

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
May 27, 2015
1:00 pm CT**

Coordinator: The recording has now started. Sir you may proceed.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Okay. Let me - this is Chuck Gomes. And this is the 27 of May 2015 and the Design Team M; excuse me, Design Team O meeting on the IANA budget. And we have on the call Mary Uduma, myself and from staff Marika Konings and Kimberly Carlson along with Brenda Brewer who was kind enough on very short notice to do the doodle poll and to set this up.

Hopefully Olivier will be able to join us when his ALAC meetings end - his At Large meeting ends and maybe others as well. But if they, they can listen to the recording and we'll take a look at the notes.

To start off with let me ask Mary if you had a chance to look at the - review the comments that related to the Design Team O. And you're - I think you're on mute Mary if you're trying to talk. There we go.

That was my mistake, Mary. This is O, not M. So my apologies. I also lead the Design Team M and have been...

((Crosstalk))

Mary Uduma: Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Mary Uduma: Can you hear me? Okay. If you can hear me.

Chuck Gomes: Yes we can. Go ahead. Go ahead. Were you able to review the comments that related to Design Team O? Okay. You're on mute again Mary, so. We were able to hear you when you went off mute. Anyway, let's go ahead.

So the first comment was from (afnic). And I highlighted the three suggestions that they make in blue font just to make them stand out a little bit. The - notice that the first point is - or the first recommendation is to suggest that the budget for IANA or for PTO - let's see, what is it? I'm getting my acronyms all confused this morning.

PTI be done on a multiyear basis rather than a year at a time. Any discussion on that? And Mary, I'm going to call on you next if you want to respond to the question I asked earlier, go ahead first. But then let's talk about the idea of a possible recommendation that the IANA budget...

((Crosstalk))

Mary Uduma: Hello. Hello. Hello. Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Mary. Go ahead, Mary.

Mary Uduma: All right. Okay. My response to that is that...

Chuck Gomes: Mary, there's a lot of - I don't know what it is. It's not background noise so much. But I don't know if you're on a speakerphone or something. But...

Mary Uduma: That (unintelligible) that - hello. Can you hear me?

Chuck Gomes: Can hear you but it's hard to understand.

Mary Uduma: (Can you hear me please)? Okay. You can't understand what I'm saying. Am I breaking?

Chuck Gomes: Oh now it - now I can understand you better.

Mary Uduma: Am I breaking?

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Mary Uduma: Okay. My suggestion as the response to the comment - the first comment is that (of the specific plan). When we're doing the strategic plan you can do four, five years strategic plan and that will take care of (unintelligible). So you do (project) on (unintelligible) drawing from the strategic plan. Yes. With recommendation that it should be - it should be given...

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I wasn't able to get very much of that. Marika, were you?

Mary Uduma: ...I believe that when we (unintelligible) the PTI (specific plan) will be a four year rolling plan and then (unintelligible) should be a (project) for this year. That's my response of the first one.

Chuck Gomes: I...

Mary Uduma: Did you get that? Hello.

Chuck Gomes: I apologize Mary but I wasn't able to get very much of that because of the quality of the audio. Marika, you maybe got it better than me because I'm sure you have better hearing than I do.

Marika Konings: So this is Marika. What I understood Mary to say is that in her perspective PTI should have a four year strategy or operational plan but with a yearly budget. And apologies, Mary, if I didn't get that right but that is what I picked up I think.

Chuck Gomes: Is that correct?

Mary Uduma: Yes, that's correct. That's correct. That is what I am putting...

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Now I guess one question I have is related to ICANN as the parent company. They have a five-year strategic plan. And the - is there any reason why you picked four instead of five or three or something else?

Mary Uduma: Well, I am not - I don't mind it being three, four, five. But my point is that strategic plan will take (unintelligible). Is good if you (unintelligible) the same as the ICANN five year strategic plan. I don't have problem with that.

I would say that in response to that comment that with the five-year, (or the) four year or the three-year strategic plan will take care of (that comment). While PTI has (unintelligible) in which it also be (unintelligible) by the community. Did you hear me (right)?

Chuck Gomes: I think I got part of that, anyway. And I like...

Mary Uduma: Marika, you can...

Chuck Gomes: ...I like your idea of a longer-term strategic plan and a one-year budget. It is kind of challenging to do multiyear budgets. It may be easier for an organization like PTI because their costs and functions and so forth are more stable over time than for example the ICANN budget.

So there may be some - it may be possible to do a little bit longer planning in terms of budget. But I think you could probably only have one real firm budget for a - for the upcoming year. But maybe we can accommodate what (afnic)'s suggesting by the fact that maybe with a suggestion that because of the criticalness of the IANA functions that there be some sort of a multiyear commitment to fund IANA at least at the current level.

In other words, maybe we could, you know, they could approve a budget for one year - a firm budget with a commitment to at least fund IANA at the same level for the following year. Does something like that make sense?

Mary Uduma: Yes. It makes a lot of sense. And well I don't - I think there's a little bit of stability when it comes to IANA functions. It's not just (unintelligible) and have a (unintelligible). I don't know whether - when ICANN does its budget it doesn't (unintelligible). Well if that will - if that will create stability or (unintelligible) with the PTI...

Chuck Gomes: I wasn't able to get very much of that. Marika, how did you do?

Mary Uduma: Oh my (god). Oh my (god). What's going on? Is it that my English is too bad or do I...

Chuck Gomes: No. It's not your - it's not your English at all Mary. Your English is fine.
There's some background noise and it's coming across like you're in a echo -
not exactly an echo chamber but there's lots of other noise coming through at
the same time. But your English is fine.

Mary Uduma: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Every one in a while I can hear you clearly but other times there's lots of
noise. Now Marika, were you able to get more - some of what Mary just said?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think Mary agreed with you suggestion. But I had difficult as
well hearing everything, so. Maybe Mary can type...

((Crosstalk))

Mary Uduma: All right. What I'll do - I'll log out and log in again and see where that leads
(unintelligible). Okay?

Chuck Gomes: I couldn't quite hear that but if you're suggesting...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...maybe we should try a dial out or some other connection. I think that's the
case.

Marika Konings: Mary, (would you) log in again in Adobe Connect to see if that changes her
audio.

Mary Uduma: I think I'll do that. I'll do that. (Right away) I'll do that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thank you. She's off and we're still getting the static. Let me put my phone on mute for a second, see if - no, it didn't appear to stop what's mine either. I wonder if we should check with the operator. Is part of it the connection, static? Brenda, can you check with the operator on the static? Maybe we should all call in again. Thanks Kimberly. Appreciate that.

Mary Uduma: Hello. Hello. Is this better? Hello.

((Crosstalk))

Mary Uduma: Hello everyone. You can hear me? Is it better now?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And Mary, what we're doing is checking - the operator is checking because it appears that part of the static we're getting is not from your line. And so they're trying to figure out where it is coming from.

Mary Uduma: ...better (unintelligible). That's all right. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: There's no static. Is that a fix maybe? Okay. Mary, go ahead and...

Mary Uduma: Okay. All right.

Chuck Gomes: ...try and repeat the last thing that you said please.

Mary Uduma: Okay. The last thing I said is that IANA has been operating and has gotten a lot of stability. And it's not just a new organization or a new initiative. So (I ended there) be following ICANN budget process. Now the five-year (unintelligible). And it's such a thing that in order to create confidence and trust (they) - (unintelligible) budget and then we need to form the PTI the next (unintelligible).

So why not? I don't see any problem with that. But I think (there have been) a lot of stability (unintelligible) of the IANA. So (unintelligible) of not having the process flow (unintelligible) the following year. And I don't think while (unintelligible) something we should be worried about. So we follow the IANA plan ICANN process of strategic plan and (unintelligible). That's my point.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. I certainly agree on the security and stability. No - I don't think any of us will argue with that at all. Olivier, thank you for joining us. Appreciate that.

What we're talking about is the (afnic) recommendation that the IANA budget be done on a multiyear basis, not on an annual basis. And Mary suggested that they have a four-year strategic plan and an annual budget. Just curious - I know you're jumping in in kind of the middle but although we haven't covered a lot of territory yet. What are your reaction to these suggestions?

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

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Okay. Excellent. Fantastic. Thanks. My thoughts on this is I wondered why the suggestion that one would have to look at a multiyear budget for IANA. Was that something for stability or financial independence or for - what are the reasons for making such a suggestion because at the moment the ICANN budget works on a single year budget?

And the ALAC has asked for multiyear budgets on several occasions especially when it comes down to projects, which require a sustained amount of funding over several years.

And I just wonder whether there was a reason therefore the multiyear budget. Was it to do perhaps with any investment that IANA might need to do when it comes down to servers and capital costs or others?

Chuck Gomes: Well, what they say, and they don't really answer it really well. But the sentence that follows that recommendation says it would allow PTI management and board to be fully responsible and not to rely each year on the budget allocation allocated by ICANN.

I'm not sure that makes them any more responsible. I think it gives them longer term information in terms of stability, which is probably good. What I had suggested I think before you come on is - came on the call is that there could be a one year approved budget with a commitment on the part of ICANN to fund it at least at that level for the following year unless circumstances clearly, you know, dictated otherwise.

So - and another point I made Olivier it's different with PTI than with ICANN as a whole is that it's a much more stable operation and set of services than ICANN overall is.

I mean the staff has remained relatively stable over several years. And their costs have I think too. So it's a little bit easier to go beyond the year with the IANA than it is with the overall ICANN budget. But that doesn't mean that it's still easy to do.

And by the way, if somebody - we have a small enough group that you're welcome to raise your hand but also if you want to just jump in and nobody's talking, feel free to do that and identify yourself. Go ahead Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes. Thanks Chuck. It's Olivier speaking. I don't have any preference either way I guess when it comes to this. I really believe that there obviously needs to be somewhere in ICANN's DNA when it comes down to the current - well, the contract it will have with PTI that it needs to adequately fund PTI for PTI to operate.

And therefore for the IANA functions to be stable. I don't know how that would be engrained into the system. Now whether one of the ways to do it is to have it as a multiyear budget, fair enough. But, you know, how many years do you look for in advance? You know, two years? And what happens afterwards.

So four years, five years? I think it would be difficult if one was to look at a multiyear budget that would span five years let's say to predict any changes in circumstances that might require additional capital investment or a significant investment and therefore it might actually play against the stability of IANA or the ability of IANA to respond to any increase in business or change in circumstances.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That's a - this is Chuck. That's a very good point, Olivier. So I wonder if we could - on this one I don't want to spend too much more time on this one.

But I wonder if we should recommend in response to this following up on Mary's suggestion that PTI have a - develop a strategic plan for at least four years and then have a one year fully approved budget but that the budget for the following year be approved at least six months in advance of that year

starting. Instead of doing it like ICANN does where it's approved a few days before the fiscal year starts.

And I think that comes back to what I think I understood Mary saying in terms of the security and stability of the IANA functions. What about - and by the way, I'm just throwing that out for thought.

We can put different - more than six months or less or whatever. But what about a recommendation along those lines? Would - does that sound good? Would you modify that in some way? Go ahead Mary.

Mary Uduma: Sounds good to me. It makes a lot of sense. There's a (unintelligible) assurance with confidence from ICANN (side to) PTI (trust) that ICANN (admitted). I think that suggestion makes a lot of sense to me.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Marika, you've got your hand up. Go ahead. And if you can help me a little bit with what Mary said, that would be appreciated.

Marika Konings: So I think Mary agreed with your suggestion because that would give an envelope of security and stability. But I was actually trying to get clarification on the exact wording because I'm still rewriting the first part. And I think you said something that the next - the budget is approved and then there's already commitment for the budget the year after or how was it exactly...

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks Marika. And thanks Mary for the feedback. So what I was suggesting was that the fully approved budget be done on an annual basis. But that each subsequent year be approved at least six months on advance of the start of the year.

((Crosstalk))

Mary Uduma: Mary speaking. Mary speaking.

((Crosstalk))

Mary Uduma: That would mean that the budget cycle of PTI should be different from the budgeting cycle of ICANN. That what it will mean.

Chuck Gomes: I didn't fully get that.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I'll just - heard what Mary said. Because Mary I think you said this would mean that the PTI's budget would be on a different cycle than the ICANN budget.

Chuck Gomes: That is correct. And that's a very good point. This is Chuck speaking.

Marika Konings: Just know that Mary has dropped - oh, she's back again in Adobe Connect. I think she temporarily dropped out.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: It's Olivier speaking.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: If I can jump into that. Yes. Thanks, Chuck. A few years ago - I don't think it was last year but the year before last year the finance department did test one thing, which was to go for an approval cycle that would actually have two cycles for the budget approval.

The first cycle of budget approval was due to have a deadline for submission of budget items by I think it was March for approval by April. And the second cycle was June for approval by the end of June; in fact I think the Board even approved that second part until after the end of the fiscal year.

And what we might wish to do here is to ask that the IANA budget itself be approved on an earlier basis than the rest of the budget. So no matter how - by how much the ICANN budget is delayed by any other incidentals or incidents and incidentals, the IANA budget would have to be approved by the Board on a much earlier basis and would therefore provide this element of stability and certainly cushion. It's just a suggestion. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: No. That's very good. I'm glad you brought up the - I think it was the special budget requests that were approved early; right? And they...

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Correct. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...(unintelligible).

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Two cycles. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I think they've done that now two years in a row and I think you're on target to a good idea there because - and by the way, this particular comment also ties into the (.nzet) comments - I think it's the last set of comments in these where they outline the steps that they use for (.nzet) budget.

And if we had the PTI submit a budget to ICANN let's say nine months -- I'm just thinking out loud, okay -- nine months in advance of the next fiscal year and then for approval by ICANN at least three months in advance of the start of the fiscal year. Would something like that work?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Works for me. It's Olivier.

Chuck Gomes: Mary. And you can just - if you want just click agree in Adobe if you want or whatever or disagree. So any objection to that approach Mary? Are you still with us? Okay. So it was my line that's causing the problem. Are you having a problem Olivier hearing me or Marika?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: You're coming on loud and clear Chuck.

Marika Konings: Your line's a lot better. I think they probably - I guess the operator adjusted your line because I think it was indeed originally causing the static but it has gone now.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Mary, are you in support of a recommendation like I just outlined where the - where PTI would submit a budget to ICANN at least nine months in advance of the fiscal year and then it would need to be approved by ICANN (unintelligible) in advance?

Mary Uduma: Yes. (Unintelligible). Listen. I don't have (unintelligible). I agree with you. I agree with you. Can you hear me? I agree with you. Can you hear me? I agree with you.

Chuck Gomes: I hear you but it's not intelligible for me anyway. Did you get it Marika or Olivier?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes. Mary...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Didn't understand anything there if something was said.

Marika Konings: Mary, this is Marika. If it would be helpful that we get you a dial out, you can just send me your number and we can try to call out to you. Maybe that will help.

Mary Uduma: (Unintelligible).

Marika Konings: Mary, are you still trying to (speak) or are you haven't muted your line?

Mary Uduma: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Mary, if you could go ahead and mute your line and type in your phone number where you can be reached, (that) would help. Okay. So now the noise has stopped and it looks like she's typing. So let's let her give a number to call out. Oh. Well, that's why - that's another reason - the roaming is another reason for - or in roaming does - oh, so she probably still has to pay even if we call her. Is that right?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. So we call her on her cell phone. But I'm asking if maybe in her hotel room if she has a - if she's able to, to go to her hotel room or another room where there's a fixed phone we could dial out to that number as well.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Okay. So for now let's go ahead and - Marika, you captured that recommendation?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I believe I have. It's the first paragraph on the right.

Chuck Gomes: First paragraph on the right. Oh, I must be way down too low in my - oh, there we go. Yes. I was - I needed to scroll up. So.

(Cheryl): Have I got the wrong (IT room) because nobody's (letting me in)?

Woman: Hi (Cheryl).

(Cheryl): Hi.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: (Cheryl), we're here in the accountability (AC) room today. It's Olivier speaking.

(Cheryl): Yes. Well, I've got the wrong (AC) room. Be good if someone let me in there.

Chuck Gomes: Hi (Cheryl).

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: So I'm just reading the notes at the moment is what I'm doing.

(Cheryl): I'll go back out and come back in again.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: I've (got) you the accountability room. It might be...

(Cheryl): I'm in there. I'm - it's not letting me in.

Marika Konings: (Cheryl), I don't see you waiting to get in. (Unintelligible) so you may...

(Cheryl): Yes.

Marika Konings: ...have to...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Sorry about that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So Marika, this is Chuck speaking. The - I think we probably should be a little more specific. The - it's not that the - I think rather than just saying the budget should be published, I think we should say something like PTI should submit a budget to ICANN at least nine months in advance on the next fiscal year.

Now I wasn't - we may also want to say something about how they do that like they - when they develop their budget they do that within PTI, you know, and I don't know if there's public comment or not. That's getting it - probably going a little bit further than we have time to get into at this point.

Now I don't know - I mean I think it would be good if they approved it six months in advance. Do people think that's reasonable? Three months might not be enough for ICANN processes, you know, from nine months to six months.

And so the question is would three months in advance be enough as long as it's not postponed to create the kind of stability that Mary was talking about? And as Olivier pointed out, they've done that on the special budget request the last couple years. So that may be feasible. Olivier, go ahead please.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes. Thanks very much Chuck. Olivier speaking. I'd say yes. Approval by March gives three more months. And that certainly gives a heads up and some measure of stability. And that's also I think might have been

something that - the budget cycle - ICANN budget cycle has advanced enough to have reached the point where they can provide numbers.

That said, I can't even imagine the numbers changing that much from year to year. So we might wish to ask for something even a little earlier, let's say by January every year.

Chuck Gomes: Right. Where they may - this is Chuck. Where they may change is when they have new efforts for example like we had with DNSSEC or with IPv6 and so forth. But hopefully those would be known enough so that they could at least put some placeholders in there.

And a budget can also be added to after the fact as long as they have the minimal budget to move forward to cover essentials - ongoing essentials. It doesn't mean that it can't be changed. And of course we've seen ICANN have to do that as well.

So is anyone not comfortable with the recommendation the way it's worded now? And except it should say I think approve the PTI budget at least three months in advance of the fiscal year instead of six months, right. Any problems with that?

Okay. Let's jump to (afnic)'s second suggestion. And all it is, is that they're suggesting an audit - an annual audit. It seems to me that's a pretty straightforward recommendation. Any objections to concurring with their recommendation there? Okay. I'm not seeing any.

So let's go then to the - the last recommendation I'm a little bit puzzled about. They recommend that it should be stated that PTI general manager should have full authority on PTI staff. I'm not sure that's an issue for Design Team O

first of all. But now we're getting into the management of PTI. Go ahead Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes. Thanks so much Chuck. It's Olivier speaking. And I agree with you. I don't think it's part of DTO. That's probably going to come down as part of the discussions we have about PTI Board composition and the management of - well, you'd imagine that the manager of - so the most senior person in PTI would have the power to fire, hire, do everything else that a CEO or senior manager has over its employees. Kind of...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Exactly.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: ...would feel really weird if that wasn't the case.

Chuck Gomes: So let's punt on that one Marika in terms of - maybe we're punting to the CWG and the Board responsibilities discussions as well as management although - anyway. So let's not for this meeting - we will - we're going to punt on the third recommendation there.

Let's jump to the next one from the ISCPC. And on that one they asked for cost estimates - they say cost estimates should be benchmarked against this figure. And they're talking about the figure of 2.3 million. I think that's not a very - and I think all three of us probably were in the call in - or the little meeting we had - side meeting we had in Istanbul about the budget. And we had (Xavia) on the phone.

And that 2.3 million I don't think is a very good figure to benchmark against. I think a better thing to benchmark would be the cost estimates that hopefully finance team is working on now that the co-Chairs asked for. Does that make sense?

I mean the idea of benchmarking against something I'm not sure we have much to benchmark against because there's going to be new costs added. Mary, go ahead. Looks like you're not on mute at least not in Adobe. But we can't hear anything. We're not hearing anything Mary if you're talking. Okay. I don't know what's going on there.

But it seems to me that the intent of the ISCPC is good here. I'm not sure it's worded in a way that's clear. But we definitely need - I think that our recommendations that we've already made kind of cover what they're talking about.

If we go to the recommendations in Annex Q for example, we're recommending that there be ongoing diligence to evaluate the IANA costs and make sure it's fully funded. So my suggestion on that one would be to refer to the recommendations that we've made and concur with them that we need to stay on top of the budget and make sure that IANA is fully funded.

Go ahead Mary. Now you're on mute now in Adobe but you may be on the phone. I don't - okay. So if you want to try - go ahead. Okay. Hand down. All right. Any objections to that approach on the ISPC recommendations?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just a note that we're going to try out - we're going to try to dial out to Mary now.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay. Good. Let's - unless somebody objects, let's go to the (crisp) team and - actually I don't know that there's too much for us to say on this one because the point is - and they don't see any problem with what we're doing with budget. It's just that what we do and what they do is independent and

that's okay. Is that a correct translation? Okay. If so, then we'll - we can just make a comment to that effect. Marika, you're okay with that?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. So basically the response is DTO appreciates the feedback provided and notes that there's no conflict between the two approaches.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That's good I think. Yes. Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes. Thanks very much Chuck. It's Olivier speaking. This one obviously is also to be taken in context with the fact that so far as far as I understand it from the discussions taking place both on the (crisp) but also in the IANA plan working group - the ITS Working Group.

Neither the RIRs nor the IETF have admitted any interest from contracting with PTI at the moment. They currently contract with ICANN and their proposal is to continue contracting with ICANN in which case obviously that - I'm not quite sure how that would fit with the PTI funding of the operation. That's another issue that we're probably going to have to discuss or the whole group will have to discuss or that the ICG is going to have to discuss.

Chuck Gomes: Right. And it shouldn't interfere with what we're doing.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Exactly.

Chuck Gomes: The one reality is though that PTI staff would actually be contracted to perform the numbering and protocol functions by ICANN even though those organizations didn't have - may not have a contract with PTI.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes. Yes. Thanks Chuck. It's Olivier speaking. I agree with you.
And I don't think it's one of our problems. That what they might wish to have to do with their contracts of course is that I think at the moment it doesn't allow their contractor to subcontract and their - ICANN would subcontract to PTI. But that's not something for us to work on. And I guess the ICG will probably have to pick that one and point that out.

Chuck Gomes: Right. Right. So that's good. So that said, let's go to Internet (nzet). And I kind of like what they do. I don't know what you guys thought of it. They outline the steps under B there that they go through and I thought those might be able to be customized as a recommendation for how the budget is developed for PTI. And let me stop there and let the rest of you jump in on that.

So I noticed Marika's suggestion that we keep our Adobe Connect mic muted. Mine is muted. So hopefully everybody else is too. Olivier, did you want to jump in?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: No, sorry about that. I think that's - it's an old hand for the time being. Sorry. I'm just reading the - reading this at the moment.

Chuck Gomes: Oh good. Go ahead and do that because I thought the steps are pretty good in terms of the process they use and could be used as a model for developing steps for the development of the PTI budget. And then going back to our recommendation and the first one from - on (afnic) with regard to timing.

While you're reading, obviously - this is Chuck again. There may be some tweaking we need to do to make it fit but actually it looked like a pretty good process. So when you're finished reading, speak up. And I'd be curious what the rest of you think.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: I'm being distracted here as well. Olivier speaking. I mean I am in the ITU cafeteria still at this time.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, okay.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: ITU in Geneva, so.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. And what we can really do is after the call but if you send to the DTO list the proposed responses and then I'd give people maybe, you know, a couple of hours to look at those before sharing those with the CWG.

Chuck Gomes: Oh yes. I think so. And then but maybe if we could try and get everybody to do that before not too late in the day tomorrow, it won't - that won't be built before the first meeting. But so that before tomorrow's out, we could submit these to the full CWG. Does that make sense? Okay. Any objections to doing what I suggested in terms of taking the Internet (nzet) process and suggesting it be followed for PTI?

Mary Uduma: This is Mary, please.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, and that's very clear.

Mary Uduma: I'm sorry - yes. I'm sorry I missed a lot. Where are you exactly please?

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Well we're down to the Internet (nzet) recommendations, okay, and which is the next to the last comment on that little document I - that I sent out. And they follow a process for their budget approval. And I suggested that it looks like a pretty good process overall to follow. And they added something about the IANA functions review as well.

So that we could adapt something like that as a recommendation for the way the PTI budget is developed and approved. Tying into what we said at the beginning Mary where we recommended when - that there be a four year strategic plan like you suggested, a one year budget that is approved at least three months in advance of the fiscal year and submitted by PTI to ICANN at least nine months in advance and a few other details.

You can scroll up if you're in Adobe and see the wording that Marika wrote down. And that - now very quickly to bring you up to speed Mary and I'm going to have to jump off in a little bit. I can't do an hour and a half because I've got a GNSO review call as well.

But on the second (afnic) recommendation on the audit, we supported that. We punted on the third one because we don't think it's up to us to talk about how the general manager of PTI functions.

Going very quickly, we agree with the ISPCP recommendation. The wording's a little bit different but we think the recommendations we've already made in Annex Q kind of cover this. We definitely agree with them that we need to, you know, benchmark the budget and make sure costs are covered and there's no gaps there.

The (crisp) team we're in agreement with them and - but there's really no action item other than to say there's no conflict and Marika has drafted wording on that. And she's going to send all this around today so that we'll have a chance to confirm.

If everybody could check it and make any edits or something then. And so now that brings us up to the Internet (nzt) recommendations. And let me stop there. Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much Chuck. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. And on Item 317 Internet (nzet) contribution, indeed I've not only read it but read it a number of times now and studied it. I think it absolutely makes sense that it looks like good practice - good financial practice and certainly good communication between ICANN and the PTI Board.

That should be because of the two organizations going back and forth that would obviously be something, which would bring stability. Obviously when you look at this and say well, you know, the PTI funding will come from the ICANN's annual setting of expectations of PTI and so on, there would be - that would also fall within the community feedback on the budget. So I think that would work as well.

Finally of course there is a question as to what happens then when the - if there was separation and PTI was to disappear and be replaced by another contractor, would this kind of - would this kind of recommendation continue with whatever other operator there will be at that time?

And I'm not sure whether we need the language to be today just pointing at PTI or pointing at PTI or any other operator that might take the place of PTI.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And that might work okay too I think to just say either or, so. Okay. And then jumping down to the last comment before I have to jump off for the GNSO review call - I'll get in a little bit late. That's okay.

The CWG accountability co-Chairs submitted this comment. I just highlighted the last part. And because they're dealing with the budget accountability, it seems to me - my thought on this and I'd like others to comment is that it

would be good for the CWG to recommend that there be specific accountability with regard to the IANA budget in the ICANN bylaws.

That was my thought in response to what the CCWG co-Chairs said. Other thoughts on that? Anyone. Yes. Olivier, go ahead please.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes. Thanks Chuck. Olivier speaking. I agree with you and I - I think that the proposal here sounds quite good. But that means we'd need to put this together. I mean put a process together. So develop the proposed process for the IANA specific budget review.

I don't know - yes. It is within our limit isn't it? So but I don't know if we need to actually have this in the final proposal that gets sent to NTIA whether this starts becoming an operational thing that then goes into implementation.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Very good questions Olivier. Chuck speaking again. Let me suggest this. I think we've got enough of a foundation to recommend the approach that we're suggesting to the whole CWG for the work for the next couple days.

And we can then decide whether that needs refining after we submitted it to the CWG. In the next couple weeks we can decide whether more needs to be refined before June 8 or whether some of that work can be done after the proposal goes out and before the transition happens. Is that a - any objections to that? Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Sorry Chuck. I didn't put my hand down. No objection from me. That's very...

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: ...well. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: (Cheryl), are you okay with that? With where we're going here? Is (Cheryl) - oh yes, she's still on?

Mary Uduma: Okay. This is Mary.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead Mary.

Mary Uduma: I'm okay with your - yes, I'm okay with your suggestion. And I want to (jump) back to 283.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Mary Uduma: And that got to do with the 2.3 million budget as benchmark. I think is not - that's bigger maybe misleading. I don't know what we recommended on that. That will benchmark but not too difficult because it has some cost element that were not included in that figure.

Chuck Gomes: You know, Mary, I'm very glad you said that because when you were off the phone, I said pretty much the same thing. That figure is not a good...

Mary Uduma: All right.

Chuck Gomes: ...figure.

Mary Uduma: Right. (Great).

Chuck Gomes: So you're confirming what we talked about earlier. And you can see Olivier's agreeing with that as well. So we're on the same page on that one.

Mary Uduma: All right.

Chuck Gomes: We think the intent of the ISCPC was good. Using that \$2.3 million budget that's not a good thing to benchmark against. And we recognize that, so. Okay. Well I have to go to jump on another call. Marika, are you comfortable with what we have enough so that we can - that you'll put it out to our DTO list and we can - and please try and comment today if you have any edits so that as early as possible tomorrow this can be sent to the full CWG.

Mary Uduma: Okay.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I can send it out now. I made a note on the right hand side and asked for people to provide input today. And Chuck, if I could just ask you a clarifying question.

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Marika Konings: You were referring to a GNSO review call that is on now. That is not the GNSO Review Working Party, right? Is that another call?

Chuck Gomes: Well wait a second. Let - hold on a second. It's...

Marika Konings: I don't have anything on my agenda, so...

Chuck Gomes: Let me look at my calendar. What - I have some meeting that starts - I think has already started. Let's see. Oh no, no. It's not GNSO review. You're right. It's a...

Marika Konings: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...Registry Stakeholder Group - our charter meeting. And I just...

Marika Konings: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that I wasn't missing a call I needed to be on.

Chuck Gomes: No. You're not. You're not.

Marika Konings: Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks for asking. And thanks everyone for rushing through this with me. I think we - this will be constructive for the CWG. And if they're supportive of where we're going, we can then decide what other work needs to be done and when it has to be done. Have a good rest of the day everyone. Thanks.

Man: All right then.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Coordinator: Thank you for calling the digital replay service.

END