RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, can we have the next slide, please? Our agenda today is closure on plans for the Johannesberg meeting, a quick chronology of the Madrid meeting and agenda, and the bulk of the call will be take up by a briefing on IANA PTI by ICANN Staff, and then we'll have a few minutes at the end for other business. Any comments on the agenda? Any issues people would like to raise before we dive in? Hearing none, any updates of statements of interest? We have an apology from Geoff Huston. Any other absences or apologies to note? Okay. Hearing none, moving on the Johannesberg meeting.

Can we have the next slide, please? Although meeting in Johannesberg had always been on the list of meetings, put there initially by Staff and agreed to early on by the team, the then uncertainty interjected by confusion apparently among the SO/AC leaders and staff about the rules for the meeting, I think caused enough confusion that people's schedules become more fluid. So we get a quick poll, and thank you for participating to get a head count. We're not faced with only 5 of the 16 members of the team able to participate if we hold the team meeting June 24 and 25, and 19 members able to attend a team meeting, less than half, if we hold it on June 25 and 26, the 26th being the first day of the ICANN Johannesberg meeting.

So, I'd like to open the floor for any opinions you would like to share, suggestions, what we're faced with now is going forward with a team

meeting on June 25 and 26, with less than half of the team members able to participate in person, or alternatively, pick another date and location in July that works for a majority of team members. I'd like to take a queue and encourage you to show your input. Any thoughts? Anyone feel strongly that we should or should not meet in Johannesberg at this point? I think Mohamad comes down on the side of scheduling the meeting at a later date. Don, then Alain.

DON BLUMENTHAL: Yeas, I'm going to something I hate, well, Yvette, can you hear me, because this is a new setup.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, go ahead Don.

DON BLUMENTHAL: Okay, great. I was initial thinking that a little over half would be sufficient, but if it's a possibility of finding another date where more people can attend, I think that would be the best route.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Don. Alain?

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: Can you hear me?

EN

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: Okay, at this point, I think we should consider two things. One is okay, we come to the meeting, we interact with the community, and because this is happening in Africa, I think it gives us opportunity to meet global community, but also the African community. In that sense, I can see having the meeting, so I must go as a good opportunity. On the other hand, if we meet in Madrid, okay, I consider to be our starting point, will we have enough material to discuss in Johannesberg?

DENISE MICHEL: Was that a question for us?

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: Yes.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, in my opinion, we will have plenty to discuss. I think that is a statement I'd make across the board for the team to meet. We have, I think, a great deal of work ahead of us.   Are there comments, perspectives? There is a suggestion by Zarko in the chat room to defer until we get together in Madrid later this week, and Boban agreed with that. Any other comments or thoughts on that? Staff can give us some, can put on how pressing the timing is for making, for pulling the trigger on Johannesberg in terms of travel arrangements and meeting rooms. We have time, in other words, to decide this weekend.

JENNIFER BRYCE: It's Jennifer here. I understand that it's fairly pressing at this point for meetings team to be able to make arrangements for us to set the room up and find the space.

DENISE MICHEL: So, we can or cannot defer until this weekend?

JENNIFER BRYCE: Well, I think, I'd say not. I'd say if you can make a decision today, that would be preferable.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay. Cathy, you have your hand up?

CATHY HANDLEY: Yeah, I think, I don't know if, I don't want to offend anyone when I say this, but I don't know how many people on this list are used to going to ICANN meetings, but the longer we decide to wait until the next meeting, the fewer hotel rooms and the fewer flights. I've got mine done, and right now just a guess with my schedule, which I know it's only my problem, but I don't have a free week in the month of July for traveling. And I think it's really important that this get – you know, we decide if it is felt, as you said, that we'll have plenty to do, then we make a decision. We can't keep putting it off. Thanks.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you. Alain, do you have your hand up to speak?

ALAIN PATRICK AINA: Okay, I was supposed to take my hand up, but I put something in the target role. I put the calendar showing that there is no ICANN meeting in Africa next year. So if we meet in Johannesberg, the opportunity to interact in Africa. So I don't know how important is that, but I just thought it was up to the team to decide.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Alain. Any other comments on this?

DON BLUMENTHAL: It's Don, I got my hand up, I don't know if it's showing up there.

DENISE MICHEL: No, I'm sorry, I missed that, go right ahead, and then James, I see, after Don.

DON BLUMENTHAL: I agree for purposes of getting reservations and all the done. I hate to put the decision off any longer. If we stick with, well, I'll take that out of the equation.   I'm coming through SSAC, but I'm already getting bite back from ICANN Travel about, we need your information. My thought is I think we should decide today, not put it off.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, thanks, Don. James?

JAMES GANNON: Same as Don, I think we should try and get this done today, I just want to put a note in that if we decide not to meet in Johannesberg, and we want to set a face-to-face, for me, speaking personally, I'd like to reschedule those into my day job work schedule....

DENISE MICHEL: I'm sorry, I missed that part, James. I'm sorry James, could you repeat that last part? Did we lose James?

DON BLUMENTHAL: I believe he may have lost his audio. He was mentioning that if we are going to reschedule for another date, that he would probably need to know those new dates by this weekend, so he can schedule it with his day job.

DENISE MICHEL: Okay, alright.   Is there anyone else before I close off the conversation on this? The Co-Chairs will confer and also touch base with Staff, then, and make a decision, and get back to the rest. Thank you everyone for your forbearance as we work through this.

Next item on the agenda please. Next slide, please. Could you post the agenda for the Madrid meeting? So, yesterday, an updated Madrid meeting schedule and agenda was posted to the list, we just wanted to

give key members a chance to ask any questions they may have and offer any comments that they may have to the agenda. You will recall that we're spending Friday in the ICANN DNS Symposium as audience members. A significant amount of topics covered there relevant to our work, so that's a briefing rich environment for team members. And then we have the technology officer staff and SSR staff for Sunday morning, essentially, so we've frontloaded the agenda to address our mandatory objective of assessing the implementation of the SSR-1 report and assessing effectiveness or impact.

Are there any comments on the first day of the Madrid agenda? So in add to the SSR-1 briefing, you'll note that we also included, given the past DNS symposium agenda and the numerous issues relevant to our work that are being raised there, we thought it would be useful, and had received the suggestion that we use the first agenda item to have a broader discussion about the front landscape and also use it as an opportunity for followup questions that people may have from the DNS symposium the day before. You'll notice the symposium scheduled is quite packed, not a lot of time for questions.

So we've got that, then the in depth briefing on the discussion on the SSR-1 implementation, then our reflection, discussion about that. Our decisions about Next Step, I'll be creating a subgroup to go in depth on these, how do we want to handle the Next Step, and then a briefing and discussion about the identifier technology health indicators program with staff to round out that day.

And then on the second day, it will be a focus on teams work with a build out of how we'll be conducting our work, so that if our work plan

James has provided on the list, thank you James – the first draft of what might be a subgroup approach to our work, and we have time for more in depth subgroup discussion, as well as a discussion on outreach plan and an agreement on Next Step. Happy to take a cue if there is any item that people want to discuss. Also, through the end of today, we're happy to take any additional comments or edits on the email list, as well. Any comments on this before we move on? Okay.

Then we'll move on to the IANA PTI grouping. We have slides loading, we have Sam Eisner who is ICANN Deputy General Counsel, and Elise Gerich, who is the VP IANA Services and President of the Public Technical Identifiers. I'll turn this over to you, Sam and Elise.

SAMANTHA EISNER: Thanks, this is Sam Eisner. I'm Deputy General Counsel with ICANN, but I'm not necessarily here today as a lawyer, but for my role of working with ICANN during all phases of the proposal development as well as implementation of PTI, because we wanted to give you kind of the general PTI/ICANN relationship overview so that as you launch into your work, you can understand what has changed and what hasn't changed by PTI becoming part of the ICANN landscape. And then Elise is here, she's joining us on the phone from the Right Meeting, and so if we have more technical questions, she'll come in, but given the time zones and everything here, I've agreed to take on the bulk of the conversation, but she's here to support if we need.

So I have just a few slides, and then if you have some questions at the end, we'd be happy to take them. It might be easier if you guys could

make me a presenter, then I can move the slides on my own. Perfect, thanks. So this is really the landscape. I know there are a lot of things on this page, but this is the landscape of the world that was envisioned through the ICG's proposal, and this is what ICANN was implementing when we developed PTI and the structure of contracts and subcontracts and oversight groups that have been put together. So, again, this slide deck is available to you, this will be here, and we'll go through each on of these parts in a little bit more depth.

So, what is PTI, so, Public Technical Identifiers. It is an affiliate of ICANN that's responsible for performing the IANA functions and delivering the IANA services on behalf of ICANN. PTI also does not have any policy setting roles. PTI is only responsible for the implementation of agreed policies and principles developed the multistate corporate community. And so the policy roles that come out of the different communities remain the same, and ICANN's role in relations of policies remain the same, and ICANN gives direction to PTI as to which policies it is supposed to apply to its work, or not.

And so you see here, it just says, the most general view of PTI and ICANN, which is PTI and ICANN have a contractual relationship, it's contracts that form the basis of all the directions of the work that ICANN is asking PTI to do. A general overview of PTI on a few different axes is first of all legal, is that it's a nonprofit public benefit corporation set up in ICANN. We are applying for 501-C3 tax status for PTI under ICANN's tax exempt status, because is PTI's sole member. It's a very legal issue, but it means ICANN has a lot of power to direct PTI's work and so ICANN, as we'll discuss later, is responsible for the selection of PTI board members, with a little bit of an exception, and it's really

responsible for making sure that PTI does everything that PTI says that it will do. So it has a few things it has to do uniquely.

So, under California law, PTI has to have its own independent financial audit, but otherwise, much like ICANN, PTI has an annual budget that is developed in consultation with the community, it then gets put into ICANN's IANA budget. It has a four year strategic plan that will be updated annually, and we would see that process happening a lot like we have our ICANN strategic planning process. What does PTI do? We'll get into that into a little bit more depth, but PTI performs the IANA function. It performs the naming protocol parameters and number services via contracts and subcontracts with ICANN, and it relies on ICANN through a services agreement to provide all of the resources required to perform those services.

And so really, when PTI forms a budget, the reason that it's part of the ICANN budget, as well, is because ICANN is obligated and funding and providing the resources so that the IANA functions are performed as expected. The board is comprised of five directors, we'll get a little bit more in depth on the composition of the board in a bit. It also has three officers appointed by the ICANN Board. I also serve as the Secretary of PTI, but again, that's not the role that I'm here talking to you in today. And then in terms of staffing, there is no change in the personnel performing the IANA functions from September 30, 2016, which was the date prior to transition, to October 01, 2016, or today. Same people who were within the ICANN IANA department other than natural changes in personnel that might happen.

And the people within the IANA department have been seconded to PTI, so they actually work for ICANN at this point and we've assigned them as part of their roles of working with ICANN, to work with PTI in performing the IANA functions there. So there is very little change. We will see on this slide what stays the same. So, what the IANA functions have stayed the same. The registries that the IANA functions maintain have stayed the same. The individuals performing the work have stayed the same. Where they perform the work has stayed the same.

And also the methods for submitting changes and updates and working with our customers, for the most part have stayed the same, other than some of the minor changes that have happened through the development of service level expectations or agreements directly with the particular customers. So at the really high level overview for those who have been pretty engrained in ICANN's work, so for each of the three IANA functions, the domain names, numbering resources, and protocol parameters, you can look at this and see who is responsible for the oversight.

So that top level oversight for the most part was fulfilled by NTAA-3 IANA Functions contract, prior to October 1st. But with the transition, what happened was that oversight was provided directly to the operational communities instead, and so on the domain name side, there is a customer standing committee, or CSC, numbering resources, community uses review committee, and protocol parameters community uses the ITFB IAB leadership to provide that direct oversight, to make sure that PTI's performing the IANA function in a proper manner. The policy places the policies that relate to each of these IANA functions, are still done in the same place. So, policies developed for

domain names within the ICANN, as set out in the ICANN bylaws for both the GNSO and that CCNSO.

The ASO is still responsible for development of policies for the numbering resources, and the IGS is still responsible for setting the policies around the protocol parameters. The main area of change is in operations. So, instead of PTI – oh, someone is moving my deck. Okay, so going back to operations, so, PTI performs the domain name functions directly through the IANA naming function contracts that is hold with ICANN. The numbering resources community to the NRO is contracted directly with ICANN for the performance of the numbering resources, then ICANN subcontracts that obligation to PTI, and also the ITF and the IAD have contracted directly with ICANN to perform the protocol parameters and ICANN then subcontracts that responsibility to PTI.

And so here are different to represent that. I'm not going to walk through each of the boxes on these slides, you have them to look at, and if you have any other questions, we can talk to them today, you can also contact me or Elise separately. But what each of the series of slides show is where the relationships come from. So, PTI through ICANN has a contract. And if you look at the dark blue box on your screen, the dark blue dialogue box, it's pointing to some papers between PTI and ICANN. So that's where PTI's empowered to do the protocol parameters work. And ICANN is empowered to do that because of the agreement that it holds with the ITF directly, and so there is a subcontracting agreement.

The same thing with RIRs and PTI. There is a contract that ICANN holds with RIRs to ICANN, and then ICANN subcontracts that to PTI . No the

TLD community or the naming community is the only place where we don't have a subcontract between ICANN and PTI with a contract. So this is a main contract as required out of the ICG proposal. And so this is the main contract that is the basis of the reason that PTI was formed. And so if you look back at the ICG proposal, the only community that required its work to be performed for the IANA functions through PTI, was the naming community.

And then each of the other two communities agreed that it would be okay for ICANN to perform their work through PTI, but with contract directly with ICANN. And then the relationship of the CSC that you'll see this box here, so the CSC as we saw on the previous slide provides oversight of PTI's work. However, the CSC is developed in ICANN's bylaws and ICANN relies on the CSC's oversight role over PTI, because any escalation of issues within PTI necessarily also has to touch ICANN at some place, because ICANN in its bylaws remains responsible for making sure that PTI performs through its contractural obligations.

That has actually been a place where the community asked for ICANN to be able to be taken to an independent review if ICANN does not make sure that PTI has lived up to its contractual obligations in the performance of a naming function. And the independent review, for those of you who are not familiar, is a place where ICANN is establishing a scanning panel, we don't have that put in place yet, but in the meantime, there are general arbitrators who would be available for that. We take a look to see if ICANN was meeting up to that responsibility. So it's essentially a judicial function over ICANN.

DENISE MICHEL: Hey, Sam? If I may quickly interrupt. For team members, especially those new to this environment, please feel free to raise your hand or post something in the chat, if you have questions. Does anyone have any questions at this point regarding the information that Sam has covered thus far? And please feel free to speak up if I missed your hand. Okay, go ahead, Sam. Thank you.

SAMANTHA EISNER: Thanks, Denise. And there are just a couple other slides, so we will have some more time available for questions. The next is the relationship between VeriSign and PTI. Many of you may know that VeriSign has been performing a root maintainer role historically for a very long time, and was part of a three party agreement between ICANN, NTIA, and VeriSign, for serving in that role. So in relation to the naming function, when ICANN would receive a request to change the information in the root zone, ICANN would process that, but that request would then have to go to NTIA for approval and verification, and then NTIA would have to send the note to VeriSign, and VeriSign could actually implement the change in the root zone.

So, in the post transition environment, NTIA is no longer part of that zone maintainer environment, and now the contract is directly between ICANN and PTI. So ICANN still processes the request for changes to the root zone, and VeriSign is still responsible for publishing those changes into the root zone, and that's achieved directly through a root zone maintainer agreement that's held between ICANN and VeriSign. So those are the gold colored boxes that you see on your screen.

EN

And then because that operation is so inherently tied to the performance of the IANA naming function, ICANN has subcontracted to PTI , most of it obligations under that root zone maintainer agreement, so that ICANN doesn't become another place for a check within the needs for changes to the root zone environment. And so that's another place where ICANN is relying on and providing resources to PTI to perform this work on ICANN's behalf.

Then there is one other key agreement between ICANN and PTI, which is a services agreement. And so the services agreement is where the obligation for ICANN to provide services to PTI including funding and very specific things about resourcing and technical resources and systems, et cetera. And staffing, and all of those things. That is where the obligations between ICANN and PTI are laid out. So this agreement really doesn't touch on any requirements about the work that PTI does, but is really the commitment of how ICANN will make sure that PTI is supported in doing its work.

So, then we turn to the PTI Board. So, current the PTI Board is made up of five directors. They are all appointed by ICANN, however, based on that proposal that came out of the community, two of those directors are actually nominated through the ICANN nominating committee. To currently, today we have Lise Fuhr and Jonathan Robinson who on an interim basis were identified by the stewardship group that was developing a proposal for the naming function, and the ICANN nominating committee is at this point going through a process to identify the two board members who will be seated on a more permanent basis on the PTI Board.

And then ICANN has the opportunity to seat three of the board members itself. One is reserved to the President of PTI, which Elise is, and she's on the board in an ex-officio capacity. And then Akram Atallah and David Conrad. And then I think I have one more slide, and then I'll go to the questions.

So, really this is just kind of the general, where do you go, who you contact. So this information is available for you to look at. So, we have Mr. Matogoro who has a question, what is the impact of moving the IANA services to PTI, who will this be monitored? The question is duplicated in there.

There are many ways to answer the question here. The base expectation right now is that there is actually very minimal impact to the customers of the IANA function based on the moving of the IANA services to PTI. There have been things that PTI has had to do in its own name, such as PTI has obligations through the IANA naming function agreement, as well as the separate agreements that have been subcontracted about the numbering and protocol parameters, about maintaining up to day security protocols, et cetera, but those are actually already things that were in existence.

For the most part, when the ICG proposal came out, much of it was based on the fact that the communities were actually very satisfied with the IANA services that they were providing. And so the intent was to create very minimal impact, if any, on the services that the customers received. And so it's far more of an administrative impact at this point within ICANN to have and maintain a separate affiliate, and to make sure that we have the understanding of the alliance of our PTI and IANA

staff. Now the work that PTI does is very importantly monitored and overseen by the customers. And so each those customers are now directly empowered to provide that oversight.

And so instead of the NTIA's general oversight role before the transition, now that we have the transition concluded and the IANA naming function agreement, now we have three separate agreements through is there is operational oversight, each tethered to the different community's needs and based on the delivery of service level agreements or service level targets that have been agreed between ICANN and PTI and the customers. And PTI is responsible in the first part for delivering that, and ICANN is responsible for overseeing that. So the big change is actually in the monitoring process, and not in how the services are delivered. Elise, do you have anything that you want to add to that? I don't know if you're able to speak.

ELISE GERICH: Hi Sam, this is Elise. Yeah, thank you. I think you did a good job. Basically, whatever PTI does, it's on behalf of ICANN, and ICANN has through the communities created these service level deliverables or targets and it's ICANN, along with those communities, that monitor what PTI does. I don't know if that's just a much simpler way or a better description that you gave, Sam. And all the reports that post to ICANN and the community are posted publicly.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, I do have a question, do you have more slides and more basic material, Sam? Or I could wait until you're done. So, Elise, could you

speak a bit more about the more security and stability related reviews assessment work that is done in relation to IANA's responsibilities? In other words, I understand the service level agreements and I understand the key customers reviewing that, how long does it take to get my ccTLD change request processed, and various things like that, but in terms of system wide security stability or specific security and stability-related issues raised by the new gTLD's or just other aspects involving the internet, and where does that come into play in terms of the structure and processes that are currently in place?

ELISE GERICH: So, part of the past, as well as the current security and stability of systems is one of the services that are provided by ICANN themselves, and through the service agreement with PTI. And one of the ways that we assure or monitor those and provide documentation of that is through what is called service organization control reports, the SOC2 reports that are done by a third party auditor, and these are audits, not financial audits, but audits of systems and processes.

And this looks into the security of our systems, as well as the processes used to provide the services. And those systems are then outsourced basically from ICANN to PTI. So we leverage the services of ICANN and whichever ICANN delivers those services on, ICANN systems, and it's a SOC2 audit that we do, and the SOC3 also, that we do annually, that assure that the stability and security of the systems are intact. I hope that's what you're asking.

DENISE MICHEL: I think in part, it would be great if you could send the team examples or links to the SOC2 and SOC3 reports and also explain the difference between 2 and 3, and then just a quick clarification before we go to, I see Emily has her hand up. The audits are an audit of activities that have occurred in the past, is that correct? Essentially they're auditing how services have been provided?

ELISE GERICH: So, typically the audit runs from December 1st to the end of November annually. This year, because of the introduction of the affiliate PTI, the audit ran until the end of September. The new audit will audit the period starting October 1st which is when PTI was established, and so we'll have a full year of PTI's operations under the service agreement with ICANN. And as I said, most of what the services agreement offers is that it provides the systems that we use for delivering the INS services, such as the works that maintain our systems, the registries that we post, things of that nature.

DENISE MICHEL: I'll take my request for SOC2 and SOC3 reports off line. Emliy. You have your hand up?

EMILY TAYLOR: Hi, can you hear me?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

ELISE GERICH: I'm sorry, I can't hear you well.

EMILY TAYLOR: Okay, I'll try speaking up a bit. Thanks for the presentation. I just have a simple question. Were you accepting a review to look into the TTR?

DENISE MICHEL: Did you get that, Elise? You need me to restate it?

ELISE GERICH: Let me repeat what I thought was said. Am I expecting that the SSR2 will review PTI? Was that the question?

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

ELISE GERICH: No, my expectation is that the SSR2 will be reviewing ICANN's delivery of the INS services, because ultimately ICANN is responsible, and that will include what mechanisms ICANN has put in place to make sure that the services are delivered adequately. That may include evidence from ICANN as to how the service is delivered. But I do believe that's the way I expected the SSR2 review to go.

EMILY TAYLOR: So you would expect this review to inquire about matters affecting the root zone?

ELISE GERICH: Correct, I expect to be ICANN deliver of the IANA service, the security of the delivery of all those services.

EMILY TAYLOR: So you could imagine, because there has been a change in the whole setup that there is some anxiety that we would be over stepping if we inquired about matters that I can submit to the root zone.

ELISE GERICH: I guess I can't speak too much of the scope of your review. I think it's pretty well defined, isn't it, in your charter?

EMILY TAYLOR: Yeah, well, the bylaws are quite detailed, but they don't actually address this question.

ELISE GERICH: So, I guess I don't know how to answer your question.

SAMANTHA EISNER: Emily, this is Sam, if I could come in. So, I don't know that the question of how much or how little the SSR2 would look at PTI, ever really came up. I know from my experiences with the CCWG, because I was very

involved with the accountability group, even more so than I was with the CWG, so I know that James is here, and James has his hand up and he was actually very active in both groups.

I don't recall that there was ever any conversation amongst the community about expectations of what would happen with the SSR2 review that the CCWG accountability was asking to be brought into the bylaws alongside the CWG's work on the development of PTI, and indeed, I don't even recall it was identified as one of the contingencies between the two, or that anyone considered that would have an impact on it. So prior to the SSR2 conversation, I'm not sure that we had a lot of internal discussions. I'm not aware of any that were talking about whether or not PTI and the fact that performs the IANA functions that are actually ICANN's obligation, whether PTI would be in or out of an SSR2 review.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you Sam. Emily, does that address the question that you had?

EMILY TAYLOR: Yeah it's quite helpful to have the comments about ICANN's obligations. So what I've picked up from your presentation is that as with any subcontracting arrangement, ultimate responsibility for delivery of service rests with ICANN, regardless of who or what it decides, what organization gets the subcontract. So ultimately if we're looking at ICANN delivery or stability or security issues, that would fit most comfortably within our review. But it's useful to know that it was never really discussed.

DENISE MICHEL: Thank you, Emily. James?

JAMES GANNON: Thanks, Denise. Hopefully you can actually hear me this time, I think you can.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes.

JAMES GANNON: I have a couple of questions. So basically what we wanted to do when we incorporated the ALC review into the bylaws was replicate them as they existed in the ALC. So, now that we have the operational work being done by PTI, my concern is that I want to ensure that the SSR review is not inadvertently descoped by that movement. So, there are some questions that you might be able to clear up.

For example, were any of the assets to do with the roots arrangement system, the key management facilities, all of the key pieces of the root zone management process, are they entirely encapsulated in the services agreement that ICANN is providing to PTI, or are any of those transferred from ICANN to PTI as assets, which would then descope them if we exclude PTI from our scope, for example?

SAMANTHA EISNER: Thanks, James. I'll start, and I'll let Elise come in if she has anything else. There has been no transfer of assets between ICANN and PTI, so the

services agreement that I posted a link to a little bit earlier in the chat covers ICANN's obligations to provide those services to PTI. So there is nothing that PTI holds as assets. There have been no transfers like that. Elise, did you have anything to add on that?

ELISE GERICH: No, Sam, I think you've covered it adequately, thank you.

JAMES GANNON: Perfect, and a quick followup, then. So just one other followup more from the documentation and policy side. So, for example, in CWG, one of our requirements that we laid out was the replacement of C7.3 in the IANA function content, which was the planning and contingency planning around transition to successor functions operators and also around the continuity and disaster recovery planning. Does that from a technical and security point of view still then rest all on the ICANN side? And if so, if there is something that is just again provided as a service to PTI, and thus would still be in scope.

SAMANTHA EISNER: I can answer contractually, the IANA naming function contract between ICANN and PTI for the performance of the naming function includes, for those who weren't involved in that transitional proposal work, the CWG that James was active on actually came up with a list of clauses that were in the IANA function to contract with NTIA that it felt were essential to have carried over into any agreement between ICANN and PTI.

And so I've just dropped in a link to that, IANA naming functions contract between ICANN and PTI, and things like that continuity planning requirement is now a contractual obligation between ICANN and PTI. And so I can make sure that PTI has this document, or else PTI is in breach of the contract. So the obligation for this document to exist rolls out to ICANN, because it's one of the places where ICANN could be held accountable by the ICANN community for failure to enforce its contract. But because of the contract, it actually is an obligation of PTI to make sure that it has this document, too. Elise, do you see that the same way?

JAMES GANNON: Perfect, that answers me perfectly.

EMILY TAYLOR: As he said, I think you were absolutely perfect, Sam. Thank you.

DENISE MICHEL: Are there other questions? Jabhera Matogoro, was the question you typed in the chat answered sufficiently? Do you have any followup to that? Or anyone else, are there any other questions for Sam or Elise? Okay. Thank you Sam and Elise for joining us today and providing this briefing. We really appreciate it. If you could work with the staff to post this background information and we'd like to park it on the Team Wiki, under the background section, both the links that were discussed today, we'll follow up separately on the reports that are not public, for which team members may want access to. And any other information

that you think would be relevant to the SSR's work as they concur IANA and PTI. It's great to have you add that to our background material on the WIKI.

Alright, that brings us to all other business on our call. I'd like to open the floor to any other questions or issues people have, on or off the agenda. And anyone who has come in late, that would like to address in the topics. Cathy, do you have your hand up?

CATHY HANDLEY: Yes, I just have a question. Back to the decision on the Johannesberg meeting. Do you know when we can expect a decision from the chairs and staff or however is making t it?

DENISE MICHEL: Yeah, I think I would like to just confer with Emily and Eric right after the call and make sure that our questions have been resolved, and then post a decision on the list. Are there any other questions or issues that people would like to address on this call? Okay. Thank you all for joining. Well, have save travels to Madrid, hopefully everyone can make the DNS Symposium meet and greet, that's scheduled for Friday at 6:30 in the Florencia Room of the venue hotel. I look forward to seeing most of you there. It there are no other issues, we will end the call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]