

ICANN

**Coordinator: Brenda Brewer
May 25, 2016
11:00 am CT**

Trang Nguyen: Well hello, everyone. This is the Implementation Oversight Task Force, or IOTF, call Number 10 on May 25, 2016. Thank you, everyone, for joining us today. For the agenda for today's call we have one item for discussion which is the PTI implementation approach. The document we had circulated yesterday to the group.

I'm noting that Lise said in the chat room that the connection is very bad. Let's see, are people able to hear me okay?

Alan Greenberg: You are crystal clear from my end. It's Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, clear for me. Cheryl.

Matthew Shears: I hear you fine.

Trang Nguyen: Okay. So, Lise, it may be your line. All right so, Lise, you will reconnect. Thank you. I'll continue on with the introductions while Lise reconnects. For the agenda today we have, as I said, PTI implementation approach to discuss

with you. We circulated the – a document yesterday and we'll be, you know, going through that document to get your feedback.

And then under Any Other Business, we'd like to provide a status back to you regarding the RZERC charter. And also providing you with an update on the IANA IPR action item that was requested by this group from the last call. And then also discuss the requested IOTF session in Helsinki. We've looked into that and have some additional information now that we can share with you.

So, Lise, glad to hear that you're now able to reconnect and the audio is working fine. So any other items that you would like – or anyone would like to add to the agenda?

Okay if not let's go ahead and get started with the PTI implementation approach. You can load the documents. Terrific, thank you. So this document we circulated yesterday and the intent is that it is for discussion with the group. It contains some additional information around how PTI will be implemented as requested by this group.

This document was based on the discussions that we've had thus far with you regarding PTI and the general agreement that has been reached, that PTI will perform all three IANA functions and that the current IANA staff will be seconded to PTI.

So what I'd like to do today is just go through this document with you. I know the page numbers that the page counts that the document is 16 pages long but actually the meat of what needs to be discussed is only about four or five pages long so I think we should be doable in terms of getting through that on today's call. And if not we can continue to cover and continue the discussion on the next call.

So if we can move on to the next page please. Section 1, which is the overview, contains basically what I had just mentioned. So let's take a look at Section 2. There is some reformatting going on there. I hope it's – oh there we go, that's better. So let's go on to Section 2.1 which is the legal formation of the affiliate.

So consistent with the ICG proposal, PTI would be incorporated as an affiliate of ICANN domiciled in California and with ICANN being the sole member. And as it is that here the draft bylaws and articles of incorporation for PTI have been circulated for review. And we note that Sidley has reviewed them and has provided some feedback.

And, you know, Lise, perhaps as another item for the AOB section of the agenda maybe we can also discuss what are the next steps in terms of responding to some of the questions raised by Sidley in their review of those documents.

So continuing on with this section, as previously mentioned, you know, ICANN will select the name for PTI. We have discussed some options for names internally and are leaning towards using IANA as the name for PTI. So that's where we are with the name. And then once incorporated, the affiliate will file for 501(c)(3) tax exempt status which is the equivalent of the nonprofit status for companies here in California.

Any comments or questions on Section 2.1 before we move on? Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I support the name IANA. I suspect we may end up getting flak from people who are saying we cannot tie that name and presumably the intellectual

property to an ICANN corporation. But sigh is all I can say. It's the only name that makes sense.

Trang Nguyen: Thanks, Alan. Okay any other questions or comments on this section? Okay let's move on to the next section then, the board of directors. I won't spend too much time this section because we previously discussed this topic already with this group.

And the section just essentially captures the decisions reached on this topic which essentially is that the ICANN NomComm process will be used for the selection of the non-ICANN directors and that Jonathan and Lise will serve as the interim directors until the FY'17 NomComm process can select the permanent directors. And of course the ICANN board will appoint and seat all five directors.

I want to also flag the note that Sidley has provided some questions for the CWG's consideration around certain aspects of the PTI board such as who should be the chair of the board and the – and quorum. So I think we would be addressing those types of specific details through the PTI bylaws discussion.

Next is the officers. So as per California law and as confirmed by Sidley in their feedback on the PTI bylaws, there will be at minimum a president, a treasurer and a secretary for PTI. As noted here, the president will be a seconded IANA staff member. And the other officers will be appointed from the pool of direct share resources provided to PTI by ICANN.

For those of you not familiar with what ICANN defines as direct shared resources, they are ICANN staff in ICANN departments other than the IANA department who perform activities directly contributing to the IANA functions while also supporting other ICANN functions. So for example there are

resources in ICANN's IT department the support the RT ticketing and RZMS systems. You know, those would be considered direct shared resources.

And we do have – and we have provided a complete list of direct share resources and in Appendix 4.2 of this document. So that has a lot more detail. And then of course the appointment of the officers will be the responsibility of the PTI board.

So let me stop there and see if there are any questions or comments.

Yuko Green: Just so everybody knows, everybody has a scrolling control so you may scroll as we talk through the documents.

Trang Nguyen: Okay. So let's move on to the next section then. If you can scroll down please.

((Crosstalk))

Trang Nguyen: Okay. Let me scroll down. Staffing, so as previously discussed with you, ICANN will second the IANA staff to PTI to perform the IANA function. We have reviewed the legal relationship between ICANN and PTI with our benefits provider and they have said that ICANN will be able to provide the seconded employees the same level of benefits.

And since the seconded employees will have ICANN as the employer, they will also continue to have all of the legal employment rights that they currently have. And also because they will continue to have ICANN as their employer, all performance reviews and disciplinary actions will follow ICANN's policies and procedures. And the terms of the secondment will be specified in the inter-company services agreement between ICANN and PTI.

And it will cover sort of how the – the arrangements of the various agreements between ICANN and PTI will look in the next section. Also in the – also important to note is that in the event of separation ICANN commits to an orderly transition including provide the seconded employee with employment options at the time of separation.

And this commitment will be reflected in the naming functions contract. In fact, you can already see it reflected in Section Header 8.3.b of the naming function contract header document that we had previously circulated for your review.

So let me stop there and see if there are any questions or comments. So, Matthew, you have a question in the chat. Do we specify what kind of requirements will be required of the ICANN staff that will be selected for the board? Matthew, are you able to speak and can you clarify your question?

Matthew Shears: Yes, can you hear me?

Trang Nguyen: Hello?

Matthew Shears: Are you able to hear me?

Trang Nguyen: Yes, we can hear you now.

Matthew Shears: Yes so I'm – we may have gone over this (unintelligible).

Trang Nguyen: Matthew, it seems that your audio is coming in and out.

Matthew Shears: Yes, I'm sorry, I'm just going back to the prior section but was just curious as to whether or not we had set up – set down any particular requirements for the members of the board that would be coming from the ICANN staff?

My second question was, will the president, the officer that is going to be the president will be seconded IANA staff, be one of the three that come from ICANN as part of the board or will it be a separate position?

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Matthew for your question. So the PTI president position we envision that being an employee – an ICANN employee that's seconded to PTI to perform the role. Obviously it will be the responsibility of the PTI board to appoint the PTI officers.

In terms of the PTI board itself and the directors of the PTI board it is the responsibility of the ICANN board to appoint those directors including the three ICANN directors. And I have to go back and look at what is actually drafted in the PTI bylaws but I believe that it is suggested in the PTI bylaws as currently drafted that the PTI president will be one of the ICANN appointed board members on the PTI board. I hope that answer your question. Xavier, did you have something to add?

Xavier Calvez: (Unintelligible).

Trang Nguyen: Okay, thank you. And, Chuck, you have your hand up so please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, and my – by the way, I agree with what you just said, Trang, on the president being on the board. That's what I read in the bylaws this morning as well.

The – my question is of a broader nature. We've been promised now since I think almost since our – the meeting in Marrakesh that an explanation of the secondment approach would be provided giving a lot more details than we've been provided. Now obviously some of those are showing up in this document and others. But what is the status of that? I haven't heard anything more on that.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Chuck. So I apologize for answering your question with another question. But did you have something specific in mind in terms of the type of details that you were looking for that we have not yet shared with you either via this document or in other forms? Are you looking specifically for the terms of the secondment?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I'm surprised I have to even answer that question. The – as you'll recall, there was quite an uproar in Marrakesh with regard to the approach that staff was taking in terms of not having a complete separation that some people envisioned it.

And we talked about since that after the Marrakesh meeting and we were promised that there would be a detailed proposal from – I don't know if proposal is the right word – explanation of what staff was talking about and the pros and cons. Now some of the legal issues have been dealt with, the HR issues, etcetera, that you even talked about a little bit today.

But I myself was expecting a document for the whole community to review, not just a team review. Otherwise we're going to have problems down the road when – if people have concerns with this approach.

And like I said before, I'm not opposed to the approach, but without seeing the whole package of what's being proposed, not just this group – this

taskforce but the whole community – I think we're going to cause some problems down the road with people who don't understand it. It'd be much better to have any concerns that people have raised now not just on this group but in the community as a whole than waiting until the last minute and finding out that people have concerns.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Chuck. Let me go to Alan real quick and then we'll respond to that. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Lise in the chat said we talked about a legal memo. I wasn't envisioning anything near like that. I was envisioning essentially a bullet list of pros, of why it was felt to be better to have them as ICANN employees seconded rather than employed by PTI. And conversely, cons of having them employed by PTI, some of those are opposites and don't need to be repeated but some of them may well be different.

So I think it was sort of – and as I said, from my point of view a bullet list is enough but just to identify that, yes it was analyzed and there was felt that there is strong advantage for many different reasons not the least of which being the comfort level of the employees which will help to ensure that the transition does not change IANA that, you know, so just documented in one place so when people say “but” we can hold up that piece of paper. That's certainly what I was looking for. Thank you.

And I strongly support the move, it's not – I'm not saying I don't think there are good reasons I just think we need to have them listed on a piece of paper. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Sure thank you, Alan. And thank you, Chuck, for your comments. So want to take us back a little bit and – to about a little over a month ago, I think it was

either on IOTF Call Number 4 or Number 5. We had shared with you a legal memo that was constructed, you know, where – that detailed our findings after the additional research that we had performed after Marrakesh.

So we can circulate that memo again. Essentially what we had presented to you on that call was that after the additional legal research that was performed, although there is a gap in terms of the legal protection that would be provided to the employees, if they were to be completely moved to PTI, that we can address them via a contractual – there's contractual ways to address and close that gap.

And so there is really no legal obstacles, you know, on the, you know, as an issue on that able anymore. However, also on that call, we said that our suggestion still would be that the employees are seconded to ICANN rather than being moved completely to PTI and on that call there was broad support from this group for that particular approach and the ask was that, you know, we provide some additional details in terms of how we would go about doing the secondment, which is what we've attempted to do here.

Yes, Alan noted what you wrote in the chat there. And, Lise, you have your hand up so please go ahead.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Trang. Well actually I think what we're looking for is a document that actually argues for the chosen solution because this is more a solution that, well, this is chosen, this has the following, what do you call it, implications. But it doesn't really say the pro and cons. And having chosen this solution that I agree with the others, I also support this solution; I think it's fine. But it's good to have the perspective and arguments behind choosing this solution and actually using this to bring back to the community.

And even – well I’m – maybe I should have said this from the beginning, but I think this document is nevertheless it’s only four pages, too complicated for us not to discuss one more time and actually in the meanwhile it would be great to have the pros and cons of why we choose this solution coming from you and actually to bring to the community.

And we need also to discuss of course the timeframe of this because I’d like to repeat that even though we – we can’t sign off on this group, we can only say this goes in the direction we’ve been discussing and we need to bring it to the CWG anyway to finally sign off. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Lise. Okay so let’s capture that as an action item if you – if we could, Lise, you go to add some additional details to this document to provide rationale for ICANN’s I guess recommendation for seconding the IANA staff. So we’ll work on adding that to the document. And also noted, Lise, around the review process for this document.

So, Chuck has said in the chat that it needs to be a self-contained document that explains the rationale. That’s – sure that can be done, Chuck, no problem. And maybe we can create that and reference that document in this document, either way.

Okay so Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri speaking. Definitely supporting the right of a better document or a more complete document. But I have two questions that I – that remain unanswered for me. One of them, and I don’t remember whether I’ve brought it up before in the discussions here, but I have brought it up in discussion before even with some of the current IANA members, is while I very much accept doing this because of the feelings of the employees as long

as we say that's why we're doing, which I think is really the only reason, I'm not sure that that same reasoning applies to the CEO of PTI since I think we need to explain that differently.

Because that person really has a different relationship in the whole setup of PTI reporting to its directors and not the directors and such of ICANN directly and not the president of ICANN directly but really reporting directly to the board of PTI.

So I think the reasoning there and when we're talking about, you know, senior management, the same touchy-feely concern that we have and forgive me if that sounds like an insulting way to put it, the HR perspectives that we take to regular employees are often different than those we take to CEOs and senior officials. So I would look to perhaps understand that particular reasoning there.

And also one of the questions I have that's unresolved is, you know, I don't want there to be turnover; there may be turnover. I don't know that there's been decisions to hire more once PTI is created. But what happens with new employees?

Are we saying that for all time all employees of PTI are seconded from ICANN? Or are we sort of grandfathering in a secondment for current employees but accepting that going forward of course they would be hired – they would be new hires and they would be hired directly for PTI? Thanks.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Avri. We'll take note of your request for some additional rationale around the role of the president and why that – we have recommended that to be a seconded role and not a direct PTI employee role. So we'll make sure that

that's included in the – I don't know what we want to call it – the rationale document or that particular document that we'll be drafting.

With regards to your other questions around the – whether or not the secondment is only the grandfathering cause of the existing IANA staff or if that would continue in, you know, I won't say perpetuity but will be also the future state.

The way that we had envisioned is that it will continue in future state as well. Essentially PTI will identify whatever resources it would need to deliver on the IANA function. And communicate that need to ICANN, ICANN would then do the hiring, if you would, and then second the employee to PTI. And that would be sort of the arrangement on a forward-moving basis as well.

And, Xavier, did you have a...

Xavier Calvez: Just to add to that...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Xavier Calvez: ...Avri and the rest of the group is that I think this logic is actually simply to be consistent with the actual purpose of the secondment which is to avoid creating two different classes of employees in that the – from a status standpoint and from a benefits and legal considerations standpoint of each of the employees in that if we would hire new employees in the PTI while the existing current employees would be seconded then you would have two different statuses for people working together in the same department on the same function.

And that's what the secondment approach was allowing to avoid while dedicating nonetheless the employees into the IANA functions operations. So the approach of continuing the secondment even of new positions or new employees allows to dedicate fully the employees to the performance of the IANA functions while avoiding to create two different statuses for employees working in the same function. I don't know if that's helpful.

Trang Nguyen: Avri, is that a new hand or is that an old hand?

Avri Doria: Yeah, no it is a new hand. So I don't quite accept that but that's beside the point. It obviously therefore requires a separate discussion in the rationale document.

And to my perspective I think it's sort of overload if we're doing it because, you know, we want to retain. I would think that starting out a separate employment track and obviously giving those that were seconded a chance to join that second track if it became more appealing over time would be a better solution. But that's just one person's opinion.

I do think it's quite reasonable that if this is the proposal that you're taking over that that extra issue be discussed and have its own set of rationales for people to look at and discuss.

And I'm just sort of giving early warning that while I've bought into the first reason for seconding, the current, in sort of a grandfathered manner, I don't yet buy into the extra rationale for why all future employees bound to ICANN and such and that part of what's happened is (unintelligible) some of the dotted line existence of PTI because of sensitivity for current employees but whether giving up that dotted line nature of PTI that sort of sense around PTI

is worth giving up on the second rationale is a different discussion. Thank you.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. I think your comment points out to – or echoes in my views, the comment from Chuck that we need to explain further the structure of this proposed approach of secondment and its rationale, which will then help informing the discussion and let people like you or others to your point, understand better the point in the rationale and the pros and cons and therefore be able to formulate an opinion.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you. All right so any other comments or questions before we move on? Chuck, please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, thanks. And I don't want to leave this unsaid. I think this document we're talking about needs to be done soon enough that it has – there's plenty of time for discussion, like several people including Avri, have said, certainly among the full CWG but maybe even broader than that to make sure that we can cover all the bases before we get to far down the line and not have to regroup too late in the process. So I just want to make sure that we're all on the same page there.

Trang Nguyen: Yes, agreed, Chuck. Okay let's see next section of the document we'll cover this quickly. The section shows basically the four contracts that we would have between ICANN and PTI. As you can see if I go from the left hand side of the graphic – of the first graphic there will be a subcontracting arrangement with the – for the protocol parameters function. There will be also a naming functions contract between ICANN and PTI that will set out the terms for the performance of the naming function.

And there will be also a third agreement which is the intercompany services agreement that will reflect the details of the secondment and the financial arrangement between ICANN and PTI. And then lastly there will be a subcontracting arrangement for the number function.

And on the next graphic what you can see here is sort of a summary – a graphical summary of what we’ve discussed so far which is – which shows the first line shows that the ICANN direct share resources, which I talked about earlier, will be provided to PTI to support the IANA functions operations via the intercompany services agreement.

So there will be language in the intercompany services agreement that will require that ICANN provide the necessary direct share resources to support PTI in the delivery of the IANA function operations.

Line Number 2 shows that the ICANN support services will be allocated to PTI. And support services are basically the IANA function portion of the services provided by ICANN support functions to most or all of ICANN departments so examples would include the HR or IT or Legal, etcetera. There’s also a – I can’t remember which appendix but there’s an appendix with additional details on the various support services in this document as well.

And then Line Number 3 shows that the IANA staff will be seconded to PTI to perform the IANA functions. And the last line, Line Number 4, the light gray one, just basically shows that the officers will be appointed from the direct share resource support as well as from the seconded IANA staff.

Let me pause there and see if there are any questions or comments. Chuck, please go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I don't understand. I asked this question, I don't know if it was in a budget diagram like this or similar in the last month or two. But what is – who's in the IANA department in ICANN under this scenario?

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Chuck. I'm going to ask Xavier to answer because you did submit a similar question to the FY '17 budget and we're in the process of drafting a response to that so I'll let Xavier answer.

Xavier Calvez: Simply I think it's more logistical than structural. Is simply that in order to ensure that we ring-fence very clearly the resources and associated costs that directly perform the IANA functions, today there is a department in ICANN that's called the IANA Department. And that's where the dedicated resources are, and you know those resources, it's basically Alissa's team as well as Elise.

And simply this graph is simply saying this is the scope of resources and corresponding costs that will be entirely transferred into the PTI to ensure that the PTI from a legal entity as well as from a financial perspective contains the entirety of the costs associated with those direct resources.

So the – don't read too much into the notion of IANA department in ICANN, it's simply logistical to ensure that we've captured correctly into one bucket the costs that pertain to the direct resources supporting the IANA functions.

We could call it differently if that helps anyone getting over the idea. It's simply to make sure we capture correctly the costs. Does that help, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: I think so. I think – I suspect that others will – when they see this are going to have that question over and over again so the better you can explain that in

whatever documents this shows up in I think it will save confusion on people's part. But I think I get that. So it's kind of really an empty department in terms of employees considering that they're all down below.

But it's more of a paper thing for capturing costs than it is anything else. And so I think I get that, Xavier, but I think that, again, the clearer you can make this in anywhere this shows up I think it will be helpful for people beyond me that'll see this and ask questions. Thanks.

Xavier Calvez: And just to then – thank you for that comment, Chuck. And if I would, you know, qualify, I mean, we could call this bucket in quotes. The department to be transferred into the PTI, if you see what I'm saying, that's really what the purpose of that is simply because – and maybe we'll just adjust that graph to try to make it a little bit more clear and avoid the confusion that it creates, your comment and perspective shows us that I think we're understanding all the same thing but we may not have represented it in a fashion that's as clear as it needs to be considering the fact that we're talking about a change.

So we'll revisit that with Trang and see how it makes sense to maybe adjust it for clarity purposes. But I think we're all in sync as to what that represents.

Trang Nguyen: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Trang Nguyen: All right so there was – James Gannon has sent his apologies but he had sent in one particular question that he wanted to make sure that we discussed so that he can listen to the response via the recording. And let me see if I – I don't know if we have that...

Yuko Green: Sure, I can post it here.

Trang Nguyen: Perfect, thank you. So just to read it out loud, “On the realization of separability of the shared services that ICANN will provide, how will ah be captured in the intercompany services agreement? For example, the key management facilities?” I think this is more of a budgeting question so I don’t know, Xavier, do you want to...

Xavier Calvez: Well, presuming that we understand correctly James’s question, I think that so today we capture in the IANA direct shared resources, and I’m referring to that box that appears at the bottom part within the affiliate box of the Figure 2 that these shared resources are – contain notably those activities like the key (signing) process that are directly pertaining to the IANA functions.

What I’m not completely clear about James’s question, and this is where it will be useful to be maybe able to discuss with him, is the question about separability. I think that all the processes that we have described within the 13 activities which is an appendix to this document, which is also in the budget document, those 13 activities would all be part of the IANA functions and part of the affiliate as a result.

And the resources that contribute to operating those activities would be either direct because they are exclusive employees of the IANA functions today that contribute to them, or shared because maybe for example, there’s a (unintelligible) resource who supports the key (signing) ceremonies as an example, in addition to the dedicated staff. So those resources would come through the direct shared resources.

I think I would want to take this conversation to the next step with James to make sure we understand correctly his question about separability of shared

services because I'm suspecting his question is about which resources are separated and which resources are dedicated. And I think we'll need to be more going more in detail with him on that topic unless there is other comments from others that we can take at this stage.

Akram Atallah: Xavier, this is Akram. If I may?

Xavier Calvez: Please.

Akram Atallah: So what I understand from the question is in normal separation you would have a transition agreement for the shared services and we need to be very clear on how this will happen. So if a separation happens we'll continue to provide HR services, IT services, legal services, all of the shared services until they have a standalone services or as a – we enter into permanent contract to provide these services. So we need to have that clearly articulated in the separation plan.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Akram. Okay. Any other comments? Okay if not then let's move on to the next agenda topic. I think we've captured a few action items relating to this plan so we'll be drafting a separate rationale document addressing what I heard was three specific areas and then we'll circulate it back to this group for review. Okay.

Let's move on to the AOB. So the first item under AOB is captured here in the notes section is next steps on responding back to Sidley on the PTI formation documents.

I know Jonathan and Lise, you – or Lise – you probably have not had a chance to chat with Jonathan with regards to what the next steps are to respond to Sidley's various questions on the PTI formation document. But it would be

really helpful to get a better understanding of what if any expectations are expected from this group and/or what the process will be to provide responses back to Sidley. So we just want to flag that for now.

Lise Fuhr: Oh yes. Yes.

Trang Nguyen: Yes, hi.

Lise Fuhr: Well I actually had a chance to discuss briefly with Jonathan so it's not easily discussed but we had a Client Committee call regarding Annex C and Sections 7 and 8. And Paul Kane was on that call and we had – we went through the sections very deeply and Sidley has made a first response on those concerns and how to deal with them. And those have been circulated to the Client Committee and we're looking at them at the moment.

Furthermore, the PTI docs has actually been reviewed, as you said, by Sidley and commented by them and they have been sent to the CWG. And we're planning on having a CWG call next week so we need to know from you if that's timely enough or there is any deadlines that we should be aware of that is actually putting that meeting under pressure or what we should do with it.

So for us it's really important to align the deadlines with you because the plan is that we actually review the answers with Sidley with the CWG on next Thursday the 2nd of June I think it is. And if that's creating trouble for the implementation we need to know it.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Lise.

Lise Fuhr: So that's our brief – yes, review, because we actually also delayed our plan on how to process the document until we've had this call. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Lise. So according to our timeline right now we've slated for discussions, you know, of the PTI formation documents, we've slated to have until sort of the latter part of June for discussions, you know, with the CWG on those documents. So I think from a timing perspective a call next week, you know, should be fine, there shouldn't be an issue with it.

Lise Fuhr: Okay.

Trang Nguyen: Okay.

Lise Fuhr: Good, so actually we'll stick with the plan that we will discuss it with the CWG next Thursday. And, well, try to process the answers as soon as possible. But I believe you're CC'd on all the answers from Sidley. Have you seen those so you have them in parallel?

Trang Nguyen: Yes, thank you Lise. I do have them. And I've taken a look at them and it's also been circulated to a few other folks internally to take a look at as well. As you know, our legal team is sort of all hands on deck this week on the bylaws so they haven't had time to take a close look at the – at Sidley's comments but I would expect that once the bylaws are behind us that they will – this will be on the top of their list.

Lise Fuhr: That's fine. I just want to ensure that you're in the loop all the time so no surprises are coming your way so that's the next step is actually – the concerns that's been raised with Paul there is a conversation ongoing with him regarding the Sidley responses to those concerns and we'll send it to the rest of the CWG whenever that's been sorted out. But the primary – or the first response from Sidley has been sent to the CWG.

Trang Nguyen: Yes, I believe I've seen that document as well and it's also been forwarded on to our legal team as an FYI.

Lise Fuhr: That's good.

Trang Nguyen: Okay. Thank you, Lise. All right so the next item, the RZERC charter status, so as I mentioned, our legal team has been very busy, you know, with the bylaws activities. So unfortunately we don't have yet a charter to share with you today but I don't know when next week's IOTF call is but we can try to target to have that document ready for your review next week.

And essentially, the term sheet essentially contains all of the details that would be reflected in the charter. All that we're doing is doing some wrapping around it so that it actually reads like a charter and then putting the document into a paragraph format instead of a table format. Okay so we'll try to target having that document ready for the group's review on next Tuesday's call.

Okay and then if we can now potentially skip over the next item and go to the Helsinki topic, because Alan has a hard stop at the top of the hour. So, Alan, I'll just maybe set this up and then please chime in. So Alan had asked for just for help with taking a look at the Helsinki calendar and potentially identifying some time slots on there for an IOTF session in Helsinki.

And the – what the advice that we've gotten is that during the second week of June is when we would have the ability to put in a request for a time slot to have such a session. And so between now and then I think if we want to hold that session we need to take a look at the schedule and identify some potential time slots so that when the calendar opens up the second week of June we can then submit the request.

Alan, is there anything that you want to add on that?

Alan Greenberg: No, not really. It turned out that if ALAC was to request the session I had to swear in blood and promise my wife's first born that this was really a policy discussion and I didn't feel that that was appropriate so this methodology should work better, thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Okay. Thanks, Alan. So there seems to be support for a time slot in Helsinki for this group to provide an update to the community on the various implementation activities.

So what I may – if I could – suggest is that maybe ICANN staff will take a look at the current schedule and identify some potential time slots and then we could do a Doodle poll with this group to see which of those time slots would be best suited. And then once the schedule opens up the second week of June then we can submit the request.

Xavier Calvez: Alan, don't believe that despite Trang's force of persuasion that we're not going to have to also given your first born to be able to get that meeting scheduled in Helsinki.

Alan Greenberg: No, but apparently if it – I would forfeit everything if I couldn't prove that it was really a policy discussion. Thus are the rules that have been set.

Trang Nguyen: Yes.

Xavier Calvez: We're just trying to abide by the Meeting B schedule, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, don't go down there.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: The Meeting B schedule said nothing about only policy, that's an invention of someone else. Let's not go there, please.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Don't go there.

Alan Greenberg: I'm afraid I have to leave in a few minutes.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: We don't have the time to have this discussion.

Trang Nguyen: All right so we only have a few minutes left so one item left, provide an update on which is a question that was raised by this group on the last IOTF call with regards to evaluation of the IANA IPR.

And we are – I've had some conversations with Xavier on that and we'll try to prepare something in time for potentially next Tuesday's call, is that – does that timing work for you, Xavier? Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Trang Nguyen: So we'll target providing the group with an update on that on next Tuesday's call. Okay. Any final comments before we close? Yuko?

Yuko Green: Hi, I will be closing the Doodle poll to set the schedule for IOTF Call Number 12 so if you could please vote for the time slot that works for you within the next two hours that would be great. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Okay, thank you. Lise, please go ahead.

Lise Fuhr: I just want to ensure that we capture in the notes that we're actually going to give it another look, the PTI implementation approach document as such.

So we both next time have to review the rationale document for this and also the approach document itself. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Yes, thank you...

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: ...next time we have the call.

Trang Nguyen: Yes, certainly. We will continue to have discussions on this on the next call, certainly.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you. Anything else from anyone?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All good.

Trang Nguyen: All right well thank you so much, everyone, and we'll talk again next week.
Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

END