

ICANN

**Moderator: Terri Agnew
May 15, 2017
10:00 am CT**

Sue Schuler: Thank you. Hello Jessica go ahead.

Jessica Castillo: Thank you. Hello my name is Jessica Castillo I am the operations and project coordinator with the finance department at ICANN.

First I would like to thank you for all the comments that you submitted on the draft FY '18 planning documents. This session is intended to enhance our understanding of the comments that you submitted on these documents and to improve the quality of our responses.

At this time we won't be providing official responses but rather we will be asking some questions and allowing opportunity for the community to provide additional context to their written comments.

For reference this process was implemented to address the ATRT 2 recommendations Number 12.1 and 12.5. This call as you can see is being recorded and will be published on the ICANN community wiki shortly after the call.

We also have a board finance committee member, Asha Hemrajani on the line. And we will start by introducing staff in the room. Starting with Leo.

Leo Vegoda: Hi my name is Leo Vegoda and I was involved in the development of the operating plan.

Becky Nash: Hi my name is Becky Nash and I am VP of Finance at ICANN Org.

Xavier Calvez: Hi Xavier Calvez, CFO.

Jessica Castillo: And any staff on the call who would like to introduce themselves please do so now.

Rob Hoggarth: Hi this is Rob Hoggarth happy to join you all today thanks.

Larissa Gurnick: Hello this is Larissa Gurnick, ICANN staff. Thank you for having me.

Maguy Serad: Maguy Serad ICANN staff thank you.

Jessica Castillo: Thank you so we will...

Asha Hemrajani: This is Asha Hemrajani. Chair of the Finance committee thank you.

Jessica Castillo: Thank you Asha. So we will go ahead and start by asking the questions that you see in the room. In the Adobe Room.

And then if staff on the call have any other additional questions we will present those after these questions are answered.

I will start with Question 1.

Man: Okay so this relates to a comment about the document about drafting pilot program. Since the comment was submitted the board has approved partial funding for the activity. And we would like to know whether the registry stakeholder group is aware of the decision and what their thoughts on this are.

Chuck Gomes: Is somebody managing the queue?

Sue Schuler: Yes Chuck go ahead. Jessica would you like me to call out when people raise their hands?

Jessica Castillo: Yes sorry about that. I didn't see that hand raised thank you. Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks and Paul I think you probably heard that Paul Diaz was planning on being on this call and he had a flight cancellation getting back to D.C. I guess from the GDD. So that is why he is not on.

So I didn't plan on taking any particularly (unintelligible) here but I will try and fill in and other registered people can jump in as well.

So yes I am pretty aware – we are aware – if I understand correctly the funding was only provided for like six months, the first half of the fiscal year. So we understand that we – what is not clear is what happens the second six months?

Is it only going to be funded for six months and then the funding drops off? Or will there be a decision made to possibly fund it for the rest of the year? It is not at all clear as I don't know if everybody from ICANN that is on this call is aware.

But we have used this – in the pilot program we used this service extensively and it has really proved to be very beneficial. So for our planning purposes for the full year it would be helpful to better understand – sorry about the dog barking. I am in a public area that is a problem. I will mute myself when I am not talking.

So the I guess that is – I don't know if you have other questions but it is just not clear at all what happens the second six months of the year or what we should plan for in that regard. Hope that is clear thanks.

Jessica Castillo: Thank you Chuck. I think Xavier had a response.

Xavier Calvez: (Unintelligible) I think from a purely factual standpoint to Chuck the – to provide clarity as you were point out to the lack of clarity on the answer.

We wanted to make clear that the decision is to fund for 6 months. So there is funding for 6 months. There is not funding for 12 months and that should be clear hopefully now and we will try to respond to the comment in the session that clarifies further that statement and that is what the board has approved.

The position for funding for six months is obviously a compromise between the request that had been formulated by their registry stakeholder group of having it funded for the full year and not funding it at all.

And that compromise is on the basis of simply trying to allocate resources to their requests that are viewed as valuable across the various organizations. Rob I don't know if there is anything else you want to add on that topic.

Jessica Castillo: Chuck had his hand raised again actually.

Chuck Gomes: Let Rob go first if he has something to say.

Jessica Castillo: Okay.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks gentlemen. Yes I will go back and double check the text of the decision that was published Xavier. I think it is actually for five months not for six months.

Number of factors I think in that decision Chuck and Paul and I did communicate in terms of, you know, what would happen with the second half? I think he had reached out to say that you guys need to plan your own budget on an annual basis.

The reason why it is only partial is indeed what Xavier outlined just dealing with competing considerations. But from a staff and community perspective, you know, after this next phase of the pilot is completed and we hope to add another group to doing that testing.

We are going to be doing from a staff perspective evaluations on the second phase. We are actually hoping to get a report from the vendors in the next week or two telling us about the feedback on the first phase.

You guys have been very glowing in your responses. But what we are trying to do is build a program that can be a value to multiple communities. And as you can imagine the challenges. You know how to find the right people. How to find the right budget amounts and the rest.

So the remainder of FY '18 will be used to evaluate the program and the plan potentially for FY '19 to see if there is the capability not only to resource the capability and the service but to manage it effectively as well.

I hope that is helpful guys. Thanks.

Jessica Castillo: Thank you Rob. Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Okay thanks. Thanks Rob and thanks Xavier. I guess it seems kind of strange from my own personal comment to fund only five months. Is this next five months based on what Rob said? Another pilot? A continuation of the pilot?

So the first pilot wasn't definitive enough to make a decision on this? Is that what I am understanding?

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob. That is correct Chuck. You guys had a fantastic experience. I think it is safe to say that the others who participated in the pilot effort did not. So I think part of the strategic and management decisions about that is well what happens when it works really well for one group but not for the others?

How do we put together a program and a service capability that could have substantial expense primarily given that it is, you know, direct vendor staff support essentially. And something that have rolled out consistently over the community would be a substantial management and resource challenge to handle.

And we want to make sure that if we ultimately make a recommendation that is it the program that should be available to the community that it can actually be delivered consistently across the community. Thanks.

Jessica Castillo: Thank you Rob. We have a hand from (Jonathan).

Jonathan Robinson: Can you hear me okay?

Jessica Castillo: Yes we can hear you.

Jonathan Robinson: So I guess my question for Rob and possibly Xavier is under what circumstances would this continue then? Is there any way in which it could continue or do we have (unintelligible) certainty of low funding past five months?

Is there any basis on which (unintelligible) the context of that really is I heard what you said about (unintelligible) areas and evaluating and then perhaps reinstating in the next financial year?

But as you also acknowledged that there is a human resources dynamic to this whereby the individual concern is not only was necessarily hang around for some form of hiatus (unintelligible).

But in fact you will have an opportunity (unintelligible) invested in this individual and their capability. So what would you say the chances are of getting (unintelligible) even in our group alone notwithstanding how you view the pilot as a whole?

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob I am happy to take it Xavier or Jessica I am happy to take (Jonathan's) question.

Jessica Castillo: Go ahead Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you. This is multi-faceted (Jonathan). We understand the issues here and there are multi-faceted. We as a pilot tried to figure out what is the sort of venue of services that can be provided that is going to be effective to you guys.

And you may recognize that different communities have different needs and wants. So one of the tests in the pilot was what type of person do you need?

Do we need a graduate student? Do we need a partner at a silk stocking law firm? Do we need someone who has worked at a registry or registrar or civil society organization or a business to understand the group that they are working with?

What would those people charge? What can they charge consistently? What will they accept? And so folks like the fellow that worked with you all and folks who have worked with some of the other groups who are testing it have come from a variety of backgrounds.

And we have been very pleased that they have been willing to work with us understanding that it is a pilot effort. And frankly that was a challenge in terms of recruiting folks to be able to provide these services because they understand that it is not a permanent placement for a permanent job.

So that is one of the challenges that we have been working through. It didn't work with some people frankly. And that is just part of the pilot effort. We really appreciate you guys participating in the effort and helping us test this.

We have also had a systems from the BC, IPC and ISP as well. And as you all know, the registrars are interested as are some of the non-commercial communities.

So it is a real challenge. Because we are dealing with literally a Rubik's Cube of who provides the service, who uses the service, who manages the service. How much of the service can ICANN resource? We even experimented with what are people willing to be paid for this type of service and can we handle that?

The experience that you guys have is very positive and I think we all recognize it was for a limited period of time. It was only for four months. Could something like that last for a longer period? All these questions are part of it.

All we have been able to get guarantees from using the special budget request right now is that \$80,000 figure which based upon the burn rate of the vendors and the amount of work that the communities have asked for we think it will last for five months.

If there is going to be additional resources available in the budget you guys are telling us that right now that says, wow we would like to have 12 months if we could and I think that is all being factored into the FY '18 budget.

That was a kind of long monologue response. I hope it was helpful.

Jessica Castillo: Thanks Rob. Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Rob. Your explanations have at least helped us understand what is going on. I have a follow up question you may not be able to answer this now but you could probably get back to us later.

And this is strictly me speaking personally. I haven't talked to Paul or the rest of the registries. But if we wanted to spread that funding over the whole year. And again I have no idea whether the registries would want to do that. Would that be a possibility? Or does it need to be used in the five month period specifically?

And obviously that is a logistical question that you may not be able to answer. But if we could get an answer at some point in the near future. So that when we plan our budget we can plan accordingly. That would be very helpful.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks Chuck. This is Rob. I can generally say that based upon what we need to do and our experience in the first year is that we would not want it to go for longer than five months.

Basically what we budget is to say that each of the interested communities who participated in the first phase were resourced with 100 hours of service. And so that is how we had to budget it. It wasn't, you know, free flowing, you get however many hours you can squeeze into a month or four months or five months.

What we are trying to look at in terms of moving into FY '18 is a level of community interest and demand. Consistent with the pilot effort we are trying to tease out different experiences because we are trying to test and see what works.

So, you know, right now given the resources that have been made available to us in the budget we have got 100 – we are figuring 100 hours of service for five different communities.

There is a little bit of management overhead here. And (David) doesn't want to, you know, spread that out over additional months. What we want to do is be able to squeeze this, do the test and evaluate because five months' time period is going to take us to what? October/November and that puts us right in the middle of the FY '19 budget prep process.

So we want to be able to have a report and make some reasonable estimates for the board for Xavier and others on the senior team so that they can look at the FY '19 plans and see what we have available.

I mean bottom line and I don't think anybody who doesn't do the math here can realize that with potentially anywhere from 15 to 19 different groups, stakeholder groups, constituencies, RALOs and others.

That, you know, if you are only talking, you know, 100 hours of service for those communities you are still well into the six figures from a budget perspective and that needs to be balanced with everything else.

You guys have made an excellent case about how this is a fundamental need for you guys going forward. So I am hopeful that we will be able to find a way to potentially make it work. Thanks.

Jessica Castillo: Thanks Rob. With that we will move along to the next question. Becky would you like to comments on headcount and cost benefit analysis.

Becky Nash: Yes hi good morning. This is Becky Nash. We received a comment and it is referenced as 3.1 in the financial overview. The question is indicated here just indicating the average headcount is projected to grow from 358.2 for FY '17 to 413.8 for FY '18.

It is of concern to the RySG that average headcount is still being added in a substantial way. The RySG notes the additional staff of 10 under the portfolio projects of DNS, GDD/IANA apparently in direct support of contracted party related work.

However, the overarching need to continue to add more staff overall is not well explained and neither is there any specific demonstration of any program or activity to improve the efficiency of the use of human resources and hence reduce the average headcount.

We had some additional questions here just to better understand what this question relates to, to help us better formulate a response to the public comment.

So ICANN's response on these comments will include the items noted below and we just want to confirm this will help address the comment in the RySG's views.

Point one is that acknowledging that this is a general topic and that we appreciate the comments on both the activities to increase and others to decrease overall.

The context of the growth of the headcount in FY '18 we just had a question about adding only 20 people was referenced in the question.

Xavier Calvez: No sorry, in the comment. So what we wanted to make sure is understood is that the growth of headcount that is qualified in the comment.

Users average headcount which is useful and I just wanted to point out that that's the case simply because the headcount that is underlying to these numbers is actually lower than the budgeted headcount for FY '17.

So the starting point and the ending point for headcount for FY '17 are both below budget. The 358 average headcount for FY '17 is also below budget for FY '17. Just it is not answering the point but it is providing context to it.

And the – as the 414 employees average for FY '18 corresponds to a starting point of headcount in FY '18 of 400 and an ending point of from memory, 420. So the Fiscal Year '18 sees a growth of headcount of 20 approximately. Just to put the numbers in context.

Because using average numbers gives a midpoint of each year rather than the evolution over the several years which is also why we offered in the presentation a graph that shows the evolution of the headcount throughout a period of three years from the previous year, the current fiscal year and the fiscal year being budgeted for.

Having said that it is simply context to the comment. But we thought it would be useful to provide.

We thought that it would be helpful to also provide an understanding of where the growth occurs. To make sure that it is understood by not only the registry stakeholder group who provided this comment but everyone who could read the comment and its response.

Because I think that the comment is on a topic that is of interest by many more than simply the reduced (unintelligible) so that is a very useful comment from that perspective.

And also trying to provide an understanding along with the increases of headcount through this period of what activities are being supported through that increase of headcount.

If I take an example, we could probably list among the increases higher headcount for example in the department that support reviews because there is a larger number of reviews to be carried out as an example. So explaining both the headcount increase and the activities supported.

From that perspective I wanted to understand if that would be at least helpful if response to the comment if not fully addressing the comment. And we have (Jonathan) in the queue. (Jonathan) please.

Jessica Castillo: (Jonathan) go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Xavier. I think that – well first...

Asha Hermranji: Sorry (Jonathan) I can't hear you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. Apologies (Asha). I had two - I switched on the wrong mic. Because of earlier problems I switched to telephone and now I have the second mic open. So that's (unintelligible).

Woman: Okay. All right.

Jonathan Robinson: On Point 0 I'm not sure I understand that. So before making two - I wanted to make three points. But my first point is I question on Point 0. I don't know that I understand that - all the explanation, which was given.

It's not clear to me what's being said there (noting) that this is a general topic and I appreciate the RSG offers comments on both activities to increase and others to decrease. I don't understand that point I don't think. So if you could further clarify that it'd be helpful. And I have a couple other follow ups.

Xavier Calvez: Yes. Sorry (Jonathan). This comment was pertaining to more than simply this specific comment from the Registry Stakeholder Group. We were trying to refer to the other comments that also suggest in various places that some activities should be supported further by - with more dollars and other activities in separate comments should be or at least to reconsider to gain the level of support that they have because they are suggested to be potentially funded too much.

So and those are separate comments than this specific one. And that's what this Point 0 was trying to talk about is I had numerous conversations with community members and asking them to comment and to provide as specific comments as possible on activities to enhance or to give less priority too from a funding standpoint.

And the Registry Stakeholder Group comments they should do that and I wanted to acknowledge the value of doing that because it's actually providing a lot of information and help as to what the community, in this case the registries think about the budget and offer constructive comment to it. So that's what this Point 0 was trying to do. And I think you have other questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. Okay. That's helpful. So you - essentially it's about recognizing our contribution to the discussion and to the - and the feedback. That's useful. I think we we're in danger on the Point 1 of getting into a sort of - and you need to be careful in your response so it doesn't look political.

I understand your point. But in FY18 the bare facts are that you commence FY18 with 400 and end FY18 with 420. But it's an equally relevant fact to say that the midyear headcount is 358 and the midyear headcount the following year is --what is the actual figure -- 414.

Xavier Calvez: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: And therefore the reason that's a relevant figure is because it doesn't only concentrate on FY18. It (unintelligible) on top of an already significant increase in FY17.

And the question is why is this momentum necessary. I'm not expecting you to answer that. But that's what this question's really about. It's saying look, you've put on significant numbers in the prior year. And you're now going to put on further additional numbers in the forthcoming year.

And so if you're not careful and you answer in the way you suggested -- so I guess I'm giving some feedback on the perspective answer -- it looks like you're not acknowledging the prior momentum and heavy increase in headcount and trying to say actually it's only 20. It's not so bad.

Whereas actually, you know, midyear to mid year it's, you know, more than 10% growth in headcount.

Xavier Calvez: So I'll respond right away. Thank you (Jonathan). Apologize I was not clear. What I intended to say is simply provide context of the 20, not just say that 20 was not a lot. That's not what I was trying to say.

But I think it's important for everyone to understand when you say there's been a significant increase, what is it about, I want to point out that this was everything that was explained in the FY17 budget and we're lower than that in terms of headcount.

So there is no mystery as to why the headcount of FY17 has grown during FY17. I'm leaving aside FY20 for a second because it's all in the FY17 budget that's been commented upon and we're below that. But that's the second contextual comment.

What I suggested to do relative to where the headcount has grown and what activities that headcount growth supported I intended that our response would cover both FY17 and FY18 so that we do cover the scope of the numbers used for the comment.

So the numbers used for the comment being the average headcount through the year of FY17 and through the year of FY18. I suggested we look at the two-year headcount growth, which then would cover the entire scope of the comment exactly to the point that you made just earlier.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks Xavier. I think that will be helpful and it will - because the comment on 18 is made in the context of 18 following 17. So I think we understand each other.

And then finally on Point 3 you talk about in your draft response or perspective response the illustrative activities carried out to optimize resources, which is a partial answer.

And second is it would be useful if to know any thinking about any drive to ultimately reduce average headcount rather than that this is an - not a never

ending potential increase in headcount. At what point can we start to see those efficiencies mean that headcount growth is arrested and/or, you know, there's some form of decline? So that's the second part of the question really I think.

Xavier Calvez: Okay. Thank you. And I'm (vivated) that in the Point Number 3 there would a number of comments, some being more specific, some being more general. And certainly any focus of stabilization or possibly decrease of headcount would be on the basis of the operating plan and what does that operating plan contain or should contain.

And, you know, if we want to consider stabilization or reductions, the questions are simply what are the activities that we are either stabilizing, doing differently or something to do.

And of course in that there is general efficiencies and I qualify by that how do you do the same thing with less resources whether it's people or external cost. And that's a general comment.

But certainly the question from our perspective would be what activities do we stop doing or do less of. And that's very - that's why the comments that the registry has provided relative to activities to de-prioritize in quote are very helpful. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Xavier. That's helpful.

Larissa Gurnick: Okay. Thank you. With that, we'll go ahead and move on to the next comment. Leo.

Leo Vegoda: Okay. Could you scroll this a little bit or is it...

((Crosstalk))

Leo Vegoda: Okay. So this relates to the comment we received on Portfolio 2.2.1 up until 2.2.3. And this is a portfolio to proactively plan for changes in the use of unique identifiers.

And the comment related to the proposed spend - and you're making it much more difficult for me to...

Larissa Gurnick: Sorry. I guess that's the size of the document.

Leo Vegoda: Okay. So related to the proposed spend of \$6 million on (ten) people working on identifier evolution, technical reputation and observing, assessing and improving Internet identifiers, security, stability and resilience.

And the comment was that this figure seems particularly high and does it need to be or could it be managed more tightly. And the Registry Stakeholder Group would appreciate more complete and clear rationalization for the purpose and content of this expenditure.

So what we'd like to clarify is the entire goal 2.2, which is being referred to here includes a headcount of 10.6 full time equivalents. And the direct personnel costs for this is about \$3 million inclusive of compensation of benefits.

Other costs related to this portfolio include travel, professional services and administration. This is the remaining \$3 million of expenses for that particular goal. So \$6 million in total.

Further comments will be provided to attempt to address this request for a more complete and better-explained rationale for the resources that cater to this goal. So that's the approach we would like to take in our response. And we would appreciate your thoughts on our proposed approach.

Larissa Gurnick: If there's any comments or other questions on that, please raise your hand. Chuck, go ahead. Go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry. It took me a while to get off mute.

Larissa Gurnick: That's okay.

Chuck Gomes: My apologies. I should have been prepared. Just one general comment especially in light of the issue of only partial support for the pilot project that we talked about first.

That pilot project has to do with policy development. And it's possible that this large expenditure could impact policy development but certainly not as clearly - is clear that that's the case. And a couple of you mentioned that, you know, prioritizing where funds should go and so forth.

I don't bring this up for a response. I just think it's important that when we're cautious, and I understand why you're being cautious on the pilot project; that was well explained.

But the bottom line is one of the most important things that ICANN does is policy development. And when - and that's got to be kept in mind I think better than it is now. And that's my personal opinion as one who's heavily involved in the policy development.

So I just say that and make that as a point. I'm not - I don't expect a response. But I do think that that's a very important point. Thanks.

Larissa Gurnick: Okay. Thank you for that. (Mason), go ahead.

Mason Cole: Hi. Good morning. Thank you. My question on this - I just wanted to follow up with Chuck a bit. Is this line item meant to monitor for example innovative changes that registries or registrars might put in place in the DNS and then how ICANN might respond to that in a (regular) fashion? Or is it meant to be more an effort to organize information that would be directed toward policy development?

And I recognize this is a bit of an open-ended question. And this may be an open-ended budget item. But any more detail that might be provided in your response I think would help us understand more about what you're aiming at here.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you (Mason). This is Xavier. I don't believe this general goal that we're referring to here relative to the unique identifier evolution and technical reputation is directly or even indirectly supporting policy development.

I believe this is largely the CTO's team that looks at various aspects of the DNS, security and cybersecurity aspects and education. But because I'm not the expert and we happen to know have been able to bring on this call any member of David Conrad's team.

I will simply defer to talking with him so that he can provide a more substantive answer to the description of the activities that are carried here that is more clear and help in everyone understanding what are those activities and how they are carried out. Because I don't believe from memory that is

supporting policy development but again, I will let David and his team (precise) further and in more detail the activities that are carried out by this group and with the funds that are allocated to it.

Larissa Gurnick: Thank you.

Mason Cole: Okay. Thank you Xavier. Appreciate (that).

Larissa Gurnick: We have a hand from (Jonathan). Go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I think I'll just sort of perhaps in a sense restating an element of what was said before. I mean we have no collectively as ICANN and the community in which you support - we have no choice but to do appropriate policy development as and when that's necessary.

And so to further emphasize, we believe that this is an absolutely critical function. And included in that is this support that we've had recently in terms of the overall policy development.

I think we made a bigger point in our comments that we noted the relatively limited amount of budget overall that was targeted towards the support of policy development in the ICANN environment. So and that does appear on your response - your draft responses here. But I'm pretty sure we made a comment along those lines.

And therefore to the extent that there is an activity, which on the face of it there's 2.21 to 2.23, is more discretionary, you know, I think our point is that we need to see that properly rationalized and ideally the relevant policy work fully supported because that is not discretionary.

So I think that's some further context that sort of reinforces the point made by Chuck and to some extent (Mason) and gives you a sense of our thinking when analyzing this and from the limited amount of information we had on this Portfolio 2.21 to 2.23. Thank you.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you (Jonathan). This is very helpful. And certainly just to - for clarity as (Jessica) introduced the call, she pointed out to the fact that we have been raising during this call the comments on which we had more specific questions.

But this is not to say that we're not considering the other comments on which we didn't have specific questions simply because they appeared clear to us and that we will respond to all the comments.

We only brought during this call those that we felt were helpful to be discussed so that we enhance our response. I don't mean - we don't mean by this process to minimize or dismiss the importance of the other comments.

And the one you're referring to is very important and I'm glad you're raising it again because it emphasizes the importance that it has in the Registries Stakeholder Group's mind.

I just want to offer a quick thought. You pointed out to policy development being a core activity of ICANN, which I think is undeniable in that it receives currently relatively low fraction of ICANN's funding and of course this is a perspective and an opinion.

I want to be careful to put in perspective and our answer will point that out that as an example the goal in the portfolio is under the goal 2.2, which by the

way are part of the strategy plan defined and built by the community and approved by the Board.

It is basically supporting security, stability and resiliency of the DNS, which is a core aspect of the mission of ICANN. And therefore is undoubtedly not a discretionary. But I understand the point that you made about more generally speaking policy development support in discretionary activities.

I would argue that SSR is hardly a discretionary function of ICANN because it's part of its mission. But the point that you made is very well understand and the emphasis of policy development support is something we need to be able to explain further and address. So appreciate that. Thank you.

Larissa Gurnick: I see another hand raised by (Mason). I'm not sure if that's a new one or if that was from a previous comment. Would you like to go ahead?

Mason Cole: Sorry. Old hand.

Larissa Gurnick: Okay. (Jonathan), go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. Just to further respond on that prior dialog. I guess the point then Xavier is of course no one would argue that security, stability and resiliency were not core to ICANN's mission and self-evidently absolutely vital.

The point about 2.21 to 2.23 is it's not immediately clear on the face of it that these are SSR related projects. They look more kind of discretionary than that.

And so I guess if that's the answer, it should be made clear where other, you know, it'll be useful to categorize other activities as in furthering the interest

of SSR policy or R&D. And my impression on the face of it from what was described was that this more R&D than SSR. Thanks.

Xavier Calvez: Understood. Thank you. That's helpful. And as we indicated, we will have David's team help us clarify further these activities. And also we - obviously as a result are making a note that the description that we currently have in the operating plan is not sufficiently explicit as to what those activities are. So we will need to change that on the go forward basis as well. Thank you.

Larissa Gurnick: Thank you. At this point we have about ten minutes left. Are there any other last thoughts or comments that anyone from the community or staff has? If so, please raise your hand. Okay. I think that's an old hand from (Jonathan). If you had something else to add - yes. I think that was old.

So with that, thank you. Becky, you want to go ahead and...

Becky Nash: Sure. So again, this is Becky Nash. If there are not any more questions either being asked by staff or comments from members of the community that have joined us, we will then look to close this call.

First of all, we would like to thank you for your comments on the draft FY18 planning document. And we do appreciate everybody's attendance on this call.

And we'd like to just reiterate that this session is intended to enhance our understanding of the comments that have been submitted on the document so that we can improve the quality of our responses and definitely the exchange that we've had today has tremendously helped us identify areas that we can research further and/or clarify points on in order to provide better responses.

We again did not intend to provide any official responses at this time. And we really do appreciate everybody's attendance and communication as it relates to questions and helped us really foster a better understanding.

So at this time I don't know if anyone else has any comments or would like to offer anything. We don't have any hands. So such, we are going to close the call at this time. So thank you again for your participation.

Man: Thank you.

Sue Schuler: Thank you everyone. We can stop the recording now.

END