that I can have a chance to answer it or help answering it adequately.

And at this stage that's the only comment I wanted to make and I would love to have a bit more background or any description of the questions that are asked in that context from any of you in the group, Chuck. So here, back to you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Xavier. And for those that haven't been involved in the budgeting process over the last few years, let me just share a general perception from my part as one who has been involved quite actively that Xavier has accomplished in - since he's come on board, some very good things on the budget.

And so I'm very complementary not only to him but his team. He's got a great team behind him and I for one have enjoyed very much working with him.

So that said, Grace, could I ask you to kind of go through the questions that we had asked one at a time and we'll give Xavier a chance to respond?

Grace Abuhamad: Sure, Chuck. Let me go ahead and upload sort of a document that I had for that. We can get started from there.

Okay, so the document you had on the screen was the collection - compilation of questions I had pulled from the call last Tuesday as well as - or last Wednesday as well as the comments that (James) had put into a - the budget document. And Xavier by the way is now in the Adobe room.

Chuck Gomes: I see he's there.

Grace Abuhamad: Right, so we can go through them in any order you'd like. What I did is I - the first three were the ones that came up on the call that Olivier had kind of identified and then the Questions 4 and 5 refer to the operating budget

document, operating plan and budget document. And then 6 through 10 referred to the Excel spreadsheet and specific projects or questions by project in there. So I concluded the references but you can start in any order.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you very much, Grace. Let's just use the - unless any objects, let's just go through them in order. So the first one as you can, Xavier, is is finance working on a current breakout of IANA cost? So Xavier, it looks like you dropped off the phone bridge. And I'm assuming that the Adobe audio is working?

Xavier Calvez: Chuck, can you hear me now?

Chuck Gomes: I can hear you. There we go.

Xavier Calvez: Yes, sorry, I just needed to turn on my microphone apparently. Sorry. So question number one is finance working under current breakout of IANA costs? When will be available? Over the past few weeks we have worked on producing information relative to the IANA costs and it - draft is ready.

The - as I said before, there's a cost to try to insert a question or a purpose. The question that we tried to insert when building that IANA cost estimate is the question of how much do the IANA functions cost to ICANN today?

Therefore, it is in the circumstances of ICANN operating the IANA function considering the infrastructure that ICANN has already in place, considering the other functions that ICANN already operates and supports, what is the cost of the IANA function in those circumstances.

So we have a draft of that information. It can be shared at any point in time forward. And it's just a matter of, I think, either this group or the wider group

to determine how this information would be best shared but it's available for sharing.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Xavier, that's very helpful. Does anyone on the call have any suggestions about how that might best be shared? Do we want it to be - would it be good to be shared with the design team right away or is it better shared with full working group or should we consult with the co-chairs of the full working group? Any thoughts on that?

Or in the chat or raise your hand if you have a thought on that, please? Vika suggests sharing it with the design team so why don't we start there, that's a good idea.

And then the design team can decide where to go with that and maybe we want - may want to make a reference to that in our recommendations that we submit on Friday or even before then. So thank you very much, Vika, for sharing that.

Let's go - and by the way, I will assume if I don't see any hands raised that nobody has any questions or comments on a particular question and I'll move right on to the second one. Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Chuck. Cheryl for the record. Just to add on - totally support of what Vika suggests, I think it would behoove us, Chuck, for us to just inform the co-chairs.

Notice Xavier, we're not rushing to say let's quickly publish these, pretty much because we all understand the (unintelligible) for discussion you brought up with us. So I think we'll be able to make - base our recommendations on these but I think just, Chuck, as long as we do a note to

let the co-chairs know that, you know, these are in hand and we appreciate it. We'll not actually publish them unless we need to.

Chuck Gomes: Good point, Cheryl. Thank you. This is Chuck again. And Grace, give me an action item to - once I - we get those on the design team to send that to (Jonathan) and (Lisa) and just to inform them and - before we take any other steps. Thank you very much, Cheryl. Xavier, you're up, please.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. One - a couple questions or comments. When would you like that I share the information with this group and this stage? Is it as early as possible? Is there a specific timing that's preferred? And the second question - sorry, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, sorry for jumping in too soon. But - it's Chuck again. Xavier, if you can do it as soon as possible that would be great because then we can get it to the chairs and see whether it makes sense for us to make reference to that in the deliverable that we have to get out this week. So as soon as possible would be great. Thank you very much.

Xavier Calvez: Okay, so I suggest that I do it by no later than tomorrow morning let's say Eastern Standard Time if that works with everyone and tomorrow morning being, let's say 9:00 am.

Chuck Gomes: That sounds fine to me, Xavier. Unless somebody else thinks differently, let's just go with that. And I see Cheryl agrees with that as well. So now...

Xavier Calvez: And I had a second - Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Xavier.



Xavier Calvez: Sorry, just a second comment is that I also think it is best to provide information with this design team, first simply because I'm assuming this is because smaller group with which it would be probably easier to have a first pass at the information.

And I'm also thinking that I would want to use this audience here to provide explanation as to what is the information that we have put together. We have to try to make it simple as well as comprehensive. But obviously it is sufficiently technical that we want to make sure that the information that is provided is adequately understood and meets the need of the group.

And I was thinking about using this group as the review team that would help to make sure that the information that we share is understandable, understood, and adequate. So let me know if that purpose is not necessarily well served with this group but it sounded to me that the group would be well able to do this and willing to do this.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Xavier. It's Chuck again, that sounds like a reasonable idea to me. I have a follow up question for you in that regard before I go to Vika.

Would it make sense later in the week after you have sent that to us and the team members have had a chance to look at it to schedule a call to go over that with you? Or do you think it would suffice to just provide input via email? Any thoughts on that, Xavier, before I go to Vika?

Xavier Calvez: I'm completely fine with having another call. I think it would be useful. I would welcome certainly questions by email prior to the call simply because it would help me prepare to provide an answer during the call. But I think a call

would be really useful because it allows to be a lot more interactive on questions and answers. So I think that would make sense to me.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Before - again, sorry for putting you off a little bit Vika but I don't want to forget this. Brenda, if you could look back at the Doodle poll, see whether we need to send it out again for a possible meeting on Wednesday or Thursday and if we do go ahead and send one out.

If we've got enough information to pick a time - make sure though we check on Xavier's availability or someone from his team, whichever he prefers because I think he sounds like he will be a critical player in that. So let's check that.

And maybe the easiest is just to do another Doodle poll so that we get the new people that have joined as well. So I'll let you - Brenda, you're good at handling those things so I'll let you handle that.

Vika, you're up.

Vika Mpisane: Thanks, Chuck. Just a quick one for Xavier. I don't know if it will help, Xavier, I just wanted to check, we dealt with you in the ccNSO (unintelligible) in 2013 in trying to determine the cost that ICANN incurs in (unintelligible) ccTLDs and (unintelligible) we had with you and there were some recommendations of how we would like to see the information structured, especially information to IANA.

That was one function that (unintelligible) felt that we were using most - probably more than any other. So (unintelligible) information you will send will be such that it could - it will attempt to identify cost attributed with the (unintelligible) and cost attributed to other IANA customers.

Chuck Gomes: So Vika, we're having a little bit of trouble understanding you. So let me - so try and talk more directly into the microphone if you can. But let me ask Xavier if he understood the question. Xavier, did you understand the question that was asked? I think it was directed at you.

Xavier Calvez: Yes, I think I understood the question. So let me repeat the question that I think I understood and because that's the one I will try to answer. I think I understood that the question was about whether the information that I will produce will provide an understanding of the costs - the IANA function for the ccTLDs versus the cost of the IANA functions for the gTLDs.

And that's the question that I understood. The cost information that I'm going to provide is the cost of operating the IANA functions. They are not the cost for a specific customer, that analysis has not been done. So if we would call the ccTLDs or the gTLDs customers of the IANA functions I have not tried to determine a cost per ccTLD or per certain activity.

So the cost that we will provide or the total costs of operating the IANA functions for ICANN irrespective of which services and which recipients of those services are being provided to. Hopefully this is clear.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Xavier. And let me - this is Chuck again. Let me share a thought there as well. I would think that some of the costs really aren't separable.

For example, a customer service that IANA provides to gTLDs and ccTLDs - I mean they have to - they provide that around the clock and obviously the use of the services varies somewhat by gTLDs and ccTLDs but they have to provide the service for both of us all the way around the clock.

So - and I'm not - I don't know how realistic it is to be able to separate those costs. I suspect that the - that the IANA team right now - in the reports they give, you could break down the number of calls for ccTLDs and gTLDs and things like that.

And we might be able to then correlate the amount of call volume to G's or C's. But I'm not sure the finance team could do that. But let me start there and see if you wanted to add anything else on that, Vika, before I go to Alan.

Not hearing you, Vika, if you're saying anything. Okay, thank you, that you don't have anything else. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you. I suspect it would be possible to divide the costs in a number of buckets, that is the cost of IANA just being there and then the marginal costs to support the IFTF, the RARs, and registries and perhaps even divided between the two kinds of registries.

But I think that's a second order thing that we might look at doing as we go forward. And I'm not sure it needs to be done on the critical path for the transition to happen itself.

And on top of that, I think some of those distinctions in terms of what you consider base cost and what's the marginal cost are going to almost be - you know, not arbitrary but, you know, sort of someone's best rule of thumb and not be particularly accurate.

But in any case, I don't really - unless I'm missing something I don't see the need for doing that as we go forward for the transition. Certainly would be an

interesting thing and I understand from the perspective of the ccTLDs why that may have some value but I'm not sure it's on our critical path. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. Chuck again. Does anybody disagree with Alan's suggestion there? Including Vika? I mean does that make sense that that particular breakout even not only just ccTLDs and gTLDs but also the IFTF and the RARs that that breakout would not necessarily be on the critical path that we need to accomplish the transition.

Anybody disagree with that? Thanks, Cheryl for the checkmark of agreement. Anybody disagree with that, just put a red X in the Adobe Connect and we'll see that - I can just check that. I'm not - another agreement by Olivier. So let's assume...

Alan Greenberg: Vika has agreed in the chat.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good, I was looking at the checkmarks and not the chat. Thanks, appreciate that, Vika. And let me look at Mary's comment too because I've been focusing elsewhere. No, that's good. So the - so one of the things that the CWG could use is a document that the ccNSO produced as well to help break that out. So that's helpful, thanks, Mary, for that contribution.

Let's go to Question 2, identify all costs operational and recurring shown in the budget that pertain to IANA functions. This includes items converted in other parts of the budget and that are shared with other departments.

And if I recall from Grace this question was I think one from Olivier. And so if Olivier wants to - if any clarification is needed we can ask Olivier to do that.

But let me just ask Xavier, is that something that is basically covered in the draft breakout of costs that you've done? Or would more work be needed to accomplish that?

Xavier Calvez: Thank you, Chuck. So I have a few questions on this question. When we say shown in the budget, which budget are we referring to? Is it the fiscal year 15, the fiscal year 15, or another reference point for budget? That would be my first question.

Chuck Gomes: I think it's - this is Chuck. I think it's probably both but let me ask Olivier to comment if he can.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes, thank you very much, Chuck. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. We're looking at both budgets.

We're looking at FY 15 as the past budget and we're also looking at the forthcoming one since this will be the one that is likely to have to be changed once the - well, maybe not changed but certainly has to be recorded in a different way probably if we're going to make any recommendations for the IANA budget to be separate from other budgets.

So we're looking at both. And here I'm speaking specifically of - so operational costs and recurring costs as two different types of costs. You've got the one which are your basic operations and so on.

And then you have the ones that have to do with your investment in computers and other types of equipment so there are various costs that we're well aware of that at the moment they're not actually standardized in a certain way and as an example, and that kind of goes into the next question as well.

But looking at the full time equivalent number of people working on IANA functions, we've noticed that although X number of people work on the IANA function the full time equivalent number of people is different in the budget and obviously we're well aware that many resources are shared between different departments.

And so we would need to try and identify what all of those costs are and how are they shared to find out if those are indeed able to be recorded as being a separate cost or a separable from the other costs that you have there. But does that help?

Xavier Calvez: Yes, so when you say the FTEs for example are different - different from what? Just so that I understand.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes, so Olivier speaking, thanks, Xavier. On the one hand I don't have the exact numbers in mind because I haven't got the paperwork there but looking at the full time equivalent of the number of people that work on the IANA functions, when you look at the actual budget and it shows the FTEs in there on their employee levels, it's a different number than the number that we have as the number of people that work in IANA or on the IANA functions.

We've been told that there's X number of people that work on that. Obviously when we say there's - let's say, let's take a number. Let's say three people work on the IANA function, that does not take into account the people that are there to do any accounts or there's any translation of documents that is needed or these things because, of course, these are resources that are shared with other departments.

What we'd like to try and find out is if we can actually identify what all of these other resources are that are shared that are not purely IANA functions and that IANA - the IANA function needs and requires to operate.

Xavier Calvez: Okay. Understood. So I think that, one, the document that will answer Question 1 will also answer a large fraction of Question 2 and probably all of Question 3 since the analysis that will be provided is providing a list of operations or asks or functions that are required to be involved in the accomplishment of the IANA functions on an ongoing basis that are additional to the IANA department.

So when you were describing earlier that there are other resources than the IANA functions that are involved in the work I want to make a simple distinction. There is an IANA department within ICANN that has dedicated resources to operating the IANA functions.

There are other non-dedicated resources from other departments that contribute to the IANA functions within ICANN. And the analysis that I mentioned earlier that has already been done provides an understanding of what those non-IANA department specific resources are and what type of activity they accomplish so that the IANA functions are operated within ICANN.

I simply - if we can establish that the vocabulary definition that the IANA department are the dedicated resources and then there are other resources that contribute to the IANA function, which then are shared between those functions and other functions that support the ICANN operations, that are therefore requiring a certain amount of allocations.



So the answer that I will provide by tomorrow morning will provide an understanding of what are those other areas whether they're departments or functions that contributed to operating the IANA functions and that are not IANA department specific.

At the end of the day I think that whether it's a department of ICANN or - that's specific or another department of ICANN, it's nearly irrelevant. There are resources that contribute to operating the functions and they are either dedicated or shared. And of course, that understanding is very useful.

I have heard already in the comments or in the questions, the reference to - they will need to be allocated or that we need to be specified in the future what will be recommended by this group in terms of the legibility, visibility in what type of information on what type of recurrence is extremely important because I'm going to make a comment that also will help you understand what has been produced so far and what is not produced so far.

ICANN does not produce costs by either functions or tasks. So for - we do not produce on an ongoing basis, it doesn't mean that it cannot be done and that's what has been done for - to satisfy the specific requests of this group.

We have calculated an estimate of IANA costs for the purpose of answering this question at this time. We do not calculate the cost of IANA functions on an ongoing basis. It doesn't mean that we couldn't - it just means that we are not set up to do that right now or for any other specific functions.

For example, if you would tell me what are the costs of policy development and that ICANN - I cannot open the document and say this is what it is. I would need to initiate and complete an analysis which purpose would be to understand what are the costs of policy development at ICANN.

Presumably that would also require to gather the costs of the policy support department at ICANN as well as identifying the other resources across the - all the other departments of ICANN that contribute either fully or partially to policy development at ICANN. And that would be also a special purpose analysis - ad hoc analysis that I would need to perform.

If on an ongoing basis there's a number of functions at ICANN that we would like to be able to - on an ongoing basis, have cost information for either budget or actual or both, we would need to define what those budgets are or what those functions are for which we want to have the costs on an ongoing basis and therefore - and then initiate a process to enable ICANN to calculate those costs on an ongoing basis. (Unintelligible) trying or (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Excuse me, Xavier. Can somebody - can everybody except those - the person talking, please mute your phone and then unmute when talking? We're still getting a lot of interference.

Is there anyone that has not muted their phone besides me and I'm talking? Okay, all right. Now, Xavier, were you finished? Still getting interference there. Can we check with the operator to see where that's coming from?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Chuck, it's me - or it's not me more to the point. I'm only just back on the call but I was getting that same noise out of the AC room. I am driving but not in traffic. And I'm now muting.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Cheryl. Okay, all right, that sounds pretty good. Now Xavier, were you finished?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Chuck, it's Olivier. I missed what Xavier was saying in his last couple of sentences because of the sound.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Man: Someone who's still unmuted.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Go ahead, Xavier. If you can repeat a little - what you said towards the end there, it was getting very hard to hear.

Xavier Calvez: Okay, understood. And hopefully I will start back at the point of time where you last (unintelligible). What I was explaining was that ICANN on an ongoing basis does not produce cost information relative to specific functions or the operations of specific functions.

So for example, the IANA cost analysis that I will provide later on today or tomorrow has been produced as a result of the specific exercise, as a result of a specific question, and produced for the purpose of that - answering that specific question at this time. It is not an ongoing activity of ICANN to produce costs of functions.

If you would, for example, ask me to produce the cost of policy development at ICANN I would also initiate and complete a cost analysis that would require me to gather the costs of - that contribute to policy development at ICANN, which presumably would involve, of course, the policy support department but also presumably a number of other functions within ICANN that contribute to policy development and that are in other departments of ICANN. So that would also be another ad hoc analysis that I would need to complete.

I'm not trying to indicate that it cannot be done, it can completely be done. It needs to be done on demand and it needs to be specific ad hoc exercise because ICANN is not currently producing or set up to produce this type of analysis.

It doesn't mean either that ICANN could not in the future set itself up to produce this type of analysis on an ongoing basis. I'm only saying that we are not currently set up to do so.

Chuck Gomes: That...

Xavier Calvez: And I'm done.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Xavier. Very informative response I thought. The - let me go back to Mary and see if she would like to unmute and say something. She had her hand up before, it's down now. Mary, would you like to say anything now? Not hearing anything from Mary, does she need to be unmuted by Grace or...

Grace Abuhamad: Chuck, we're - and Mary, this might be - we're having trouble with your line so I think you're unmuted now. Go ahead.

Mary Uduma: Are you hearing me?

Grace Abuhamad: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Grace Abuhamad: We can hear you.

Mary Uduma: All right, I think the point I wanted to make is (unintelligible). I want (unintelligible) to first look into (unintelligible) with the indirect one and with corporate costs from other departments (unintelligible) is that there is (unintelligible) and the (unintelligible).

The (unintelligible) is (unintelligible). What I am (unintelligible) that contributes the cost to the CAP EX need to be also included in the analysis. So I don't know what (unintelligible) that this is (unintelligible).

So it is a - so it cost accounting model (unintelligible) CAP EX aspect of the cost of IANA (unintelligible) complete cost. (Unintelligible) operational cost and the overhead on the record and (unintelligible) the CAP EX aspect of the (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Mary. This is Chuck again. Xavier is then - you've got your hand up so I'm going to go right to you. I was anyway. Is there - is it reasonable to expect that in the analysis that you've done for the IANA cost that in most if not all cases the purpose would be clear? Go head, Xavier.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. So thank you, Mary, of the question. It's a relevant one and this is one subject that I would have addressed in the preamble to the email that I will send to the group with the analysis. When we produce this analysis a few weeks ago basically between mid-February we did not attempt to address he question of what are the asset costs for the IANA operations.

So the document that we produced that I will share tomorrow only has the annual costs of operating the IANA functions for ICANN. It does not have the costs of building the assets that are required in order to operate the IANA functions.

And if this group would like to formulate the question in the request this is something that I obviously - can work on in addition to producing the annual operating costs for ICANN. It will take a certain amount of time. It will not be immediate. It will not be by tomorrow but this is something that can be done and I would definitely agree is a relevant piece of information.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Xavier. Chuck again. And of course all of us I think understand - and this is really to the team members on the call, is that once we see this document Xavier's looking for feedback on that from us. So we'll be able to provide that on - once we see it. Olivier, your turn.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much, Chuck. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. And just adding to what Mary was mentioning regarding CAP EX, I wonder whether it would also be possible to show what we call a (unintelligible), a monetization of already purchased capital equipment and so on.

Because I do realize that this is showing us one piece at the moment across all of ICANN's budgets and IT resources, etc. are all shared. But if one was to look at strict costings one would - it would be good and it would certainly be important to also be able to gain a full picture of what it costs to run the IANA function from A to Z, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Olivier. Chuck again. Let me make a suggestion. To the extent we can hold off on some questions until we see what they've done I think we can be more efficient and then we can provide feedback and ask questions based on the analysis that Xavier's going to send to us tomorrow.

So now keep that in mind as we're doing this because I think some of these things - some of the questions may be answered in what he gives us. If not then we can raise the questions then and make comments then.

Alan, you're up.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I missed previous calls so - or calls if there were multiple ones so maybe this question's already been addressed. At this point we are not likely to be going out for tender to completely subcontract the IANA operation and do a brand new entity. How much of this stuff we're talking about right now do we really need for the transition?

And how much might be needed for instance if ICANN were to spin off a subsidiary or affiliate, you know, just for bookkeeping purposes but we don't really need for the transition plan? I wonder how much we're getting into the details that are both interesting and perhaps important in the long term but not something that we need to address in the next week or two.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Alan. This is Chuck. And I think you make a good point. At the same time, I do believe that once we begin to narrow down hopefully to one solution some of this - we won't know for sure how much detail we need until we know the details of that solution.

It may very well be that some of the detail we can get later at a later stage of the evolution of the IANA services. We may not need it for the specific transition out the door but we don't really know for sure.

So what we're getting right now - and it's not for this group to necessarily do the analysis in terms of what the - how the budget matches to the ultimate solution we select. But certainly it's something we should keep in mind.

And I think the working group itself in Istanbul suggested that, you know, it'd be helpful to know the cost. That's what they're giving us now. I think, Alan,

your point's well taken that we need to be careful not to get down so far into the weeds of something that is not on the critical path for the immediate transition just like others have said on this call.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, Chuck, if I may - have one more comment. I don't believe any of the solutions that we're looking at including contract calls really need these kind of numbers in great depth.

The only ones that might require it soon after transition or in the process of actually doing the transition is spinning off a subsidiary and knowing what assets we have to transfer to that new corporation.

So I don't think any of them - unless we're going out for tender and want to be able to do a sanity check or are they quoting us something reasonable, I don't think any of the solutions that we're looking at right now really need these in great detail and we - I think there's been general agreement that on the very short term this is not moving away from the ICANN staff and the ICANN physical infrastructure. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Chuck again. And as you noted yourself, if we went out the door with the subsidiary model, and I'm not suggesting that we will, but if we did that would have some cost implications where having the analysis done in advanced would save us time in getting there. But point well taken, Xavier, your turn.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I jump in there before you...

Chuck Gomes: Sure, Cheryl. Do you want to go before Xavier or let Xavier...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If possible because I'm kind of disagreeing with Alan.



Chuck Gomes: Okay, go ahead, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Look, I think in as much as it shouldn't obviously cause (unintelligible) on our time or Xavier's but I think as he and his team are answering our questions - these additional questions, even if they're just taken with notice and the homework starts getting done would be extremely useful.

I think one of the most powerful things in the tendering process or the contemplation of tendering process, running the ccTLD in .AU in the past has been our ability to look at these CAP EX's and amortization aspects because it just - it provides a very real, you know - it's a reality check pardon the pun.

And of course, we really need to also recognize that one of the things that we're likely to be recommending, of course, is to ensure that in the absence of contract and of course, we'd only be in the absence of contracts that such things as subcontracting could even be contemplated because no one is at C.2.1 or something or other, that is impossible with the current contract with NTIA.

Sorry, Xavier, Chuck made me read it. And also, of course, it's under that same contract that the assurity of having both wrap up possibilities under bankruptcy and also abilities to transition in inverted commerce, not the way we're using it, but to ensure ongoing operations including the cost for that are assured.

And it's in the absence of that contract that I think having these figures to hand would be extraordinarily useful so we know exactly - you know, in our inability to look at what must be necessarily confidential documentation it does give us a - I think, a reasonable rationale to assure community in the

future that what we're recommending retransition is valid. And with that diatribe I will go back on mute, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Cheryl. And before I give it to Xavier - our time's running out very quickly and I'd really like to take advantage of the time we have with Xavier to let him respond to specific questions we have and leave our debating among ourselves in terms of what things are needed by us and so forth separate from that.

We will need to get to that but let's really take advantage of Xavier's generous willingness to interact with us right now. Xavier, you're up.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you, Chuck. You made a reference earlier to keep questions to after you will have seen the document we have produced. I'm fine with that.

I just want to point out that in respect to the subject of capital expenses that we have been discussing just now, I want to reiterate that clearly the document that I will provide tomorrow morning does not include any capital expense reference since that's not the answer that we were trying to produce at the time.

If I may bounce back on that point and address both Cheryl's and Alan's - and the point that I started with - on this call, we can provide any analysis that is required and useful for this group. We just need to be really clear on what the question is that is being asked to answer.

As an example, capital costs, it would be a very different answer and a very different analysis to get to this answer, to answer the three following questions. What are the capital costs for ICANN to operate the IANA functions today? One.

Two, what are the assets to be transferred to a special purpose entity if we would want to carve out the IANA functions from ICANN tomorrow? Two.

Three, what are the capital costs to start the - to create from scratch the capabilities of operating the IANA functions? That's three. Those three questions are completely different from each other, different analysis, different answers, different purposes.

And they all relate to what are the capital costs. I'm not trying to gauge or guide your discussion. I'm only pointing out to the challenge in spelling out very well the question that you have for what purpose so that we can answer it adequately.

And my point being very specifically to I'm expecting that you guys want to know what the capital costs are. I think I heard from the previous conversation that the capital cost that you would like to understand are what those capital costs are for ICANN today, that's the first question out of the three that I listed earlier.

And I want to make to sure that I'm very clear on what the question is. So that would be one that I would want you guys to make sure you can spell out. And I'm not saying you should respect - it's not a one-shot only, you can have - you can ask several questions and we'll try to answer all of them, I just want to be very clear at what information you want to know. I'll shut up there.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Xavier. And again, I want to point out that I think that getting down to some specific questions like Xavier very well gave us examples for just now probably is going to be easier to do once we know the specific solution that the group is recommending.

So in other words, once we decide on a solution and put it out for public comment that might be a good time to ask some of those specific questions rather than getting bogged down in the specifics knowing that there's still quite a few variables that may change in the next couple weeks.

Olivier, your turn.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much, Chuck. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. And I was going to - well, provide my view on what Xavier has just told us here. I think that all three are needed, one, two, and three, very good examples that he's provided here.

We're going to need those in the future, doesn't mean we need them in 24 hours but I have a strong feeling we're going to need all of these because if we want to have a full analysis of the budget of IANA and how the IANA runs and if some of the solutions are going to say, well, this is how things would happen if there was a bankruptcy of ICANN and IANA had to stand on its own two feet, we would have to have those figures and show at least that we've spent some time working those figures out.

But I do understand at the same time what Chuck is saying, this is not a showstopper for us and I think that we can provide you with advance notice, Xavier, that these are likely to be needed and so you have the time with your team to identify how - if you would be able to actually find those out.

I believe it is possible but it might involve work that is outside the usual day to day running of things. And I don't know what my colleagues think about that because we haven't discussed this yet but my feeling is that we will need them and we'll need them maybe after the public comment period, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Olivier. And just to follow up on that and also what Alan was saying earlier in terms of what pressing needs we have now and ones later, as you're developing questions and comments for the analysis that Xavier's going to send us.

If you could comment in terms of whether something is on the critical path, in terms of doing the transition or maybe something that could be deferred a little bit later, keep that in mind and try and comment in that regard in comments or questions that you raise after seeing the analysis.

Xavier, is that an old hand? Or if not go ahead and speak.

Xavier Calvez: Yes, sorry, it's an old hand. I'm lowering it now.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank. All right, now let's move ahead. Four I think is maybe partially covered because I have - at least I have sensed - I don't remember whether it was in this design team or another one that I'm leading, we've talked about the fact that the IANA customer service is separate from the GDD customer service team.

But it is true that the IANA services as ICANN has organized right now does come under the GDD. So in some cases some GDD services that include IANA services will have to be broken out. But I'm going to guess that we don't need to really talk too much about that now.

I think we already know and Xavier and his team are providing an analysis that we'll be able to - probably identify any other areas within GDD costs. It sounds like they will have already pulled those out with the exception of CAP Ex that he just talked about.

So unless there's any objections I'd like to go on from 4 and go to 5. Anybody object to that? Okay. And then 5, it's kind of similar except related to accountability. My suggestion is is that we look at the detail they give us and see if we still need to ask Question 5 after that. So any objections of moving on there? Okay.

And Number 6, I think we kind of covered that as well. Well, let me stop and talk - let Olivier talk here.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much, Chuck. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. And I'm sorry to interject in your listing and going through the questions here. I was just going to ask one thing though, of course these are the questions that we have asked and we are flying through them and obviously it's a better use of time for them to be answered in writing.

But I did wonder whether Xavier had any questions about the questions that we asked and maybe we should also give him a chance then during this call if he does wish to stop you from going through the list and say, hang on, I do have a clarification needed on that, could you please explain? And then we're here to answer, thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Olivier. Chuck again. And of course, Xavier, please do that as you have questions of us. Go ahead.

Xavier Calvez: Okay, thank you. I don't have any other specific questions at this stage. The - what I want to be really clear on and I think I have so far - and if it's not clear then please let me know.

But what I want to make sure you can do is spell out the requests for information that you have very clearly, ideally in writing, not that I think it needs to be very formal but the formality of writing it down requires to spell it out if I may say. So I think that that would be helpful.

I'd be happy to help this group spell out those questions. But I want them to be really clear and also issued formally, not for any other purpose than making it clear what the question is, where it comes from, and who it gets to. I will provide an illustration that I think is frustrating to all of us.

I said earlier that I started working on IANA costs slightly before the Singapore meeting. I have produced an analysis towards the very end of February for internal purposes with the reviewers that had completed their work about then, that was a month ago. You guys still don't have it.

A clear path of communication would help, I think, make that type of work be completed and communicated more timely if there would be a formal process of question and answer.

So if you can produce the questions that you would like answered and have them in writing and send them through the adequate channels so they get to the person who can answer the question in your view, I think that would be real helpful to make sure they're answered as timely as possible.

My second comment is the scenarios that I was spelling out a little bit earlier that Olivier used for the purpose of his chat comment, of course, I made up but I made up on the basis of what I have heard.

I reiterate that I do believe that the cost whether capital or operating for those three scenarios would be quite different from each other and would require

definitely the significant amount of analysis to be performed by ICANN in order to be answered.

There could be - they could be answered at different level of granularity but producing even a high level answer or a - basically a low granularity or low detail level of answer would still require a certain amount of time. It is not a very simple analysis.

It's one that needs to be produced with a very significant (unintelligible) in purposes. And it is not one that ICANN has any - already available analysis to start from. I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Xavier. Now for a Questions 6 through 10, this is Chuck speaking again. For Questions 6 through 10, I would like to ask that if you or someone on your team, however you decide best, Xavier, could respond to those in writing to the list, I - they're very project - portfolio specific.

And I don't see a lot of value in taking the time on this call to go through those specifically. In cases where you think it's covered in the analysis you're giving us, just say that, see the analysis.

If more work needs to be done just say that but the - rather than taking - getting down into the weeds of those specific projects, I think they're questions that would help us to get answers for but I don't think it's best use of our time on this call to go through them one by one. Xavier, go ahead.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you, Chuck. So I believe that the analysis that I will provide by tomorrow will be helpful because it is more comprehensive and more specific that the information from which the Questions 6 through 7 have been drawn.



I'm not saying those questions aren't relevant but if you remember the statement that I made earlier that ICANN does not currently produce costing information for functions like IANA for policy or any other. The information that the Questions 6 to 7 was used to formulate the questions is the FY16 budget, that is currently for public comment.

Again, that information is not produced with - in mind, the intent to produce cost of functions like the cost of functions that you would like to be able to see for IANA.

So you're using to spell out the Question 6 to 7 and information that's not designed for the purpose of answering those questions but the information that I will share by tomorrow morning with this group was designed for that purpose.

I think as a result it may be helpful to wait for you guys to wait for - to have been able to look at this analysis to then determine how we can best answer the Questions 6 to 7.

One thing that I would like to say is that the analysis that I will provide by tomorrow as using the FY 15 budget information, that analysis can definitely be replicated using the FY 16 information if that would be useful and required, that can be upon request.

I also want to emphasize that when you don't - let me rephrase, when you produce an information for a relatively general purpose and then you try to produce a similar type of information for a specific purpose as a specific exercise there are inevitable structural (unintelligible) differences that made the two pieces of information very different.

And by the way, reconciling them together is not always possible. The budget is an all-encompassing exercise for the 360 degree view of the entire organization with a defined structure, with a defined approach, with a defined level of granularity, with a defined purpose, which is the operations of ICANN on an ongoing basis by the ICANN staff.

So they are not the right materials necessarily to look at the very specific focused set of functions with the specific purpose for that information to be produced in mind.

So I'm going back to the same statement that I made earlier, there are as many members as there are questions asked for a cost analysis. If you needed information, you need to spell out the question you want to answer. So that's why I want to be very specific about that.

Having said that I - again, my recommendation would be to wait for the analysis from tomorrow, which was produced for that specific purpose. And I think a lot of those questions will be more clear after that. And if they wouldn't be I'm very happy to answer them then.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Xavier, that makes sense. Now can I conclude the same thing for Questions 8, 9, and 10? In other words...

Xavier Calvez: Yes, so - I think so as well. Yes, I assume that 6 to 10 was the scope of that conversation. I haven't answered 4 to 5 and I am happy to follow up with the IANA to be able to identify if any of the IANA related customer service support is provided by the (unintelligible) customer service as opposed to the IANA customer service. I'm happy to at least start digging into that question if that is helpful.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very - I think that would be helpful so thank you very much.

Xavier Calvez: Okay, I will do that.

Chuck Gomes: What I would like - (unintelligible) what I would like to do is jump to the recommendation you've document. Grace, if you can put that up there. The clean one is probably best for now just to make it clearer.

And Xavier, what I'd like - I don't know if you've had time to look at these recommendations or not but the most critical thing that this drafting team - design team, excuse me, needs to be present by Friday is our recommendations, okay.

And it would be very helpful for us as a team to know that the recommendations we're making - first of all, are clear enough. And secondly whether they are feasible recommendations.

And so what would be very helpful for us on the remainder of the call, if it takes that long, to get your sense. Are we going in a reasonable direction? Are we asking for things that are not only - are feasible and reasonable? That would be very helpful.

And so if we - everybody has the ability to scroll down. If you'll scroll down to the recommendations section, the proposed recommendations, I'd like to focus on - like us to focus on those and get Xavier's reaction on those. Xavier, your hand's up, go ahead.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. So I'm trying to stay on the Recommendation 1, yes. And obviously my ability to answer the question, are they feasible, are they

reasonable, is only - I'm engaging only myself in that - in providing that answer.

I cannot speak for - with the limited amount of background that I have into the (unintelligible) transition, steward transition project, including the organization of this group, which is all of 24 or 48 hours. I do not have the entire framework or background to be able to fully answer those questions.

But I can give an opinion on the basis of what I'm understanding at this stage. So with that limitation I'm happy to proceed with trying to answer the question.

The IANA costs should be fully transparent so there's a few - there's words that need to be defined correctly. IANA costs should be fully and transparent only be in my view adequately defined.

So I think IANA costs - I think we mean the entire fully comprehensive IANA costs, not simply the IANA department costs or certain costs that are more obvious or specific as opposed this is the entire scope of IANA costs yet to be defined.

Should be - when we say should be what - should be in what context, in what framework, in what timeframe? Is it tomorrow? Is it in the future? Is it in a specific type of document, in a specific type of process? I don't know what the answer to that question is.

Chuck Gomes: That's a great question on your part. This is Chuck again, Xavier. And we didn't put a timeframe on that. I don't know that we can.

Obviously maybe what we should say and see if this makes sense and other people feel free to jump in, IANA costs should be fully transparent as soon as possible because we understand right now a lot of times they have - an analysis has to be done and so forth.

But going forward, this design team believes that they need to be fully transparent. That will become - they will be transparent if we go to a subsidiary model I think automatically. But we're also limited by we don't know what recommendations are finally going to come out of CWG.

So we have some of the same limitations you do but is there a way that that could be worded that it makes it (unintelligible) and feasible? Go ahead, Xavier.

Xavier Calvez: I would assume so. I think that if this statement is - if the statement is solution agnostic it's difficult to make it a lot more specific. I would suspect that maybe there is either a guiding principles that is subject of a recommendation and one guiding principle would be that the IANA costs are fully transparent at all times for any purpose.

Because I think that at the end of the day this is - I suspect the intention of this Statement 1 is that in the future - in any future state I think this group things that the visibility of anyone on the IANA costs need to be present, and need to be available, and thereof the IANA costs need to be transparent.

So it stands to be less of a request or specific requirement and more guiding principle for any future state. Maybe there's a way to formulate it like that if I'm analyzing the purpose correctly.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Xavier. Does anyone - I mean let me say, is there a - would you like to come back to us, sorry for fumbling around a little bit. Would you like to come back to us with some wording that - because I think you're right.

I think you captured it right. Just agree with me anybody on the call. I think it is for any future say, we think the costs should be fully transparent. So I mean is that the way we should word it? Or is - you want to respond to that? Is that what we should say? IANA costs should be fully transparent for any future state of the IANA services. Is that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Chuck, Cheryl here.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, I was trying to put my hand up in the room but I found driving and putting my hand up in the room a little more complicated than even I could manage.

The - I just wanted to pick up what Xavier's unofficially proposing in terms of drafting of text (unintelligible) excellence and to some extent I'd almost just be stealing it unashamedly from him when we release the recording and putting it into our own drafting.

But I did want the word he used earlier on compressive to be in that text as well. That was just my very brief intervention, thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Cheryl. So let's - Xavier, Chuck speaking again. Does that - I mean does that work? Does it say IANA costs should be fully and compressively transparent in any future state? Is that specific enough?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry, Chuck, comprehensively transparent is a ridiculous terminology.  
What you want is compressive costs that are transparent.

Chuck Gomes: Run that by me again, please, Cheryl. This is Chuck. IANA compressive costs? I didn't quite follow what you suggested there.

Grace Abuhamad: Chuck, this is Grace, if I can step in I think what - okay, go ahead, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, bless you, Grace. I'm sure you know exactly what I want to say, go ahead dear.

Grace Abuhamad: I think what Cheryl was going for was IANA's comprehensive costs, like the comprehensive costs of the IANA function should be fully transparent for any future state.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, does that work, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Cheryl. And thanks, Grace. Does that work for you, Xavier?

Xavier Calvez: That sounds fine to me. But I want to - I'm not responsible for making the recommendations so I don't want to influence too much the group. It sounds clear to me at this stage, again, for - to produce transparent analysis, then you would need more context. But I - again, as a guiding principle it sounds reasonable to me.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Xavier. And that's what we're trying to get, that's why I would like to go through these recommendations, make sure we're specific

enough like you have said several times on this call. And that we're not asking something that's impossible. Okay?

And 2 then, and I'll let you read it on - and everyone else read it on their own, I believe that is what you're doing in the analysis that you're giving us. Is that a correct assumption?

Xavier Calvez: I believe it is correct with the limitations of what is included versus not included in that analysis. But you're correct. For example, capital costs are not correct - are not included but the annual operating costs of operating the IANA functions by ICANN is what I will provide. So if that was what was requested in 2 then yes, that will be available soon.

Chuck Gomes: And we'll have the opportunity - Chuck again. We'll have the opportunity to provide feedback if we think it doesn't include something that's there. And you'll have a chance to respond to that in our next call together.

Number 3 then, this is a future one that the same kind of itemization that we're talking about for the current budget would be the ideal state for future - all future budgets and operating plans. Any questions or comments on that?

Xavier Calvez: Yes, the - so the - I think if I understand correctly the question here, in order to be able to answer this question as an example for FY 16 we would need to make sure that the structure of projects under which the entire organization works is defined and designed so that a selected list of projects can be extracted and when aggregated together provide the comprehensive IANA costs. It is possible. It would need to be designed as such.

And the current structure of projects has not been designed for that purpose. Therefore, in order to produce that information it would need to - the



organization would need to operate a retrofit of the project structure in order to allow for that analysis to be provided.

And again, the analysis that I'm reading here is an operating plan that includes the entire list of projects that make up the IANA functions for ICANN.

It is possible. It is not currently available as - with the existing information that we have produced and are using on an ongoing basis for the FY 16 or FY 15 operating plans.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Xavier. And notice two points of flexibility in the way we have worded that. Note that we said if possible for fiscal year 15. We understand the challenges there.

So we're not saying it has to be to the extent we can move in that direction for fiscal year 16 in the short time we have in front of it and the short time that your team has to work on that. So please note that, okay. We recognize that's a - asking a lot and it may not be totally possible for fiscal year 15 but we'd certainly like it going forward after that.

And then notice also we said at the end to the project level and below, in my own opinion, if it can be - if the projects can be retrofitted in the future probably not fiscal year 16 I would think but if they could be that makes it really easy because you're giving the TDL down to the project level.

If not, there's the - you know, maybe we just - certain projects have to be broken out a little bit below the project level. We're not saying which way to do it. I personally like the project - you know, retrofitting the projects to do that. But that's okay.

Okay, so now on the last three, I don't know that we need to - I certainly want to give you the opportunity to comment on those. But the last three are - they're future work that we're recommending be done depending on the solution, okay, that is recommended and ultimately approved.

And we'll certainly need finance's cooperating doing these three but I don't know that we necessarily need to spend too much time talking about them here.

And very quickly, especially since Cheryl's driving, the - 4 is identifying any related cost elements that may not be needed in the future depending on the solutions suggested. Number 5 is projection of any new cost elements that will be incurred with whatever solution is provided.

And then 6, a review of the IANA stewardship transition costs in the fiscal year 16 budget to ensure that there are adequate funds to address this cost. This is kind of the issue that - what four of us on your first webinar brought up, you know.

There's \$7 million in the budget for IANA transition and for the accountability stuff and AOC stuff and I think there's one other element there. We don't need to talk about that now.

But this is along that line, knowing that there's going to be some estimates and so forth but we want to, you know - we're suggesting that the CWG review and that going forward we review the costs of the fiscal year 16 budget at whatever time it is. It may be after they're approved, okay, to make sure that they're adequate funds, for example, in the reserves if any excess costs would need to be allocated like you've already designed in the budget. That's what that one is.

And so 4, 5, and 6 we need to deal within the future once we know the solution and even once we know the solution is approved. Any questions or comments on that, Xavier?

Xavier Calvez: The only comment I would make is that the support of ICANN finance or ICANN in general to any analysis of this group or any other is guaranteed should be assumed and is unlimited.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. And I - as you know, I knew that already from your team and from having worked with you. But I did at least want to reassure that there's no surprises going forward and that you understand the recommendations as they're being made. Does anyone on the call - go ahead, Xavier.

Xavier Calvez: No, sorry, I think I (unintelligible) to the point that we made earlier, 4, 5, and 6 are very dependent upon what solutions are being formulated. So I think they're good milestones of questions to be worked on once we have sufficient information to work on them. And we will make ourselves available then.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, I appreciate that. Chuck again. Anybody else - we're coming up to the end of our 90 minutes.

I want to open up the floor to anybody on the call to make any comments or ask any additional questions, keeping in mind that we're all going to work on looking at the analysis tomorrow and come up with questions in writing and comments in writing based on that analysis.

And then we'll meet with Xavier again later this week. Any questions or comments, please raise your hand or in the case of Cheryl or anybody else that's not in Adobe Connect anymore, please speak up?

So I'm not seeing anyone or hearing anyone so my question to the group, are we - other than the analysis that we're going to do and the rewording of Recommendation 1 that I think we've already come to agreement on.

Are we essentially pretty much done with this document unless anything that we might want to make reference to with regard to the analysis that finance is providing us? Olivier, please.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much, Chuck. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. And I think you've answered your own question here. I think it really depends on tomorrow and on the document that we receive - that we will receive.

I would be interested in finding out whether if there was a need to speak to Xavier again and have some of the answers or if we had any points to ask on the documentation that will be given to us that will be an ability for us to do so before we provide our report?

Chuck Gomes: That's the plan, Olivier. This is Chuck. The plan is to schedule - and we're going to do a new Doodle poll for Wednesday or Thursday, okay, with Xavier and Xavier, if you want anybody else from your team on it just let us know. It's your call.

We appreciate the commitment of you and your team to work with us. But the plan is on Wednesday or Thursday to do another meeting, another 90 minute meeting, hopefully that everybody can attend assuming that's possible but certainly maximizing the amount of participation.

And then at the end of that call after going - and now keep in mind, we want people to submit their questions and comments in writing to Xavier before that meeting.

In other words, before Wednesday so that he has a chance and his team has a chance to look at those to maximize our time in that call and then we will make the decision at the end of that call whether any adjustments to our recommendations and this document need to be made before submission to the CWG. Does that make sense, Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: That works for me, Chuck. Olivier speaking. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: You're welcome, thank you. Any other comments or questions before we adjourn this call? Grace, are you okay in terms of next steps? It looks like I'm looking over there right now. And thanks, Xavier, we'll just count on finding a time that you're available for that call.

And so - okay, Grace anything else on your end?

Grace Abuhamad: No, so my understanding is I have just one edit to do in the Recommendation 1 of the document so I'll put that edit in and then send it out to the group right after the call.

Chuck Gomes: Just send that out as a redline, it will be a real simple redline. That will be the only change. And then you've taken great notes and we've got the chat that will be available. So thanks everyone for the great participation. I hope we can get this much participation on Wednesday or Thursday. And hopefully we'll be able to wrap it up then.

Now the reality of the matter is this group may be asked or we may volunteer or whatever the case may be to do some follow on work with regard to budget going forward after we deliver our recommendations.

So I just - a warning in that regard so that we - because we've kind of got the background and we're providing the feedback to the finance team on their analysis it is possible that we will be asked to do more later on. But we'll deal with that when that happens. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: How could we resist, Chuck? How could we resist?

Chuck Gomes: What's that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: How could we resist?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Cheryl. Well said. So thanks everyone, meeting I think - and Xavier, thank you very, very much. You've been very helpful. We appreciate it and look forward to talking to you later in the week. This meeting's adjourned and the recording can end.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, bye.

Chuck Gomes: Bye.

END