ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
April 19, 2016
3:31 pm CT

Coordinator: The recordings are started.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. Okay this is Chuck Gomes and this is the Design Team O meeting on the 19th of April, 2016. Thanks, everyone, for joining. Is anyone on the audio but not in Adobe please speak up if you are. Okay – everybody is in Adobe. Thanks, Brenda, I should have looked their first.

Okay so welcome, everyone. I think I – and I don't think I said welcome to Alan and Elise. Welcome to both of you. And Paul is on. I know it's late for you, Paul, thank you for joining us. We'll try and move right on through the agenda.

So the main thing is going to be talking about possibility of comments on the ICANN budget but first of all wanted to get a – since I only heard back from Mary on the bylaws language changes that I sent around yesterday just wanted to take – just take a minute or two or however much time we need. You can see Section 22.4(f) there the changes are highlighted that were made. And

these were changes proposed by ICANN Legal. And they seem fine to me. Does anybody have any comments on 22.4(f)?

Okay. Then let's go to – hello, Xavier. Xavier is going to get off sooner than you, Olivier, because when we start talking about public comments on the budget so you can be jealous on that and have to hold on your beer.

So the next item is Annex F(1)(f). and this one has a couple different changes that were made. The blue and red are from ICANN Legal. The green is something we just did at the end per Xavier – Xavier's suggestion and confirmed by Mary. So I did send those off so that was what it should look like in the final version that's supposed to be posted tomorrow. Any questions or comments on Annex F(1)(f)?

Elise it's, yeah, I get that all the time being in there twice. One of the times usually is my phone number. I haven't figured it out either. So okay let me just take a look here at what – at what Alan is going to say here, see if he has anything on Annex F. I'm not seeing any hands or hearing anybody…

Alan Greenberg: I'm only commenting on Adobe Connect. It's Alan.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay thanks. Maybe you can teach something to both Elise and I on that. Okay let's go to the last one then, Section 22.4(b)(i). And I think this is the latest language. I'm not sure what happened to what's highlighted in yellow but I'm sure they'll get that right whatever right is. But you can see the changes there. Any comments or questions on that section? Okay, well, not seeing any hands or hearing anybody we will then I appreciate that so we'll just – I can send Jonathan and Lise confirmation that DT-O was okay with the latest language in those.

Let's then go to – and, Xavier, if you can stay on for the – when we go over your responses to our comments, is that okay? Are you comfortable with that?

Xavier Calvez: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks. Okay so let's go to Agenda Item 4 then. And, Brenda, if you can put the first document you had up there that has those comments so we have them in front of us. It was sent to the DT-O list so I assume everybody has them. I sent it a second time this week. I had sent it a week or so ago as well. So let's take a look at those starting in Section 4.1 there.

You can see the question basically regarding the third paragraph. It says, "A placeholder for the above activities was offered for a range of $6 million to $9 million. Waiting for more detail and conference saved cost estimate." And then I asked the question, "Is it correct to include that the $6 million to $9 million placeholder includes estimates for Track 1, Track 2, Track 3 and Work Stream 2?"

And Xavier answered, "Yes, it also includes the implementation work relative to Track 1 through Track 3, implementation of Work Stream 2 enhancements is not included." So it does not include Work Stream 2 enhancements, okay, which makes sense because we don't really know what those will be. Any questions on that? Pretty straightforward response.

Going on then, and I'll have to read Alan's explanation later, so that I can benefit from it. The next paragraph says, "A project cost support team is currently being organized to define such activities and costs and suggest funding solutions. The community input on possible funding approach is welcome as part of the public comments submitted on this document."

And then I asked, "What team is that referring to? Who's on the team? What types of solutions are being considered? And is that related to the Design Team O work?" You can see Xavier's comment. "This comment to the project cost support team created in Marrakesh including staff members who support the community working groups to create cost estimates for the remainder of fiscal years '16 and '17."

Xavier, who's on that team? Is that public knowledge? Can you share that with me – with us?

Xavier Calvez: I don't know that it's public knowledge but it's not a secret either. The team is – team that's – just to read the purpose is simply there to support the development of cost estimates for the project of the USG transition which includes the components that we've looked at earlier which is simply the transition from since March 2014 and until it's completed as a project including its implementation. Has a cost, we have talked about, about $25 million between FY'15 and FY'16 including legal fees and so on. This is what we're talking about.

And the project cost support team is there simply to help the – both ICANN and the community groups to develop estimates for the remainder of FY'16, as well as for FY'17 as it relates to those costs that support the completion and – of the transitions proposal as well as the implementation of those proposals. And we would need to include in the scope of developing estimates also WS2 because this is an activity that will impact FY'17 possibly beyond FY'17 but at least FY'17.

So that team – that's what that team does. It's simply there to help both ICANN and the working groups to develop estimates. That's all there is to it. And it will be disbanded once that project is expected to be completed which

needs to be somewhere by the end of May. And it will also give, we hope, a good learning from that mode of operations and whether that type of support is deemed useful and therefore should be replicated in the future.

The team members – so there is a finance person to support the development of estimates. There is a legal person to help develop legal related type of cost estimates. There is a project – well there's effectively two project managers. There's a project manager and then a coordinator who helps, takes notes, schedule meetings and so on. And so that's the roles. Bernie Turcotte is the project manager. Nathalie is the coordinator and Nathalie works effectively in the implementation team so she's being lent by Trang to help us support and organize the work of that group.

The finance person is Becky Nash who most of you know, is VP Finance in my team reporting to me. And the legal support person is Steve Wong who basically manages within the legal team of ICANN the budget of the departments and a number of other administrative related type of tasks. He's not a lawyer, he's not involved in legal content matters but he's involved in managing the budget of the legal department and procurement for the legal department and a number of other administrative tasks. And that – and he's part of the team as well.

So there's basically four people in the team and of course I advise the team as useful to help them move forward when that's required. So that's the people involved in the team.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Xavier. That's much appreciated. And I'm looking in the chat here. Note Paul's comment. No – "I know we have had verbal assurances in the past and the status quo will be maintained but where can we

have the written assurance that there will be not be charges by PTI at the point of service delivery on customers, registries?"

I don't know if you can respond to that, Xavier, or not but I'll give you the opportunity if you want to.

Xavier Calvez: I'm sorry, I'm not sure I understand well Paul's question. Maybe Paul can speak to it if that's okay?

Chuck Gomes: Paul, can you do that please? This is Chuck. We're not hearing you, Paul, if you're trying to talk so you may be on mute. I'm just – let me scroll down here. Let's see.

Paul Kane: Technology…

Chuck Gomes: There we go.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Good, we hear you…

Paul Kane: I apologize, yes I was speaking – I was speaking to myself, I apologize to everyone. So really I know we've touched on this before in the past and I know we're discussing (unintelligible) and I'm never too sure if such things should be in bylaws. And I'm really guided by Xavier as to where is best. Historically there have been no charges by IANA on customers, registries, using the IANA service to record key elements.

And I just think it would be helpful, reassuring, useful to the community, the registry community that uses IANA, if it were recorded in writing that the

status quo will continue, namely that post transition PTI will not be charging end users for service at the point of delivery. And I'm guided by you as to where such things should or could be recorded. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Paul. This is Chuck again. And let me respond first and then let Xavier jump in. I'm wondering, Xavier, if this could just be added as an assumption at an appropriate place in the document. I can tell you, Paul, that in terms of revenue, which the budget also includes, there is – there are no items for revenue from registries for IANA services.

So I think the answer to your question that there's no plan to charge for point of service but I don't think it would hurt to put an assumption in there that that would not be the case because they put assumptions on other things in terms of building the budget. So, Xavier, it's your turn. Go ahead.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. So I'm suspecting, and I'm just venturing a guess here, so currently the IANA services are provided for free as per the existing agreement. And I will let Elise complete further because I will not much more information than she does.

But I would – it's not a budgeting matter whether the IANA services should be or should not be provided for a fee. It should be in the structure of the post transition requirements. And I actually thought that somewhere in the proposals but maybe I'm just wrong and you all should actually probably know better than I do, I thought that that statement had already been made that the IANA services would continue to be provided for free by the operator of that service.

I actually don't remember if that has been the case and if, yes, where it has been stated. But I thought that it had been spelled out and I may be wrong. I'll stop there and let Elise go further.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead, Elise. We're not hearing you if you're speaking. No, we cannot hear you. So she's typing. Okay so she's going to dial in – this is Chuck – while she's dialing in, Xavier, would – I wouldn't think there would be any problem in adding that assumption in here or whether you want to call it an assumption or not in the documents – in whatever comes out as the final – the final budget. Am I correct on that?

Xavier Calvez: Are you thinking, Chuck, that it's in the annual budget plan that the statement that the services are for free should be made?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I don't know that that – I think you're right that it doesn't – a statement like that probably doesn't go in the budget. But just like you put assumptions for registry and registrar revenue, it seems to me it would be a simple thing to just add an assumption and calculating revenue. It was assumed that there would be no fees charged for IANA services to registries.

Xavier Calvez: So let me elaborate on that. If the services would effectively be provided for free then the budget would reflect that and would state as an assumption that because the services are supposed to be provided for free there is no revenue in the budget. But that's – but the budget is not a governing document and I'm suspecting Paul's point is about having a governing document that states that the services continue to be provided without compensation to the operator.

It doesn't feel to me that the budget would be the place where that statement is made, it feels – I will merely – it feels to me that it's either a bylaw question or an agreement in the contracts – in the contract between each of the

operational communities in ICANN and then in the contract between ICANN and the PTI. But it feels that it should be somewhere else than – I guess than the budget document.

Because the budget changes every year and the budget is just an estimate of an action plan at some point, you know, it's not a governing document. So it doesn't feel to me that the budget would be the place to state that even though, of course, if that would be stated somewhere else the budget would say because those services are free then there's no revenue in the budget for those services.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Xavier. This is Chuck. And I see that Elise is in now, so Elise, go ahead.

Elise Gerich: Hi. So I want to go back to the assumption and make sure that everybody realizes that not every one of the communities have made the same assumption. For example, the numbers group have put in their SLA agreement the they expect to make a certain contribution to receive the service. The IETF I think in their proposal did say they expect to receive it for free. I don't know if it was said anywhere, as Paul mentioned, for the names communities.

But to also mention what is in the current NTIA contract, the current NTIA contract does permit charging fees for service to compensate the operator and the way that could be done, if the person who wrote the RFP had decided to offer services for a fee, the services would have had to have been well defined and delineated and there could be no profit being made.

So even though ICANN, over all these years, has offered the service for the good of the whole community, it wasn't necessarily mandated that the

services were for free. The contract would have permitted services to have fees as long as they were just directly attributable to delivery of those services.

And like I said, the RIRs in their service level agreement, which is posted on the NRO site, anticipate that they are going to make payments for the receipt of services. That's just a clarification.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Elise. This is Chuck. So let me make a suggestion, Paul, on this. The – I think Xavier is right that the budget probably isn't the place. I mean, because I'm very familiar with the budget I know that it's not planned for charging fees because it's not in there. But if you would, you know, and we're really at a stage where it's really too late to add anything in the bylaws in that regard but because the bylaws are going to be posted tomorrow for public comment.

If you're not comfortable with the fact that it's not in the draft budget, if that's not satisfactory for your concern, then my recommendation would be that you submit a comment in response to the post – excuse me I said posted budget – the posted bylaws – the bylaws are going to be posted tomorrow – if you think that should be in there or if you think that it might suffice to be in some other one of the documents that are being finalized for the transition. Is that acceptable, Paul?

Paul Kane: So we are discussing the budget. And the main focus needs to be, in my opinion, that an assumption is made, as is recorded in the current budget and has been recorded in previous budgets, that there is no line item for ICANN to – sorry, PTI, to receive direct funding. And it's not expected that there should be direct funding. There many registries that make contributions to ICANN

and a proportion of that may, at ICANN's discretion, be paid to PTI or IANA service.

But I think that this juncture, because we're talking budget, the assumption should be made – should be declared that PTI is free at the point of delivery. What I'm trying to get away from is, as you know I'm very keen for PTI to have its own bank account. I'm trying to make sure that if there is money flow that the money is not flowed from the point of – the customers directly to PTI because that could be deemed to be certain customers getting preferential service.

If, however, as has been the case in the past, registries elect to pay contribution – voluntary contribution to ICANN that is fine. But I just think it is prudent that the budget makes clear that PTI is free at the point of delivery. I take what Elise is saying, it's expected there should be fees or certain communities can make fees. But if I'm not mistaken the RIRs will be paying ICANN the service, not PTI for service.

And if they are paying PTI for service the nondiscriminatory service issues do come into play. So I'm just thinking out of the box trying to make sure it's a budget issue rather than a bylaw issue. We can make it a bylaw issue but if we're too late we can make a suggestion but I'm just thinking in order to capture it at this point, which has always been the intent, you've said your thing before, Chuck, that there's no line item so therefore it shouldn't be there, I just think it is prudent financial planning to make everything very transparent. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Paul. This is Chuck again. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. This was discussed in the deep dark ages of the CWG, right at the beginning. And my recollection is that we said that as the current situation is we were not expecting any charges to be made directly for services. Yes, some registries do contribute something to ICANN. But we also understood, at least the way I understood the discussion at that point, that should things change in some great way in the future and ICANN simply didn't have the resources to allow it to fund IANA, that it is conceivable that IANA could start providing some charge.

Now certainly at that point there was no PTI and we didn't discuss the exact flow of the money. But we did understand, at least I certainly did, that there could, in some future time, be some charges associated with the services that IANA provides to the registries.

So I don't think we want to put in the bylaws or anywhere else, something that would prohibit that completely because that says we may cut off, you know, that's cutting off our nose to spite our face type thing. In some future world that may be the only way that the services can be provided. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. Chuck again. Xavier, your turn.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. Not necessarily on the substance but in the form I think to Chuck's point, Paul, the statement that you were pointing out to – that you're making relative to the lack of intent of charging fees for services for IANA is a comment that (unintelligible) part of the budget public comment process that closes by the end of April – the 30th of April so that it's recorded there and that we can then consider that comment and answer it as part of the public comment. I'm sure many other people would be interested by that request and comment in by our response and I think that that's the right place to put it as it relates to the budget.

I do think, however, that there may be more – more to think about in terms of how to reflect the principle of IANA not charging fees and I also want to say that though the contribution from the registrar – sorry, the RIRs, is to ICANN as I understand it, and I don't remember the exact wording of it, there is a fraction of it that is designated for the purpose of funding the IANA functions.

And I don't remember what that fraction is but I think it's in the range of $300-$500K and is for the direct costs of IANA. So though the contribution is to ICANN, the total contribution is to ICANN, there is a fraction of it that's designated to be specifically allocated to funding the IANA functions. It doesn't mean that the PTI charges to its customer a fee because it's a voluntary contribution from the RIRs that's in the – in an agreement. I'll stop there.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you very much, Xavier. This is Chuck again. And, Paul, I think Xavier made a good suggestion to submit your comment in response to the public comment period that has been open since March 5 on the budget and operating plan and like he said, that ends on the 30th of April. But I think it's a fairly simple comment that you could submit and certainly encourage you to do that. I don't think we can do anything further on that in this call.

But like Xavier said, it is probably – there may be other people in the community that may like to see the same thing as you. So by submitting it to the public comment forum then you – they're able to see that as well. So in fact if you submit it sooner you may find – give people opportunity to also comment on your comment before the 30th comes.

So I'm going to suggest that we move on to the next comment item, which is a really easy one on 4.2 in the document that's up there. That's really an action

item for me, although if any of the rest of you found the particular portion not clear you could comment as well. But it will – I've given myself an action item on that because I haven't done it yet so I can give more detail in terms of what I think is unclear and give Xavier and his team a chance to respond on that.

Unless anybody has anything else on 4.2, we'll go to 4.3, focus on the IANA functions operating plan and budget. Well, excuse me, there's another comment on – well you can see Xavier's response there. So anyway let's go on to Section 4.3 and Xavier's comment 5 and it refers to the table at the top of Page 28 in the budget document.

And breaks it down by operational community and by the three sources of costs. And so my question was, "How do the cost elements of the table correlate to the diagram of the IANA implementation in Section 4.2?" And then you can see Xavier's response, "Assuming that the table referred to Section 4.2 as the one appearing on Page 23 if so the summarized view of the total IANA function cost on Page 28 corresponds to the cost of the activities included in the two boxes surrounded by a blue outline in the graph on Section 4.2."

So it's a little bit hard to follow that, obviously, because most of us don't have that. But I have got a document in front of me that I can look at it. So on Page 23, let's see, yeah, I'm not – I can't do it real quickly here to correlate all that. I'm going to – what I will do instead of wasting everybody's time, which it might be, is I will track that down – I'll give myself an action item and of course respond to the DT-O list on that rather than take everybody's time on this call unless somebody has another comment or question on this.

Okay going then to Section 7-2.1, "Are we correct in concluding that the IANA stewardship transition, to the extent the costs are known, is included in the operating plan and budget?" And it is included, in fact in my notes in the agenda in fact I think I noted that. Obviously they're cost estimates like any budget is. The transition itself, as we'll talk about a little later, costs are not but the funding of PTI is included in the budget. And Xavier confirmed that in his response. So I don't know, unless somebody wants to pursue that further we'll move on.

Okay going to 7-2.17 there, and he noticed that on that one there's $300,000 for personnel in that particular item and $800,000 for professional services. The question was whether or not that's sufficient for implementation and Xavier's suggestion is that we submit a public comment in that regard so that they can respond to the whole community and not just us. And I think that's a fine suggestion. So we'll come back to that when we talk about our any comments that would be submitted and how we do that. Any questions or comments on that one?

Going then – and you may need to scroll down a little bit on your screen to 7.12-3.2. And I'm just scrolling – on my screen as well as what I have in front of me here. So you can see that there's an activity – the second activity on Pages 54, 55 is to measure – and these are metrics for measuring success – measure and compare metric for the IANA functions against baseline for year over year improvement. And this will need to include new SLEs once they are finalized.

And so that's fine. I agree that's a comment that we can submit. We meaning either DT-O or just me as lead or however we decide to do that we'll talk about that later. And then going on it says, "description of Portfolio 323, Root Systems Operations on Page 55, facilitating and continued evolution of the

root server system to ensure its ongoing security, stability, resiliency of DNS technology and operations change over time, maintenance of relationships with the root server operators, RSAC, and related stakeholders."

So the question was, "Is this portfolio above and beyond the PTI budget and operational expenses for the number and protocol IANA services?" And note that the answer is, "No, it is included in the IANA PTI function." So I think that that question is answered unless somebody has further comments or questions.

Okay, we're almost done going through these. In Appendix B, which is the fiscal year '17 IANA operations by activity, "Is it correct to assume that this appendix does not reflect changes that may occur after the transition occurs?" And he said, "No, this is reflecting the activities carried out in the IANA functions as foreseeable during fiscal year '17 assuming the transition occurs."

So in other words, like everything else in a budget, as Xavier has already said, they have estimated to reflect as best they can what the costs may be. Any questions on that?

And then last of all, the second bullet in – on Page 70 there, "Includes drafting, renewing and finalizing annual SLA. Is it correct to assume that this does include the new SLEs?" And again, very clear answer, thank you Xavier, "No, they tried – they knew what the new SLAs were, they tried to estimate what those costs might be." So that's much appreciated. And appreciate the clarification. So, are there any questions or comments? And, thank you very much, Xavier, for taking the time to respond to these questions.

A couple action items that I'm taking on on two of them, and there are a couple of them that we should include however we decide to do that in some comments in our response to the budget in the next week or so. Any comments or questions about this before we let Xavier go?

Okay, and this is Chuck still speaking. So I think we can go on to the next agenda item then which gets into – it's Agenda Item 5. And you can stay on for this one if you want, Xavier. Make sure I state these correctly. But I thought it would be good, and we've kind of covered some of them already, but in 5(a) I noted as is noted in the operating plan and budget that fiscal year '15 and fiscal year '16 IANA transition costs were funded from the reserve fund, not from the approved budget. I think everybody already knows that.

Also Item B, the fiscal year '17 budget excludes IANA transition costs but it does, in C notice, it does include costs for PTI including the formation of a separate legal entity. Did I say that correctly, Xavier, if you're still on?

Xavier Calvez: Yes, you…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Good, I didn't want to misrepresent it but I thought I got it correct. And I mainly put those things in the agenda just so I didn't forget to make sure everybody understood that as we talk about possible comments on the budget and operating plan. Unless anybody has another question for Xavier, we will let him depart since we're talking about comments on his team's documents. Thank you very much, Xavier.

Okay, going on then, Chuck still speaking, to Item 6. Should comments be submitted? I won't say "we" because we're going to have to decide who "we"

is. But the – I think we have two things that we've already identified from Xavier's responses that it would be good some comments are submitted. And we'll talk about how we do that later.

What I'd like to talk about – so we've covered 6(a) already. Six b, does – is anybody aware of any other issues with regard to the budget and operating plan that we may want to comment on? I sent the document around that had the blue highlight, I tried to highlight everything related to PTI, IANA services in blue so it made it – you didn't have to go through the whole budget document if you couldn't do that.

But I'm just curious whether there are any thoughts on any other comments that you think might need to be made on this. Or is it just the two comments that came out of the responses from Xavier?

I think there's pretty good – in fact I think there's very good interaction with the IANA implementation taskforce and what's going on in implementation planning and so forth. Certainly all of you are welcome to take a look at the estimated costs for PTI. I'm sure the ICANN team wants to get it right as much as we do so I don't think there should be any distrust there.

But certainly one of the reasons they post the detail for public comment is so that the community does have opportunity to have its input. And we've got another – just a little over a week to do that – I guess a week and a half about until the 30th which I think is – is that ton a Saturday? I'm not sure.

Okay, so if we don't need to – unless somebody has a different idea what I will task myself with over the next couple of days is to develop some comments to cover the two items that we talked about with Xavier, and also

do the action items that I signed up for on this call and send that to the DT-O list.

Now my guess is that we may not need a call for that, we should be able to cover it on the list, although the responses on the list haven't been very good lately so maybe I'm wrong on that. Like I said Mary was the only one that responded this week on the list to the material that was sent around on the bylaws. So what do you think, I mean, if people – we have a call scheduled for the same time as this one for Thursday of this week. And the plan, at least between me and staff was if we don't need it we'll cancel it, okay but if we do we've got it on the calendar.

Thanks, Cheryl, for the input in the chat. Any, I mean, if you want to – is anybody in favor of – if you're in favor of having a call to finalize the comments we can go ahead with the call on Thursday. It probably wouldn't be a very long call. And I would definitely, if we're having the call, definitely get the comments – the final comments out to everyone before that call.

And then that would give us an opportunity if somebody wants a little more time to look at the budget to see if there's anything else you want to comment on. All I'm waiting for is if anybody on this call wants to – thinks it would be useful to have the call on Thursday. Anyone? Not hearing anyone or seeing any hands or checkmarks or anything else I'm going to assume that we can finalize this on the list.

And let me – let me ask for future meetings, and we are going to have to have future meetings as you'll see later in the agenda there are several tasks that we're going to be working on over the next couple months in cooperation with Xavier and Elise and her team and so forth. But so we are going to have to

have future calls. Is this meeting time a pretty good time? Or should we do another Doodle poll as we determine when we're ready for the next meetings?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Fine for me…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Anybody want to comment on that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's fine for me. It's Cheryl here. Fine for me.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, anybody opposed to this time? We'll worry about days later. I don't think there's any…

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl was trying to get in I think.

Chuck Gomes: Oh go ahead, Cheryl. Well I heard her – I heard her comment but go ahead, Cheryl, do you want to say further?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, not at all.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I thought I – yeah, so I did hear…

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: …my input for that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. And Olivier is okay with that. I'm not hearing any objections. So Brenda and Marika – thanks for joining us, Marika, the – looks like this time is a good time but I don't think that we're ready to schedule the next call since

we're going to cancel the one on this Thursday and work on list for the comments.

And then once we're ready – let's look at Agenda Item 8 which is the future work that we still have to work on, that's develop a process for development and approval of the IANA services budget. Xavier and Elise are working on that. And, Elise, if you want to comment on that you can but you're not required to. So probably we don't want to focus on that too much until they get back to us with their initial thoughts in that regard.

Certainly, Elise, at any point you want to bounce anything off of the team here feel free to do that. And we'll do our best to respond. We also have the development of a caretaker budget, which is another thing that will need to happen. But again, that's something that Xavier has said he's going to make a proposal there and get back to us on. And that's one that we'll probably coordinate with the CCWG budget folks as well since that is an issue coming out of their work.

And then last of all then, there's the question of should vetoing the PTI budget trigger both the PTI caretaker budget and the ICANN caretaker budget? We may have to talk about that further and we can work that into a future meeting unless we're told that that's of a more urgent nature, which I don't think it is but we'll find out.

So that's why we will need some future meetings. Once we are ready to deal with any or all of those issues we will schedule another meeting. And I guess my last question on that is are Tuesdays or Thursdays okay or are other days better? Any objection to just going with a Tuesday or a Thursday meeting for our next meeting once we decide to schedule it? And of course we'll have to

look at conflicts at the time but – and we'll do that – staff is really good at doing that.

All right, well unless somebody has any o there business we need to cover I think we accomplished what we needed to in this call. And thank each of you for your contributions in that regard. Please be watching for the messages because we do have a deadline, we need to get the – oh the other issue we need to talk about that I totally forgot mistakenly is is it – should it just submit these comments as the leader of the DT-O team? Or should I say that as endorsed by the DT-O team?

Or I see a checkmark from Cheryl that maybe I should just submit them. And I'm okay with that. I won't blame the DT-O team…

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: …unless you want me to.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm sure you can have our endorsement.

Chuck Gomes: So what I'll do – that's a good point, Cheryl. What I'll do is I'll put them, get them out hopefully this week and give you a chance to comment and say if you endorse them. And if there's reasonable endorsement support for them from the team I will say that in my – in the comments I submit. I'm comfortable with that approach.

Olivier, please your turn.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yeah, thanks Chuck. Olivier speaking. I was going to (unintelligible) green tick mark because you basically what I was going to

suggest. So, yeah, great way forward. You can either endorse or you could have a consensus call on asking for no objections and…

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's a good idea.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: …as long as you indicate the level of support on our design team. You can't – I don't think you can say that you're filing it on behalf of the team but you can certainly say that we all support what you're saying in an individual capacity. So there you go.

Chuck Gomes: Sounds good to me, Olivier. Thank you. Anything else? Okay, well thanks, everyone. And have a good rest of the week. We'll be talking on the list.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Chuck. Thanks, everybody. Bye.

Chuck Gomes: Meeting adjourned and the recording can stop. Thanks, Brenda, for doing this mostly solo. Appreciate that.

END