ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
November 4, 2015
3:00 pm CT

Coordinator: The recordings are started. You may proceed.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much. This is Chuck Gomes. And this is the CWG
Stewardship Design Team O meeting on the 4th of November, 2015.
Welcome to those that are on the call.

The purpose of this meeting is kind of a little kick off for our reactivating
Design Team O. And the background for that goes back to a budget planning
session that was held in Dublin, although I participated and wasn't in Dublin,
on Sunday afternoon into the evening. And in that session we obviously talked
about the process going forward and Xavier and Carol and others on the
Finance Team did a good job of leading us through a good discussion.

But one of the things that came up was the budget implications with regard to
the eventual implementation of the CWG Stewardship recommendations. And
let me be clear right up front that it's not our role to decide how or when the
implementation will occur but it seemed natural for us as the IANA budget
group in the CWG to serve maybe a coordinating role with regard to preparing
and contributing to the budget process so that hopefully any delays can be

minimized as much as possible with regard to the budget process and the overall implementation.

Again, let me be clear, it's not our role to decide how things should be implemented or what. But if we can facilitate the full CWG and the assumptions that will be built into the budget then I think we will contribute in a constructive way.

Now so to get things started, hopefully all of you saw the slides that Xavier or - and - has. And I would like him to go through those. I hope he can speak now. The - and go through these slides. They're up in the Adobe right now to kind of set the stage for what we're doing and then we'll open up discussion on that after he does that. So, Xavier, can you speak now?

Not hearing him so there must be something going on with regard to that. The - no, we're not hearing you, that's correct. So are you on mute? Have - Xavier, have you dialed in or you in the Adobe? So not connected at the moment so we'll let him try and get connected so that we can hear him.

The - in the meantime why don't we go to the next slide - the second slide and we'll just...

Xavier Calvez: Chuck?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...for people to review. Are you there? Xavier?

Xavier Calvez: Can you hear me now?

Chuck Gomes: Oh, we can. Very good. Very good.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. I (unintelligible) mic capabilities available so then I was able to take in. Sorry for that false start.

Chuck Gomes: No problem. Can you go ahead and go through these slides that you sent and then we will open it up for discussion to make sure that everyone understands the process and how it relates - the budget process, operating plan and budget process and in particular how it relates to the transition and budgeting for that.

Xavier Calvez: Okay. And I have Trang with me in my office so she will join in as needed. So the slide that is first in this presentation on which we are now is one that we put together - and I apologize for the formatting and the bubbles at the top that's not appearing correctly, is a PDF issue.

Is a slide that we presented during the session on Thursday morning, was it, or Wednesday morning in Dublin with the CWG to just lay out the - in parallel the two timelines for, one, the planning process at the top, and second, the transition process at the bottom. (Unintelligible) given the opportunity to state that from our perspective the two timelines and processes are independent from each other but obviously are carried out in parallel. And what happens or does not happen from a transition standpoint needs to be taken into account from a planning standpoint to determine how we reflect the requirements of FY'17 as we can see them.

And the main topic here is to say that based on the logistics to produce an operating plan and budget document that is intended to be published for public comments on March 5, it takes a (unintelligible) of time to put together that document whilst all the assumptions are finalized and laid out. There's consolidation, there's reviews, there's drafting, there's further reviews, there's a (BSE) review, anyway there's a timeline that's required.

And this is where we had laid out basically a cutoff of January 15 or approximately January 15 to have finalized any assumptions that (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Did we lose Xavier?

((Crosstalk))

Xavier Calvez: ...when we look at that we can see that - sorry, Chuck, you were saying?

Chuck Gomes: Well you disappeared for a little bit and came back but you seem to be coming through again. Go ahead.

Xavier Calvez: Okay, sorry. So the bottom line is that under the presumption that the transition process timeline I the one that is here and we are showing here the scenario of the proposal to the board NTIA is made available by the end of December 2015, which will...

((Crosstalk))

Xavier Calvez: It has changed already so it's pushed out a bit. So but I guess it just makes the point even further that we will have to basically define an assumption of how we're going to reflect the potential proposals in the plan approximately by

January 15. And therefore under that approach what assumptions should we define for...

((Crosstalk))

Xavier Calvez: So I can stop here though to see if there's any questions or comments that we want to make at this stage before we move on to the next slide.

Chuck Gomes: So does anyone have a question? And while you're thinking about that so the intent of our work in Design Team O is really, between now and the 15th of January is to assist the CWG as much as possible in clarifying the assumptions that staff will use to develop the draft budget between the 15th of January and the 5th of March. So the cutoff for the assumptions is 15 January. Now that does not mean that the assumptions have to be totally locked in. We know that there's lots of work going on and things might change.

But to the extent that by January 15 the CWG can reach as much consensus as possible regarding the assumptions that will be built into the budget for the transition, the fiscal year '17 budget, then that will obviously make the process much more effective during the public comment period which starts on the 5th of March and lessen the chances of problems or delays after that.

Now again, it doesn't mean that things can't be changed because we can't really control that in terms of the overall processes for accountability and for the transition itself. But our goal then would be to assist the CWG as a whole, because it's not up to us to define the assumptions, but hopefully we can facilitate discussion in the full CWG so that before we get to 15th of January there's reasonable, maybe full consensus in the CWG with regard to what assumptions should be made and building that draft budget.

Xavier, go ahead.

Xavier Calvez: Chuck, thank you. I think this is helpful to clarify. I was simply going to offer a slightly different twist to what you just said in the sense that we don't believe that it's necessary for the CWG to develop anything further then what has currently been developed for the simple planning of - sorry - purposes of the planning meaning it's not the planning process that requires the CWG to define anything further.

But I think from my perspective would be really helpful is that we can use this group to help ensure that the assumptions that we would collectively as a community define to include in the plan are not conflicting and the CWG does not object to that assumption or those set of assumptions being retained in the plan because it would be stupid for all of us together to have a different perspective as to what we reflect in the plan.

So it's less about the CWG developing anything further relative to the proposal of the CWG but it's more, in my views, for us to have open lines of communication that let us be able to spell out assumptions that make sense in this group, the DTO could really help doing that. And then communicating with the CWG those assumptions to ensure there is no conflict or objections in these assumptions being consistent with the spirit of the CWG proposal.

That's the way I'm looking at it. Does it make sense, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: It does, Xavier. And I think maybe you said it clearer than I did. So again, we're not changing anything in the proposal but we're going to review the assumptions and test them not only with ourselves but ultimately with the full CWG to make sure we're all on the same page so that as we move down the road and the budget is built there - hopefully will only be minimal changes if

any to the assumptions that will be built into the draft budget. So, yeah, that's very good.

Now let me open it up to anyone who has a question because it's important that we're all on the same page in the design team with regard to this. Any questions? Okay, sounds like everybody is okay on that so go ahead and proceed, Xavier.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. Thank you, Chuck. Can you go to the next slide, please? So I think that Mary and Chuck were part of the group that met in Dublin on the Sunday and of the local time and of course Chuck was on the phone with us. But just to recap what I think are the key takeaways relative to what we are discussing from the discussion of that group was let's try to keep things simple, one.

And second, in no specific order, let's try to keep the process on time. I think that from an accountability standpoint it would be - first of all it's not the best practice. Second, we want to be on time. Third, it would be really looking bad at this time from an accountability standpoint that we do not manage to keep the process on time. So I think it's a very important requirement that's independent from anything else.

Keeping things simple as a number of - or driven, in our views, by a number of requirements which is simply, one, we need to be able to make the plan sufficiently simple that as many people can look at it, understand it and be able to comment on it in having overly complicated structure and approach in the plan would hinder that ability.

Two, it's also easier to produce a plan where things are simple. And, thirdly, even though it's not on this slide, considering the fact that we need to finalize

assumptions so much in advance anyway of having a large amount of information to be able to plan in detail then keeping things simple is also the best approach to not try to define assumptions without having the ability to and therefore take positions that would need - that would require justification without having the facts that support that justification.

So precision is not accuracy, it's no use to be very granular without the information to do so. This is the approach or the mindset of the (unintelligible) the consensus of the group that discussed on that (unintelligible) for both Cheryl and Olivier to have that feedback and Cheryl was - as it was part of the time in order to then go into the next slide which is what can we think is an approach on the planning basically for the impact of the CWG proposal during FY'17.

So if we go on the next slide. Thank you. So I was simply trying to spell out here at the very high level what I'm suggesting for purposes of simplicity and keeping on time we do for the budget. I think that there is, you know, at this stage after Dublin there is a presumption or a consensus that timing being a side note for the minute, we will find a way for this transition to effectively happen and therefore we should have, as a base scenario, a scenario under which the PTI is implemented and the - and therefore we need to define an approach of how the PTI is (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: You went blank...

((Crosstalk))

Xavier Calvez: ...transition process would be such that there would be nothing to reflect in the FY'17 plan from an implementation standpoint. Therefore we are suggesting that there is a base scenario that we are retaining the operating plan and

budget for '17 and that scenario being the PTI is implemented. In addition, we're also suggesting to have a base approach which is there is no operational separation or no change to the current operational separation, should I say, between the IANA functions in the rest of the operations of ICANN, there is no change between after the implementation or before the implementation.

And therefore we keep things as is from a separation standpoint. For example, there is a separate IANA department where (Elise) and her team are located. Everybody else that participates to the IANA functions are...

Chuck Gomes: You went blank again. Not hearing you, Xavier. Can people hear me?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes we can, Chuck. It's Xavier we keep dropping.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Okay so, Xavier, I don't know - periodically you keep dropping and at the moment we cannot hear you so not sure what's going on at your end.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: It's Olivier here. There have been some issues with Adobe Connect. I've had some earlier today with - and I've got good connectivity around here. But it seems to drop out for a while and then it catches up and drops out and catches up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: These things...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Maybe if we could just get him to pick up a phone and Brenda could dial him?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, so, Xavier, we're not hearing you. If you haven't dialed in I wonder if it's possible for you to dial in because it appears that you're being dropped periodically in the Adobe room if that's how you're communicating.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm sure Brenda is trying to sort it all out but, you know.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You know, Mary's already got a slow connection and it'd be impossible for her I would have thought. Yeah thanks, Trang. Be good if we could get a telephone link as well there.

Chuck Gomes: While we're waiting here. Trang, I really appreciate you participating in these calls as well since you're tasked with the whole team there on implementation so thank you very much for joining us along with those from finance so.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, it is appreciated, you're right, Chuck. One of the questions I wanted to ask is - Cheryl for the record, by the way, one of the questions I wanted to ask or comment perhaps more than a question I wanted to ask on this slide is I think it's fairly important that as this - this planning aspect is socialized that it's terribly clear, and popped out quite obviously in any documentation, that this is an FY'17 approach. And that there is no resistance to looking at opportunity for structural separation or operational separation from a reporting perspective let alone from a future structural separation potential.

So I just want to make sure that community doesn't grab on to what looks like a very sensible plan to me to get this thing going as any form of (unintelligible) to resist more detailed reporting capabilities and getting a handle on more specific (unintelligible) analysis in the future. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Cheryl. This is Chuck. And Olivier, I'm going to go to you. I think your point is well taken and that's probably a question once - for Xavier when he gets back on. Does staff view the - this very minimal implementation of PTI in terms of separation as a temporary solution or a - if it works a longer term solution? And I'm not advocating one way or the other but I'm curious as to what staff thinks on that. And that would be a good thing. Let me go to Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks. It's Olivier speaking. I was going to say exactly what you were asking here, whether this is a temporary solution or whether this is something in the longer term. I'm discovering this as we're going along since I did not attend the meetings in Dublin. I was unable to do so.

And I personally think it seems like a very careful and well thought out approach as it is proposed to us here. Maybe I guess in socializing it with the other members of the working group, of the CWG, we do have to remind them of the budget planning process being from fiscal year two another fiscal year in which case the FY 17 would start on 1 July. And just because the number 17 is there doesn't mean we're waiting until 2017 for this to happen. That's just a concern because I have noticed in some of our own community some confusion always with regard to the fiscal years. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Olivier, that's helpful. And I'm going to add another point to what Cheryl and Olivier said. I think point 2 on the slide in terms of presenting it to the full CWG to test it and make sure we're all on the same page needs to be elaborated quite a bit more. We don't need to go into minute detail by just saying no change to operational separation probably needs to be explained further.

And I think I understand, probably all of us on this call understand what this staff means in terms of "no operational separation" but I suspect there will be people in the CWG that don't. And I think we need to add to this things like I mean, PTI will have its own board and I don't know what that means in terms of any management changes. Does do we also mean that there would be no changes in management? I think it's pretty clear that the shared infrastructure and overhead in this scenario would be just like they are now.

But at the same time from a budget point of view I think it's essential that the PTI budget, whether there is operational separation or not, be clearly differentiated from even if it's with shared expenses. I think that community and in particular the CWG is going to want to see a clear unambiguous breakout of the costs of PTI. So I think number two really needs to be you know, resented to the full CWG in quite a bit more detail.

Trang, go ahead, please.

Xavier Calvez: So it's Xavier because for some reason I got kicked out but Trang hasn't, which is great.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: You didn't sound like Trang. Go ahead, Xavier.

((Crosstalk))

Xavier Calvez: I'm not trying to, by the way. I'm not trying to. So let me try to address the two comments that have been made. And Cheryl, I apologize while you were speaking we reconnected so I don't know what we've heard and not heard but I think…

Chuck Gomes: Seems to have lost you again.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh dear. Can someone just phone the man please?

Chuck Gomes: I would be appreciated. Thank you Cheryl.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Make it better.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Chuck, its Olivier speaking. I saw that Trang's hand had been up for a while and perhaps we could have given the floor to Trang. But now Trang has also disappeared. So it seems that wherever they are their telcos are not doing too well.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I get at impression, Olivier. Thanks. This is Chuck. And I think Xavier was using Trang's connection and apparently Trang's connection went down as well.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...we just couldn't let Xavier speak perhaps. It's all about Xavier (unintelligible) I think.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Marika are you on or Brenda are you on the audio or just the Adobe?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I am on audio.

Chuck Gomes: So if we could get them on the audio be a phone it seems like that might solve our problem. I don't know why that hasn't happened. And Brenda is working on a dial out...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks, Brenda.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: She's working on it. Olivier, agree with your comment in the chat. And I think Cheryl is agreeing with that too in her previous comment there.

Xavier Calvez: Chuck, this is Xavier. We joined on the phone because both Trang and I have been kicked out so at least...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Excellent. So go ahead and pick up where you left off and if we need to back up to Cheryl's comments we can do that but let's see what you've got.

Xavier Calvez: Okay. So apologize for the hectic speech here with the logistical challenges. So bottom line the question was is the approach of no change to the operational separation a short or long-term option from a staff standpoint. So let me spell it out the way I think about it and I feel that Trang thinks in the same fashion.

What we are seeing of the CWG proposal is not addressing any specific requirements as to a level of operational separation. And if that's correct under that premise why go for more complicated than needed and therefore not changing the operational separation of the functions versus the way they

currently are separated is simply the path of least resistance, the easiest approach and also the less costly approach.

So that's the only one that makes sense to do as long as it is not in conflict with the CWG proposal. And we have not so far been any conflict between that approach and the CWG proposal. And of course if the group sees differently you should let us know because we are not seeing that issue at this stage. So that's why we are going with this approach for now.

And whether it's a short-term or long-term question is dependent upon whether there would be later on a different set of requirements driving the need for further separation. And I will also try to address the point that you made, Chuck, visibility on the budget.

To me this is a separate and additional topic is how much information to be able to share and provide relative to the PTI/IANA functions budget. And from my perspective we have already started but we would continue in probably more extensively to provide a view of what the PTI budget is within the overall ICANN budget.

As part of that ICANN budget document that's provided for public comment we would have a very specific section that identifies the overall PTI budget with an amount of information and detail that I think we could altogether design in the fashion that makes sense to have and that we would produce as part of this document.

So that visibility on the budget in my view is not tied or conditioned by the level of separation. By the way, what that separation is is something that also would make sense in my view for transparency and clarity, would make sense to spell out. So when I say no change to the existing separation we should say

what is the existing separation so that is very clear to everyone. And then it's more easy or easier simply to comment as to whether that makes sense or not. And I think that's probably a prerequisite to be able to retain the assumption from a CWG standpoint.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Xavier. As you can see by my checkmark I totally agree with that last point you made. And I think it's really important to see that. Now one of the things that I understand, and I'm not in the Accountability CCWG, but from my understanding with regard to budget accountability there seems to be an understanding in the CCWG, and I think the broader community, that accountability with regard to the IANA or PTI budget is a critical part of the budget accountability.

So having a clear picture of what that budget is and how it changes going forward I think is a prerequisite. Now Xavier, are you saying that come the point of - I know you didn't go this far, let me rephrase that. So are you planning that by the time the transition happens that you would be able to - the finance team I'm talking about - would be able to present a clear PTI budget regardless of the fact that there's shared infrastructure overheads and no operational separation?

Or do you see that as a process that may have to be continued past the actual transition assuming the transition happened by September 2016?

Xavier Calvez: Thank you, Chuck. So can we - let me back up a second. I'm expecting that by the 5th of March in the document that will be submitted for public comment we would under the scenario that I laid out in the slides, we would have somewhere in the document assumptions laid out for how and how much of the PTI is implemented by when in FY'17 or prior to and with what impact

financially and possibly presumably, in my views, with project level information.

Simply because - the reason I'm saying that is simply because that's our standard, right? This is what our standard is since last year and therefore that's what I'm presuming would be presented. So yes, I would expect to have a PTI budget in section with information relative to that PTI budget in the FY'17 document submitted for public comment by the 5th of March irrespective of when the transition is the only caveat relative to that last comment is is if the transition would be of such a timing that its implementation would now be planned outside of FY'17, meaning after July 1 '17 then of course the FY'17 plan would probably not have the same shape than it would if the implementation starts during FY'17.

So for now I'm only assuming that the transition would be starting to be implemented sometime during FY'17. Under that assumption we would show a PTI budget probably at the project level with a certain amount of assumption. Does that answer your question, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I think it does. Anybody else have a question in that regard? That clearly answers my question. And let me reemphasize too, while people are thinking about that, that the - what you said about the providing additional detail in terms of what no change in operational separation means is really critical I think in terms of what we present to the full CWG to test this base scenario...

((Crosstalk))

Xavier Calvez: And I think that that can be done earlier than obviously March 5 meaning over the next few weeks we can spell out how things look like today so that it can be used as an understanding of what that assumption means which I would

assume is going to help everyone feel comfortable or not with that assumption.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, that's good. In fact we'll come back to that because I think when we finish this - thanks for the checkmark, Cheryl. This is Chuck. I think that's going to probably be an action item that'll come out of our meeting today because I do believe in the next couple weeks if possible, it doesn't have to be exactly two weeks, but if we could in the next couple weeks come up with what this base scenario and its assumptions are and what they mean and present that to - after another call by this group - present that to the full CWG for their feedback will be a critical step.

Because two weeks from now we're already well past the middle of November and so forth and we know we're going into a holiday season so it'd be really good if the full CWG - we can test the consensus of the assumptions before the holiday season if possible so we don't have too much carried over into January.

Are there other questions or comments? Okay, Xavier, why don't you go ahead and finish the - we stopped at Item 2 - why don't you go ahead and finish the slide?

Xavier Calvez: Just one additional last comment on what you were saying earlier and hopefully what I will say will make sense to everyone. But you mentioned, Chuck, the shared infrastructure, under the presume that we have a PTI, which is a separate legal entity, there will be a - what normally is called a management fee agreement which is simply an SLA between the two legal entities that ICANN and the PTI are, that specifies what services ICANN provides to the PTI like for example accounting support, HR support, maybe rent and so on.

So all those services would be listed would be translated into dollar values to evaluate the cost of and that - that is - upon implementation that is what would be then used for also planning purposes to say this is what the budget of PTI would look like. So short of that having been developed because it will be part of an implementation phase, we would make the assumption as to what those costs would be but that would be possible to do and won't before planning purposes.

And I would honestly the model that I have produced when I say I - and Trang has produced of the IANA functions costs, we would use that model, refine it a bit for planning purposes. And after the implementation it would become a service level agreement under which each service would be spelled out, the cost of those services would be spelled out and that would be on a monthly basis how we would transact between the ICANN entity and the PTI entity. And that would then be used as a model for budgeting purposes in the future.

But that's just transactional, this is just operational. This is how any type of parent subsidiary relationship works in any group or organization so that's very straightforward and that does not prevent or impact the ability to produce a separate budget. Just wanted to make that clear.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Xavier Calvez: So - thank you. Next slide please - or sorry at the bottom of the slide the only question which we've started to talk about is the timing of the implementation in terms of start as well as how long would the implementation take. I think that when we get to January 15 one thing that we will need to define together is when are we assuming that the implementation - let me rephrase - that the

transition is effective? Let me take a very simplistic qualification of that question.

If we say the implementation or the transition will be effective October 1, for example, 2016, it's three months in to the fiscal year '17. How do we modelize that starting date and are we taking 9/12 of full year set of costs? Are we - so that's what that question is trying to point out to. And we'll just need to see what we do there.

How long would the implementation take is also a parameter in the sense that between effective date of the transition and how long the implementation will take to develop either having started before or starting at the time of transition, therefore how - what will be the date of effectiveness of the PTI of all the elements that are - that go along with the PTI with the customer standing committee and so on and so on. That will be a point of - I would say nearly logistics which is what is the starting date for the effects of those - of that implementation.

That's something that I don't know we can answer as of yet.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. And I think that makes sense. It seems to me, and obviously a lot of things are going to happen that none of us have control over with regard to what I'm going to say. But I think if things go ideally if the actual implementation could start some of the implementation could start even before the end of fiscal year '16 but certainly maybe the beginning of - no later than the beginning of fiscal year '17 even though the transition itself would not take place possibly until October 1. But those are details that will be worked out.

So in the budget planning for fiscal year '17, I assume that there would be, again depending on how things actually fall out, there would be budgeting for the costs related to implementation like for example forming the new PTI and its board, etcetera, etcetera. So that would probably - even though the implementation itself - the actual transition may not happen until October 1 there would be costs in fiscal year '17 before that. And maybe some even at the end of fiscal year '16 and of course so far the way those costs are being handled is through the reserve fund and so forth.

Could we go back up to - and I'll go Olivier - but could we roll back up to the - I think it was the second slide which was the timeline. Because if we look at the timeline here it shows - it depends obviously when NTIA approves the transition because probably until - and maybe I should possibly instead of probably - until NTIA approves the transition it may be difficult to start some of the implementation work before that. But that's something we can talk about and work with the community on. But just looking at this - well board approval is shown in June 2016. Where is - where is NTIA approval? That's not shown on that slide unless I'm missing something.

Trang Nguyen: So, Chuck, this is Trang. So that timeline basically everything has shifted by half a month to the right. So phase 1, which is the phase in that orange that you see there represents the proposal development phase. And at the end of that phase - the end of phase would signify ICANN board's approval and transmission of the proposal to NTIA.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: In other words in January?

Trang Nguyen: That would occur in middle of - right now we're anticipating sort of in the middle of January. There is no specific date designated yet but it will happen sometime, you know, between middle to end of January.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And so then when - then NTIA approval would occur estimated five months later.

Trang Nguyen: Correct. Now that takes into account - now that assumes that the dotCom obviously will pass which does require SG review of the proposals after NTIA certifies it. And that's what we've been sort of accounting for.

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Sure, no that makes sense, Trang, thanks. Now let me go to Olivier. Sorry for putting you on hold there, Olivier, but please jump in.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: That's fine, Chuck. Thanks very much. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking for the transcript. I have a question regarding the current costs for implementation. If the implementation was to start at some point when we are still in fiscal year '16 how would these costs be currently allocated? Would these be through the current contingency fund or are there budget items that are there specifically already for IANA stewardship implementation? That was my first question.

And the second one I'll formulate once I've got an answer on this.

Chuck Gomes: Okay that's good. And let me go to Xavier on that. I think it was kind of covered in our Sunday session but, Xavier, I'll let you respond to that.

Xavier Calvez: Yeah, so the costs for implementation we are expecting - so if they would happen in '16 it will be part of the initiative that's currently laid out - that currently captures the costs of the transition and the cost of implementation

would simply be added to the cost of transition even they happen during FY'16.

During FY'17 we will likely see some implementation related - and by the way maybe some possible still tail end transition related costs happening. And if that would be the case I would expect both the transition and the implementation costs to be also part of an initiative separate from the ongoing post-implementation costs of the PTI which would then - those be ongoing costs of forever, in quotes, of the maintaining the IANA functions under PTI model in - within ICANN.

So hopefully that clarifies your question, Olivier, and if not please let me know.

Chuck Gomes: And before we go back to Olivier's second question to see whether it's clear, Olivier, am I correct that that initiative, if I recall correctly, that initiative the funds are in excess of - predicted to be in excess - may already be in excess - of what was budgeted in fiscal year '16 for the transition so those are coming out of the reserve fund. Is that correct?

Xavier Calvez: So we don't have yet know if they're going to exceed the $7 million budget that we have even though at the current rate of spend its likely. And, yes, they come out of the reserve fund.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thank you. I just wanted to add that. Olivier, did that answer your first question?

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yes, thanks very much, Chuck. Olivier speaking. It definitely answered my first question. In fact, it even went to some extent to answer my next question. And I was just going to ask based on what Xavier has just told

us does he feel confident of being able to produce that budget then? In other words having the implementation costs and - as one item, perhaps detailed in a certain way as a special project or whatever the nomenclature for this is and already having the running costs being completely separate as if the implementation had already taken place.

I gather going through some prediction as to when the implementation will be complete is probably as easy as finding out a whole number of other random items in the world. So to simplify matters would Xavier then take the implementation as being complete at FY'17 start? In other words have the details of post-implementation IANA and all this be clearly laid out in the budget including the expected costs for that since we are aware that there might be a difference in costs before and after integration?

Xavier Calvez: So, Chuck, if I may?

Chuck Gomes: Oh please, Xavier, I was hoping you would.

Xavier Calvez: Okay. So it's difficult obviously right now to say what's - what the timing will be. But I can imagine the following that would make sense to me. Transition, I'm expecting that there will be transition related activities possibly beyond June 30, 2016. If that's the case I would assume that we would try to have a placeholder for that in the FY'17 budget.

Implementation, I would assume also that there would be implementation costs that would happen prior to the end of June and likely after the end of June therefore in FY'17. So I would also want to try to plan for that even if it's with a placeholder, even if it's with a very high level estimate or envelope.

And then thirdly, I would also presume that we have a defined assumption for the start of the ongoing PTI operating costs that the PTI model will trigger. And that I would also expect to be part of the FY'17 plan. And I would expect those three components to be reflected in the plan that we publish on March 5.

Of course by then, and as we go back to our first slide, by the 15th of January, all those items will be the subject of a lot of assumptions and very little information. Which is completely fine. I mean, that's not a problem in my view, it's just a matter of spelling out what these assumptions are. If we - if, for example, we are going down that path I will say transition activities for '17 maybe will have a $1 million placeholder under the assumption that there is some transition activities going on up to, for example, the end of September.

And then I would say implementation activities I would try to have an educated guess with Trang's help of what the implementation activities that would occur during FY'17 be and maybe I would put another $1 million placeholder or $2 million, I don't know. And then I would say the kick in - the PTI costs kick in October 1. And we are assuming that that would be 9/12 of an annual cost, for example, if we have defined the annual costs. And that's what it would be.

So I think it's just a matter of laying out the assumptions and the rationale for those assumptions, which then let anyone understand why the numbers are what they are. And even more than the numbers understand what the scenario looks like. So I feel completely comfortable doing that. And I would want to do that in a very simple and transparent manner so that everyone understands what assumptions we retain so that anyone can say, well I agree or I don't agree and why, and then we can take it from there.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Xavier. And let me emphasize again then one of the main objectives of what we're doing in this design team and ultimately then blessed by the full CWG, would be to, as best as possible, make sure that there's consensus from the CWG on what those assumptions are by January 15 so that, again, the draft budget includes the best possible assumptions known at that time realizing that things can change but hopefully not too much. So...

Xavier Calvez: Yeah, absolutely.

Chuck Gomes: ...that's really important.

Xavier Calvez: I completely agree. I mean, there's no scenario in my views under which I, to make it simple, would take a different position than the one that appears to be the most relevant and likely by the CWG. I mean, that would be stupid. So I think we just need to find the right most simple approach.

What I'm hoping I can use this group for help with is trying to find an approach by January 15 that is extremely granular because that would be deemed useful is something that I want to caution the group with because granular, and again, you know, accuracy is not precision if we are very granular is going to require a lot more assumption and basically simply providing a lot more ground for discussions on whether assumptions are correct or not without any facts to say so.

So let me take a very simple example. If we would want to go very granular as to what the costs of the PTI would be I would start asking questions, do you need to have separate insurance versus not? So who's going to have an opinion on that and what rationale do we use to spell these type of assumptions? So I would simply want to make sure that we have as simple

and straightforward assumptions as possible because I think that will be easier for everyone to coalesce around a position.

And I'm hoping that with your help the CWG can accept that this is probably the most practical, pragmatic and effective approach to plan for FY'17 recognizing, which I want to make the point that it's important - recognizing that the plan is just a plan. As soon as a plan is published it's obsolete. Right? So it's useful to spell out because it lays out expectations but we also have to recognize that a week or two after we publish it for public comment we'll have a lot more information and probably different pieces of information then the data that we'll have entered into the plan.

And that's fine. As long as we all accept that reality then it's also allowing everyone to understand, it's no use to go too much in detail when we - you don't have a lot of information because you're trying to create a reality that is not yet visible. Let me stop there.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Xavier. And let me reemphasize one point that I think you made and I think everybody gets it already, by the way this is Chuck speaking, that if we try to get too granular in terms of the assumptions by January 15 we will probably fail. At the same time to the extent that we can, at a high level, and in a simple way reach consensus in the CWG on some simple assumptions that the budget team can use to develop that draft budget that will be very helpful. And so that's where we're headed.

Xavier Calvez: And certainly I'm very happy to help that with providing as usefully as possible any description of assumptions that the CWG can have then a look at with your help and your guidance of this group to look at and say does it make sense or not? I would want to, you know, this - we're helping each other here so it's a matter of what is useful for the CWG to look at? What is, in your

views, most adequate for the CWG to be able to weigh in? And how we get to a position of consensus. But I'm very convinced that this is very doable and I have no doubt that we will get there.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Any other questions or comments of Xavier at this point before we move on? Mary, please.

Mary Uduma: Hello?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. We can hear you.

Mary Uduma: Okay. Yeah, I agree with most of the things that Xavier has said here. And I also want to ask whether is possible to do (unintelligible) in the proposal so that - in putting out the proposal it set an assumption that was what you think it would cost and in that assumption because what (unintelligible) the cost. But I am a bit worried about not taking everything in. And at the end of the - and not presenting by the deadline so if we can present by next meeting two scenarios that we can look at that then I think we will be able to decide which one we go with.

Chuck Gomes: Well, let me respond to that first and Xavier, if you want to respond you may as well. I had - the chairs of the CWG asked me join the first part of their call - preparatory call yesterday for the meeting that's going to happen tomorrow for the CWG. And what they had anticipated in terms of an approach was that staff would, as Xavier has described, present an approach and we're calling that this base approach with no operational changes and so forth. They didn't say that but that's where we're headed I think.

And then the CWG would respond to that rather than starting off with multiple approaches, even if it's just two.

So now that's the thinking of the chairs. I'm sharing that. I suspect they will comment on that tomorrow in the meeting. But what I understood from them, and certainly Marika if you understand - if I didn't get that quite right please correct me on that. But I think the preference is let's start off with a proposed set of assumptions like Xavier has mentioned here, and then we'll write those up clear enough so that as we talked about earlier on this call, so that it can be reviewed and discussed by the full CWG and then if we need to look at other alternatives we can do that.

Now Marika, let me - you were on the prep call, right?

Marika Konings: Yes, correct. And I noted in the chat that I...

Chuck Gomes: Did I capture that correctly?

Marika Konings: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Good.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Mary, did you want to respond to that?

Mary Uduma: Yeah, okay. Mary here speaking for the record. Well, if that is the plan or the approach that's good. And as a (unintelligible) Xavier has said is the plan. The plan is the plan is not actually the actual thing. So I don't have problem. We can go by that afterwards and just look that (unintelligible) a single approach and then go with that. But the fact that I was mentioning an alternative is that

(unintelligible) situation and there is, you know, (unintelligible) shared services at the ICANN level the PTI.

So that was what I was thinking about. But I agree with them so that we keep it simple and we make it easy and make the deadline. I don't have problem with that. I'm fine as long as all the (unintelligible) are clearly explained and again all the items - all the possible cost items are included in the model that (unintelligible) I think that would be fine for me.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Mary. And then of course we find out when we present these basic assumptions that there's huge problems by people in the CWG obviously we're going to have to work on that and see if other alternatives and for which areas - which assumptions may need to be looked at differently. But that will give us a point of takeoff for where we need to do a little more work. Thanks, Mary. Xavier.

((Crosstalk))

Xavier Calvez: Thank you, Chuck. And I think Mary's question or point is actually allowing me to go back on one of the sites simply because I kind of skipped that. If we go on the next slide the second next slide please. The next one. So what I skipped in saying earlier is that the approach that I'm suggesting is that we have a base approach in the plan which is PTI implementation and no separation or no changed to separation.

And that we also spell out what alternative scenarios there could be to that base scenario but that we allow ourselves to describe that scenario, have a relatively high level gap analysis provided along with that scenario that says the scenario could be -if the basis no changes to separation an alternative could be for example, for the sake of simplicity, full separation and then we

would describe what differences there would be under that alterative scenario with the base scenario and say costs would be different for all those reasons with an expected impact of that amount of money.

And that would create, if you wish, an alternative scenario. So I don't think the approach of having a base approach is excluding the possibility to have the possibility of showing a scenario, an alternative scenario, and that's what I intended to offer is that we have the base and an alternative scenario, maybe two if we think that makes sense, so that we can show a bit of flexibility and sensitivity analysis of the plan to what if things happen differently.

A scenario could be about the amount of separation, it could also be about the timing of implementation for example. So we could have a couple scenarios that would be useful to present as part of the plan to bounce off from a base scenario that would be more detailed and more granular into the plan.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Xavier. So my question then - and I guess this is to the staff team both from the finance team and from the implementation team so, Trang, it'll probably be directed at you as well or maybe especially at you, is it possible within two weeks, so that would be the 18th of November, to have a more detailed description of Item 2, maybe a little bit of Item 3 on the slide that's in front of us right now but where we have a sufficient description for the full CWG. So if we could, by the 18th, maybe just a day before the 18th so that maybe on the 18th we could have another call, and finalize what we would present to the full CWG shortly thereafter.

I'm guessing that they may have a meeting on the 19th, don't know if we could get it to them that quickly if there is a meeting on the 19th, but is it realistic in two weeks. And of course I would have presumed that we would probably have some iterations on the list, the DTO list in the meantime so that

we can iron out some details and refine it a little bit before we actually have a call to finalize it. Is that unrealistic to do that by then, Xavier?

Xavier Calvez: So I guess I would want to understand slightly better what you have in mind the level of information would be. So I think we can further describe the approach of having a base scenario. We can describe the information that this base scenario would be documented within the FY'17 plan, for example, what is the presumed structure of the IANA functions, what is separated from the ICANN operations, what is integrated with the ICANN operations basically providing a bit of a model of what the data could look like and what information would be provided.

If it's already formulated we would at least say this is - we would describe what we would need to formulate further and that we would expect to put into the plan. We can suggest an approach relative to the transition costs, the implementation costs and the ongoing post-transition costs which is what we were discussing earlier with the answer to Olivier's question.

So I think we can lay that out in, you know, a bit - basically everything that we said today we can lay it out at the next level of detail. I don't think we will have much of the implementation plan in the next two weeks because that's a lot premature of course as per the timing. But I'm not - I'm not assuming that's what you were asking, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And I think we're on the same page. I'm not looking - we need to have enough information and again, I think we covered that on this call. You mentioned, you know, describing what the separation is right now between IANA and regular ICANN functions and so forth.

And that kind of information - the key focus I think is the assumptions under the base scenario and how they translate in terms of the no operational separation and so forth so that the full CWG can at least ask meaningful questions and we can begin to zero in to find out whether the assumptions of this base scenario are consistent in people's minds with regard to the recommendations that the CWG. So I think what you described is what we need.

Now let me open it up others. Did we miss any? Did Xavier miss anything in terms of what he described there? I think we do need to talk about the fact that there would be a clear PTI budget eventually. And we're not looking for any of those details about what the amounts would be or anything like that or even implementation details because that's beyond our control. But it would be the assumptions that would be used to build the budget.

Thanks, Cheryl, for that agree. Did that make sense, Xavier?

Xavier Calvez: Yes it does. One question for you in order for me to try to gauge the - notably the topic of describing the separation of that currently exists between the IANA functions and the rest of the ICANN organization. What knowledge does the CWG have of how the operations are currently organized?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I think it varies hugely depending on who you're talking to okay? Some of us that, you know, work with IANA and so forth probably have a much better understanding there than others. But again, I don't think we need to go too deep in that. But when we say something like no change to operational separation there does need to be this base understanding of what is the current operational separation. Not real detailed...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...but enough so that they know what that means.

Xavier Calvez: Yeah, yeah, no no absolutely. Means nothing to say no change if you don't know what is the current situation, I completely agree.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, exactly. So that's good.

Xavier Calvez: Yeah, no understood. So I think - sorry, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Well I was going to say, Trang, does this all make sense to you in your role?

Xavier Calvez: Chuck, Trang had to leave a few minutes ago.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay okay that's okay then, that's okay. I know you will work with her. Mary's got her hand up, let's let Mary talk.

Mary Uduma: Yeah, Mary here for the record. Is it important that we look at the (unintelligible) CCWG Accountability presentation. I did ask the question (unintelligible) the assumption that the proposal and assumption that taking and meeting the requirements of CWG was full separation or was the separation of PTI from ICANN or another separation of operations.

                 And the assumption that CCWG Accountability is making is that is a full separation, operational separation. And when it comes to (unintelligible) and planning - operational planning we are now looking at what is it that CWG requires? Is CWG saying there should be no operational separation? So we need to clear that point so that it will help Xavier in preparing his (unintelligible) and his assumptions.

So if we are going by this no separation of - I mean, no full separation of PTI operations from ICANN operations then it will help him. But if we are going by the assumption of CCWG then it means it will be a full separation. (Unintelligible) CWG is saying no, we are not looking at full operational separation. Then the budget will make sense, the plan will make sense, the assumptions will make sense.

So if we have only (unintelligible) I mean, Xavier, (unintelligible) in preparing this presentation. Please we need to help him in - at this time where is this time. Thank you. I hope I made my points.

Chuck Gomes: And, Mary, this is Chuck. Let me ask a question because I think there's two types of separation we're talking about.

Mary Uduma: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: One is the operational separation or lack thereof between ICANN and the IANA functions in the initial implementation of PTI. The o there one is the separation that could occur down the road somewhere if in fact PTI was not correcting problems and performing as needed. So which of those separations are talking about?

Mary Uduma: Thank you. Mary again. Thank you. I'm looking at we are preparing FY'17 budget. And if we are - and we are going to share the PTI budget as a separate budget from ICANN budget, okay? There is the - you can assume that operationally the department is still within ICANN. So I'm not looking at down the line, I'm just looking at the transition and formation of PTI as an (unintelligible) of ICANN and its operational (unintelligible) at all, IANA we are still happy with the PTI operations.

So as today costs, infrastructure, (unintelligible) are embedded together. So what I'm saying here is (unintelligible) is to have Xavier prepare the budget is to know the (unintelligible) of CWG. If CWG (unintelligible) let the status quo remain so it would just be (unintelligible) or SLA has Xavier has explained.

Or CWG is saying no, keep all costs, all operations that relate to IANA function separate within PTI and PTI should have its own finance, should have its own human resource, should have its own legal expenses and all the rest of the expenses. So that's the thing that (unintelligible) then it will help Xavier in preparing the budget. I hope I - I'm not talking about separation down the line, I'm just talking about separation of the operations of the common departments of IANA from the total operation of ICANN.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Mary. And if I understood - this is Chuck. If I understand correctly so this - that is - the base scenario basically assumes that there would not be some of those separations that you were talking about in the base scenario.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay, and so that's what they're going to describe. Now if we get a huge reaction from the CWG as a whole that hey that's not consistent with what was proposed then we're going to have to react to that and deal with it. But that's what I understand.

Mary Uduma: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Xavier, do you want to comment on that?

Xavier Calvez: No, I think it's a reasonable question. I have not seen anything in the CWG proposal that defines the level of separation which is why the base scenario approach I think is at least a plausible one. And I think that if we lay out an alternative scenario that provides visibility as to what the implications of further separation would be I think then we cover all bases.

And I agree that if the CWG would say no, no full separation is what - is wanted I think that it needs to be - I think part of the - the problem is that there is nowhere in the CWG proposal that this is specified so would that be a change in the proposal that the ICG should have taken into account that the CWG is expecting a separation - a full separation of the functions versus what currently is is begin done? I think that was left unaddressed, not necessarily by design but simply because that's not what was the level or definition of the proposal.

So my point is I don't see a rationale for doing that. I can see that maybe the discussion could happen. I think again this is becoming an implementation design question rather than a planning question. And I think that, you know, we should just take the conversation to the CWG, lay out the case that we just spelled out of a base scenario with an alternative scenario and see what makes sense.

Again, I have not seen anything the CWG proposal that suggests that there should be separation nor in any CCWG conversations because they are not about that topic really.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Xavier. And...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...if we can go back to something that Cheryl said early in our call when we were having the connectivity problems, it seems to me that there could be some phasing involved in terms of the level of separation. For example, this base scenario, to start with but it could be that -and that may be okay at the beginning. But maybe to facilitate - and I'm not saying this is the way it should be, I'm just talking about possibilities, maybe to facilitate the possibility of separation of PTI from the - from ICANN some middle ground might be helpful that would make that easier if that should ever happen.

I'm not saying that's what should happen but I think that goes back to what Cheryl was asking about whether, you know, the base scenario is good for now. Maybe a little bit more separation could be deemed to be desirable in terms of facilitating future processes like separation of PTI. So anyway I'll leave it at that. I know we're at the end of our time. Thanks, Cheryl, for that checkmark. I hope I captured that correctly.

The - I wanted to ask one more question before we close and then talk about our action items. But am I correct, Xavier, and I'm sorry Trang is not on, but - or maybe she is again - am I correct that in the assumptions - and these may relate more to fiscal year '16 work that needs to be done. But for example, there's work that needs to be done on the SLEs that is going to - that will incur some costs and resources and so forth. And I know there's been discussion with (Elise) on that on the IANA side.

Are those kind of costs being considered? Because before we can even define the SLEs there is some testing that needs to be done and so forth. Is that all included in the work that Trang and the implementation team is doing?

Xavier Calvez: Yes, it is. Trang is not here with me and I don't know if she can speak but I think it's fair to say that yes it is. It's encompassed into the

transition/implementation work that she is leading. And that is true irrespective of whether it is in FY'16 or '17 meaning that that implementation/transition work from our perspective is an initiative meaning that its reserved fund funded and it pertains to implementation as opposed to an ongoing cost of the PTI basically.

Mary Uduma: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thank you that's very helpful, Xavier. This is Chuck again. So okay very good. So let's talk about next steps because I know we're out of time and I want to wrap this up. Is it fair to assume that staff then, and you guys can determine who's involved in that, will come back with a first cut of a little more detailed description of the base scenario as we've talked about and do that and present that to the list so that we can discuss it on the list.

And hopefully finalize it in a call, if we can do a call two weeks from today on the 18th. Is that a reasonable approach going forward?

Xavier Calvez: I think it is. Put it differently we'll do as much as we can by the 18th so that it can be reviewed by then. And at least can serve as a basis for further communication with the CWG. I guess the question I would ask you, Chuck, is there is - what we can do by the 18th and there is what we need to do overall which may take longer than what we have in between now and the 18th. So I'll go by the constraint that you think is most important to you. We can do something between now and the 18th that I'm sure can help. It may not be the full set of information that would be presented during the - in the budget but I think we can give a shot at it at least, you know.

Chuck Gomes: No, I appreciate that. And I understand the limitations. The important thing in my mind is that we need to get something to the full CWG. Doesn't have to be what's going to be in the budget come - and the final assumptions. But we need to as soon as possible start testing the assumptions with the full CWG and allow some time for interaction in the CWG. Otherwise we're going to find ourselves in the first part of January and we may not be able to properly evaluate consensus in the CWG for that January 15 deadline which I'm taking as firm.

So if you can even start feeding this group, DTO, including the staff people that are on it, information as you develop it we could start some iterations on the list so that when we get to the 18th even if we're not totally finished, but I think not too long after the 18th we need to get something to the full CWG shortly after that even if we have to add to it as you continue to work on it.

Xavier Calvez: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Does that make sense?

Xavier Calvez: Yeah, yeah, completely. I have no problem with that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay good. Good. And, Brenda, if you can do - well let me just ask for those that are still on the call. Is the 18th - let's see am I traveling - no I'm traveling on the 19th, so is the 18th a possible day to do a Doodle poll for another meeting or maybe even this time would work. But, Brenda, if you can do a Doodle poll for the 18th. If anybody knows that the 18th is a terrible day speak up now.

Mary Uduma: This is Mary. This is Mary. I think I'm fine with 18th.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's Cheryl. The date is fine but just get Brenda to check - my calendar is showing that the time may have a clash with a planned At Large capacity building webinar. They tend to rotate around times. And the one we did today was midnight my time but on the 18th I'm seeing it as 8:00 am my time. So I'm sure we can find times that will Doodle around that. But Brenda might want to just double check with Gisella to see if there's a blackout time there that I think will be running around that 2000 UTC or 2200 UTC.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so, Brenda, if you can do a Doodle poll for a few times on the 18th that would be - that would be good so we can kind of at least get something on the calendar that works. And in the meantime we'll watch for stuff from staff. And if all of us will participate I'm sure Alan will want to get involved once he's off vacation and come up to date with what we talked about today. And then when we get to the 18th hopefully we will have already made some progress.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Great.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay?

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Sounds good.

Chuck Gomes: Now is there anything else we need to cover today? Okay this meeting certainly met my expectations; I hope it was helpful to everyone else. And I think we've set a good starting point for us to facilitate an examination of the assumptions and thanks for all the help, I really mean this. Xavier, and the full finance team as well as Trang and the implementation team it is very much appreciated. And the policy staff too.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you for this call, it was very helpful to us so I think we are moving well forward and that's very helpful.

Chuck Gomes: So with that said, I think I can adjourn this call. And we'll continue to work together.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you.

Mary Uduma: Thank you. Good call. Good outcome. Thank you. Bye.

Chuck Gomes: Bye all.

END