

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
June 20, 2016
2:00 pm CT**

Trang Nguyen: Thank you operator. Hello everyone. This is the Implementation Oversight Task Force, IOTF Call Number 13 on the 20th of June 2016. Thank you everyone for joining today's call.

On today's agenda, as you can see in the note section of the Adobe Connect room, our main topic for discussion today is the continued discussions around the PTI staffing topic. And then we have a few items that we have put in there for the AOB section of the agenda, the Helsinki implementation update session as well as the work plan to finalize the PTI information document and other PTI related documents and then decision log and then we'll close it out.

So any additional items that anyone would like to bring up for discussion on today's call? Okay. Very well. Then let's go ahead and get started with the main agenda item, PTI staffing. Akram is joining me today. So he's with me here in the LA office.

Akram Atallah: Hello everyone. I read (Jonathan)'s email to the group and I think that as (Jonathan) mentioned, we had heard the community there's basically more than two camps I would think and there are people that are fine with the

proposed - the government approach for employees. There are people on the other side completely against it and there's a bunch of people in between with different goals in mind.

But I think that we've heard the community loud and clear. And we think that at the end of the day we want to implement the spirit of the proposal and not just the (theory) words in there.

So based on that and we are working to come back with a proposal that bridges the gap. I saw (Matthew)'s email, which makes - which bridges the gap between the desire and the outcome and details operations to get there.

And so what we were thinking is to propose that we would work with the staff affected by the transition to PTI to come up with a plan benefit and payroll and the rest of the issues that are of concern over some time and put something in place that gives them at least equivalent benefits if we cannot give them the same benefits exactly because of, you know, the different providers that we have.

But put something that they - the same words that they agree with and make sure that they're happy with it before we put it in place. So and then once we do that, we can move all the employees to work for PTI.

So we were thinking that along (Matthew)'s email, which mentioned the three year period, I think that would be ample to put a stake in the ground to at the latest by three years; have all of this implemented and done.

And then in the meantime we will - with the work that we have ahead of us to actually get the transition in place and have the government to begin with until such thing as we have the providers all set up and everything.

And that - and we were going to work with both HR and Finance and our internal team here at ICANN to put the best package in place. I think that gives us the outcome that the part of the community want at least and then also give us the stability and the continuity that we want to provide with IANA services and give the staff a little bit of time to settle into PTI before we start moving, you know, working on moving them to become PTI employees.

And I think for new employees as soon as we have the systems in place they will be moved immediately and if they are hired, they would be hired based on becoming PTI employees if we can make them PTI employees immediately as they are hired.

So if they are hired before we have everything set up, we will actually make sure that they have that in their - in that contract that they will be hired as PTI employees and therefore will be moved immediately.

I think - I'm hoping that this proposal kind of bridges the gaps and gets everybody happy with the transition or with the plan for the employment - from the employment perspective. And if anybody has any issues with these, please let me know.

Trang Nguyen: All right. I see a couple folks in the queue. (Jonathan), please go ahead.

(Jonathan): That's very helpful. I wouldn't speak for others but that certainly seems to be quite a significant movement. I'm just going to play it back to you as I understood it to make sure I do understand it correctly and you can put me straight if I don't.

But what I understand you to be saying is that an added comment will be a temporary solution to last no more than three years while you do whatever it takes to essentially match employment conditions or make them equivalent at least so that staff are comfortable moving across and all new employees - your intention at least is that all - any new employees coming in and (all) current ICANN employees will go straight into PTI regardless of whether employees are new or current by no more than 36 months post-transition or PTI staff will be employed by and within PTI.

That's how I understand it. I know it made - I hope I'm not just being repetitive. I'd just like to make sure that my understanding is clear. Thanks.

Akram Atallah: Yes (Jonathan). Agree. Thank you for maybe presenting it in a little more of a clear way than I did. Thank you. I reading (James) note. For those who are not on Adobe, I think one of the key - one of the key things to bring back for the IANA staff is that we want them to be happy also while making sure we get the proposal implemented.

And want to come to an arrangement that works for everyone involved. Really don't want it to be a (unintelligible) to the IANA (situation). Agree 100% (James). We, you know, I met with the IANA staff just last week to talk to them and make sure that they understand it.

And one of my first - one of my first statements to them is that everybody's fighting for them and they - everybody actually values their contributions and wants to keep them as the issue is more about implementing the proposal and making sure that PTI has as much independence as possible so that they can actually represent the needs of the customers and be as independent with these decisions as possible.

So that message is loud and clear. And there is no - there is no issue with that.
I hope that addresses and confirms your concerns.

Trang Nguyen: Alan, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you. As most people know, I'm one of the people who not only was willing to have this comment but I always imagined that was how we would do it to begin with.

And I still have worries even though they're not nearly as firm as before that we are tinkering with the potential for hurting IANA and the excellence of the services we provide in trying to address these issues.

One of the issues that I was most concerned about and certainly as a manager have always been concerned about are issues of mobility and career path. With (succotid) employees they are still ICANN employees and are treated as internal employees for promotions or transfers to other jobs as they open and vice versa for that matter as jobs may open in IANA.

Can you really do that if they're being treated as two separate corporations? Can you privilege someone from another corporation outside of the organization over external - other external employees? Is that even legal? So career path and mobility are one of my real issues. And I think they're a major issue contributing to employee satisfaction. So I'd like to hear some comments on that. Thank you.

Akram Atallah: Thank you. This is an issue that's also dear to my heart because it's not only - it not only benefits the employees but it also benefits the IANA delivery in that we today like to keep our employees who have experience in developing IANA and provide them opportunities across ICANN.

And the more we have of these experienced IANA employees that have moved on and trained somebody else to do their job but they are still within ICANN, the more we can actually handle transition of the individuals out of the IANA to deliver the performance that we want.

So you can imagine if somebody leaves and we have somebody on the bench that could step in and bridge the gap until we hire somebody else. That's very helpful.

So that's a win-win situation that we try to keep all the time and we've made sure that this is available for the employees. We will find a way to give them at least an equivalent path to be able to move within ICANN and stay within ICANN if they want to apply for a position that is open.

So we're going to look into that, you know, formalize the process and make sure that they have that - these opportunities. And I agree with you this is one of the - one of the key things that we want to provide for the employees. So we will make sure that we do.

And we'll present all of the plans so that everybody sees what we're doing to keep the employees happy. But most importantly I want the employees to participate in setting that framework to their satisfaction so that we can actually provide with the continuity they are looking for.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Just to be clear, it should be going in the other direction also. That is experienced ICANN people should be able to move into IANA positions.

Akram Atallah: Oh, absolutely. Absolutely.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you Alan. (Lisa), please go ahead.

(Lisa): Thank you Trang. I'm very pleased with the proposal of actually taking (Matthew)'s proposal on doing this in a way maybe one, two years to have the staff transferred in a good and stable way to PTI so you don't need to do it very fast but do it so every benefit and career opportunity are actually ensured.

But my concern here is that if we - if it takes too long time, it's going to interfere with Work Stream 2 and many of the issues that are going on here. And I think it would be nice to have it done in a way so we don't have the accountability work going on forever and the IANA stewardship transfer going on forever. So it's more to try and set a deadline so we comply with that and not to have it too long.

And regarding the career opportunities, well, I think you're right Alan. It should go both ways. For me it should also be nice to have - to work for PTI from ICANN side. It's - it should go both ways.

But I see no barriers in actually having the same - getting same opportunities to have another carrier within ICANN as ICANN's own staff - I might be wrong. But in Denmark this would not be a problem, no.

But I'm very pleased with the new proposal for implementation. And that should be the main line and I completely trust that Akram you will do a great job of actually having this implemented in a good way. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you (Lisa). (Jonathan), before I go to you, there are a couple of questions in the chat room that maybe we'll read now and then get them answered. From Chuck who asked any idea how long it would take to provide the details of the proposed revised staffing plan for PTI.

Akram Atallah: Chuck, this is actually - the staff will be all the same. So everybody's that's in the IANA department will move there. We actually will be able to provide that - this information in the proposal hopefully when Trang?

Trang Nguyen: The next couple weeks. I...

Akram Atallah: Okay. Before Helsinki.

Trang Nguyen: ...just before we head out to Helsinki.

Akram Atallah: Yes. And then what we will do is for the - for being able to set up the plans and everything, like I said, we want to get with HR and the - and Finance and make sure that we have those plans in place.

I would like to keep the same plans as much as possible so that there is no daylight between a PTI employee and a ICANN employee. But if we cannot, then we have to provide an alternative. That might take some time.

We will update the community on that hopefully as we make any changes and we have things confirmed. And we want also the PTI employees on to confer the changes - that the changes meet their needs.

So I don't think that that should take us too long. Probably within six months to a year after the transition I think we will have a good idea what we're going to do, so.

Trang Nguyen: Yes. And just to add to what Akram just said, the issue that we're running into with our providers is that they can only give us advice at this time because

PTI is not yet a legal entity. So we can't get any sort of commitment or specific details from them at this point.

But as Akram said, once PTI is incorporated, we will start working with them and figure out the details of the plan. And...

Akram Atallah: Donna.

Trang Nguyen: ...yes. And Donna's asked Akram can you provide information about staff that currently performed IANA functions; not necessarily names but job descriptions.

Akram Atallah: Yes Donna. Thanks for your question. We have - we will be able to provide that. It's no problem. Actually if you look at the NTIA contract with ICANN, it practically includes all the positions. But we will - pretty much all the positions. We have some positions that are not in the contract as well. But we will actually put that in the proposal maybe and so we give clarity to everybody.

Trang Nguyen: Thanks Donna. (Jonathan), please go ahead.

(Jonathan): Thanks. Two very brief points in support of those that (Lisa) made. I do think that there's a point where we should support you in meeting the window of time - a decent window of time to achieve this. But at the same time, and I'm sure Akram would do this as a professional manager in the event. It seems to me that it would be good to execute the changes as soon as possible rather than working within the full three-year window.

So just be - and second, I think in terms of career progression I think - I feel like (Lisa) (comfort) in the professional management at ICANN too with this

and make sure that staff are able to essentially give up their careers by moving between the two entities. So I feel confident that you and Akram will be able to sort this out. So that was just my two final thoughts.

Akram Atallah: Yes. And I think also (Jonathan) it's important that once we make that commitment that hopefully the Board of PTI also will make sure that there is oversight making sure that this is happening as soon as possible as well.

Trang Nguyen: All right. Thank you everyone for that feedback on our new proposed PTI staffing plan. As I see no other comments in the chat room or hands relating to this topic, I - let's - I'll move us onto the AOB section of the agenda.

With regard to the first topic under AOB to (unintelligible) the implementation update session, there are a couple of things that recently came up I believe when we did the doodle poll Monday lunch hour was identify as the preferred option for everyone for this session.

When we went to schedule it we ran into some scheduling issues and it turns out that the only available timeslot now would be the lunchtime on Thursday instead.

So we wanted to get - and I don't know if it's on this call or maybe we can do it by the mail list. Want to confirm back with this group to make sure that lunchtime on Thursday is going to work. To make sure that we can - we don't lose that final time lost, I think what we'll do is go ahead and book that timeslot. And then figure out from a coverage perspective how we can make it work.

And I do see (James) in the chat room indicating that Thursday will work for (James). With regards to the structure of the update session itself, I believe

that we had agreed on a short update about 15 or so minutes of an update to be provided by ICANN staff. And then the remainder of the session will be open for a Q&A.

So what we will be doing is essentially using our dashboards that we have been using to update the CWG to provide an update during that first 15 minutes of the session and then the rest of the session will be opened up for discussion.

If the proposed PTI staffing plan is - and I expect that we would be able to circulate that before the actual session in Helsinki. Then we can also provide a brief overview of that proposed - revised proposed plan so that it can also be opened up for discussion as well.

And then Chuck, thank you. See that you've noted that you've made a lunch appointment for Thursday. To keep Monday open. But now that we're using Thursday that you'll try to reschedule.

All right. So (Yugo), did I miss anything else with regards to the Helsinki implementation update session?

(Yugo): Trang, no. That's it. But (Jonathan) has a hand up, so.

Trang Nguyen: Okay. Please go ahead (Jonathan).

(Jonathan): Trang, I suspect that you'll do this anyway but I would think that the format for the update feels like, you know, something about like you've been doing with your slides with the timetable and the key elements and so on.

I also think a summary of key decisions would be useful because I think that will really capture. And if you're going to do that anyway, forgive me. But I do think that would really capture the work that's being done and the key sort of milestones that have been achieved and will inevitably prompt questions.

And then I guess the other thing we've got to do is when we go into the Q&A that will be clearly - I suppose a Q&A for both staff and the IOTF members, chair, co-chairs and IOTF members who are on the panel. So it'd be good to clarify who exactly is going to be there.

And I supposed it's important as well. We take things for granted. It's very easy for us to assume that everyone knows exactly how it's working and how we're working.

But as I've often reiterated, I mean I think it's important that we explain to people, you know the CWG did its work, made its proposal. Staff is responsible for implementation. CWG is responsible for being agreed to be responsible for oversight of the sort of authenticity or accuracy of that to the proposal.

So I think without wanting to draw people through too much detail, we should make sure we set the scene properly with a good insight into the work that people - some great slides and graphics that show the nature of the progress being made and the remainder of the work and then also summarize key decisions.

And that feels to me like the right structure. And, as I say, forgive me if that's along the lines you're working anyway. And if others see it differently, by all means come in on that. Thanks.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you (Jonathan). The idea about showing the decision log is a great one and we can certainly make sure to incorporate that. I was - if you are going to be able to participate on the Thursday lunch hour (Jonathan) one think we may consider doing is asking you to maybe open up the session and to make some introductory remarks sort of along the lines of what you just said just set the scene.

And then certainly, you know, I can go into the main part of the session with regards to providing the updates very much along the lines of what we've been doing for the CWG.

(Unintelligible) I thank you and I see that you've accepted that. Except I think (Lisa) you're not going to be there on Thursday. Why did we change from Monday? The Monday's lunch slot we were told were no longer available for booking is what I understand. (Yugo), is that correct?

(Yugo): Yes, correct.

Trang Nguyen: And Donna who has been helping us with this process is typing. So I'm just going to wait a few seconds here and see - or Donna, if you are able to speak.

Donna Austin: Yes. Hi Trang. Might be easier if I just speak.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you.

Donna Austin: (Lisa), to your point, there are some additional challenges with finding rooms and availability for this meeting. So the Monday lunchtime session just wasn't possible by the time we put the request in. So if you want a lunchtime session, Thursday is the one that's available.

We can secure a room and, you know, the necessary recordings or whatever. You know, we could potentially do it at another time during the week but it's likely that we'll be conflicted with other sessions that are going on prior to 3 o'clock. So Thursday is really the only time that the lunchtime session is available. Thanks.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you Donna. And Chuck to confirm, yes, it will be 12:30 to 1:30 on Thursday. Yes. And Alan, you have your hand up and you've been very patient. Please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. By the way, Chuck said 12:30 to 1:00. I presume you just said 12:30 to 1:30. So I presume that's the correct time. And I was going to ask what time is it because the lunch period in Helsinki is variable.

Sometimes it starts at 12:00, sometimes 12:30 depending on who's running the meeting before that. I wasn't going to be available on Monday. I now will be available for the second half of this but not the first half. Just to note that.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you Alan. Yes, it's 12:30 to 1:30 on Thursday. Okay. So it looks like that time works for the majority except for (Lisa). So maybe (Lisa) I can follow up with you offline, see if there's anything that we can do to make that work.

Akram Atallah: Maybe we can have a call in or...

Trang Nguyen: Yes. Yes. So I'll connect with you offline (Lisa) and see if there's anything else that we can do. All right. Moving on the next topic. Work plan to finalize the PTI information documents and ICANN PTI contracts.

We had circulated the work plan for the group's review - I don't know, last week or I think it was last week or the week before last. According to the work plan, we were supposed to have sent over to you the draft of the ICANN PTI contract for the naming function as well as the two subcontracting agreements last Friday.

We are working on that. It's taking us a little bit more time than we had anticipated. But we certainly will be getting those out this week. Hopefully there in the next day or two.

Also in addition, we are looking to also send out and circulate the PTI conflict of interest policy, code of conduct - PTI Board code of conduct document and expected standard behaviors document. All of those documents will be based on the ICANN document and those will also be circulated early this week. I'm hoping in the next day or two.

And this is a work plan that we circulated to the IOTF. I'm not certain if it has been circulated to the CWG. I know that (Grace) is very keen on, you know, whether or not there needs to be any changes to this work plan so that she can start to organize the CWG related meetings according to their schedule.

So unless there are any concerns or objections with the proposed plan, we'd like to be able to circulate it to the CWG and start to plan our work around this document. ICANN certainly is planning our work in accordance with this document.

And I just sent the that - we have not received any major - any comments or major concerns or issues with regard to this timing and work plan. So unless - so (Jonathan) and (Lisa) maybe I can connect with you offline and see what would the appropriate next steps be in terms of finalizing and agreeing on this

work plan so that we can share it with the CWG and plan the schedule around this as well I'm sharing it with the - with Sidley so that they are aware of what's expected when.

And then (James), I see you have a question in the chat room. What was the date for sharing the name of PTI? I think for our work plan we were hoping to share that at the end of this month. There are - we are currently doing some necessary work before the name can be shared. And once that work is completed, then we certainly will share the name of PTI.

Let's see what else. There's some comments in the chat here. I'm concerned that the contract will be out for public comment (at a time) when a decision needs to be made about the contract being extended or not. Rather than having public comment period already concluded.

Okay. So Elise, if I understand your comment correctly, you're concerned about the timing of when the contracts are going to be out for public comment in relation to when NTIA is going to be considering whether or not to extend the IANA functions contract.

Yes. And we tried to as much as possible pull that timing in and at the same time making sure that Sidley and the CWG has adequate amount of time to fully review these contracts.

Now this is what we're going to work towards is of course such as target dates. Of course if we can complete the work earlier, then public comment can start earlier. You know, so - but unless we start to pull in the review time, et cetera, it may not be possible to start public comment on these documents any earlier than that.

And for the subcontracting agreements I know that we've lumped it here with the naming functions contract, which indicate a public comment period during the month of August. But those contracts ICANN does not currently plan on posting those subcontracting agreements for public comment.

They're essentially just subcontracting agreements carrying over the requirements that are already in the contract have been - that's gone through their own processes.

What this here indicates for the subcontracting agreements is that if the protocol parameters and numbers community wish to publish those draft contracts for public comment by their processes that that's the recommended of time where that (protect these).

So really the public comment period here is applicable to the naming functions contract.

Akram Atallah: Mainly.

Trang Nguyen: Mainly, yes.

Akram Atallah: And I think Elise as the - I share your concerns. We want to make sure that we get everything done by the right time. I think that from our perspective on the 12th of August is when we need to deliver to NTIA a update on the project plan.

And from our perspective it's not that everything should be done by then. It is that they want a confirmation that what's done is done and what remains to be done will finish in time for the - by the September 30 date. And therefore there is no need for an extension.

So it's not that we have finished everything by the August 12 but they have to have some comfort that we can finish everything by September 30. So and that's how we're planning on the implementation side.

Trang Nguyen: And we also provided additional time on the front end before the public comment period just to ensure that there is coordination with the CWG and with Sidley so that there is buy in on that document before it is posted for public comment.

And I think that that would give the NTIA additional confidence too in terms of our ability to then finish out the rest of the process by September 12 as indicated here in this work plan.

Any additional comments or - okay. Thank you (Elisa). All right. Well let's move on to the next item, which is the decision log. So we heard your feedback from - of (CU) IOTF calls ago and modified or updated the decision log a bit.

The decision log is a document that we have always included with the deck - the IOTF deck. However, we don't always take time to review it on every call. You could - could you go back to the last slide that you showed please with the table? Thank you.

So what we've done here is we've actually expanded the decision log table to show on the left that you can see the various items that have been in discussion within this group or advanced the discussion within this group.

And then we show the progress as you can see through the IOTF and then CWG and then we've indicated on the table was well decision of anything that was reached and then what the next step would be.

So for example, if you look at the very last line in the table, the (unintelligible) charter that with through the IOTF and then it went through the CWG. And then it's - the agreement with that can be posted for public comment, which it has. So the next step is to finish out the public comment period.

So that's sort of the format that we've - we've updated this table to and hopefully it provides a little bit more clarity in terms of, you know, each of the - each of the items and what process has been completed and what's still outstanding.

And one thing that we could make a point of doing is at every - on every IOTF call moving forward to go through this decision log and review it so that it's clear.

So if we just take a quick look at the various items that are on this table, I mentioned the (unintelligible) of charter at the bottom of the list, the CSC formation being the next item up.

That has going through the IOTF and then the CWG review. And the request for appointment has been issued and currently we're waiting for appointments of the members and liaisons from the appointed organizations.

The - with regards to the approach for selection of interim PTI independent directors, that was discussed on the very first IOTF call and gotten also the CWG - agreement from the CWG on one of the CWG calls.

And so the decision is that (Jonathan) and (Lisa) will serve as Interim Directors. And so the next step will be to move forward with implementation of that.

And then the next item up on the list will be PTI services. And that's related to - and that has gone through discussion within the IOTF as well as the CWG. And the agreement that was which was that PTI will perform all three IANA functions. So the next step for that is to implement that decision via the contract and then the bylaws for PTI.

And Donna, I see that you have your hand up. Let me run through this - the rest of the items on this table really quick and then we can take a pause for questions and comments.

The next item is the IANA problem resolution process. We had a couple of areas where we required clarification. And the clarification was provided by Chuck and Design Team M I believe.

That did not go to the CWG if I recall correctly. However, it was just clarification item and therefore that step was skipped. Now if we need to go back to the CWG, you know, for those couple of clarification areas, then please let us know.

The same with IANA customer service (complete) resolution process. And then with regards to the IANA IPR, TBD there. We did not - we did not know if any of the IANA IPR related discussions would require discussions with this specific group. And that's why up in the very beginning we put that in as a placeholder in case any discussions need to be had with this group relating to the IANA IPR.

Akram Atallah: Do we - I'm sorry. Do we have a schedule from the IEF or something that, you know, so we can include in this.

Trang Nguyen: No, not to my knowledge. In fact there's no specified timeframe for when the framework document would be finalized amongst the three operational communities.

What we're doing is working backwards based on the comments that the IANA IPR has to be transferred by July 30. And we're using that day and we're working backwards to...

Akram Atallah: September 30.

Trang Nguyen: ...September 30.

Akram Atallah: Yes.

Trang Nguyen: Sorry. And we're working backwards to see, you know, from a timing perspective when we - they need to have that framework document finalized so that we can move forward with the next step, which would be the contracting piece and making sure that all of the contracts and the terms are figured out.

So we're working on that and we'll share something with the community soon in terms of a project plan from our perspective of when things may need to be completed.

The ICANN PTI contract we are drafting that. And so that's in discussion. Same with the PTI governance document. And then PTI staffing is also

another point that is in discussion. So there's no decision or agreement yet.
And that's why you see those columns being blank.

And then define selection criteria for NonCom PTI independent Directors.
That is also something that we're working on putting together some proposed
criteria for the group's consideration.

So let me stop there. And Donna, you have a hand up. Please go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks Trang. So it was related to the CSC formation. And I guess just by
way of an update for this group, we have had a - as (Matthew) will understand
this.

Once we get past 22 July, which is supposed to be the timeline for the liaisons
to be identified by each of the ACs, it's really important that we meet that
deadline because there are a number of steps that the Registry Stakeholder
Group and the ccNSO have to have a conversation about the membership slate
and then ccNSO and GNSO Councils need to have a discussion about the full
membership.

And we need to have that process completed by I think Trang it's the 12th of
August. So I have heard that some of the ACs might have trouble meeting that
22 July deadline for selecting their preferred and alternate candidates for the
liaison.

And if that is the case, we kind of need a heads up pretty soon because we
really want to meet that 22 July deadline. And the - (James) and (Katrina),
Chairs of the ccNSO and GNSO are actually preparing a letter at the moment
to go out to the ACs just requesting that, you know, it's really important that
we meet that deadline.

So if there is any risk that that is, you know, the ACs can't meet that deadline for their liaison selection, it would be really good to know so we can understand how we need to factor that into the timeline that we've created.
Thanks Trang.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you for that update Donna. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. It's Alan speaking. Donna, consider this a heads up. The ALAC probably will not be able to make the date. Thank you.

Donna Austin: So Alan, do you have some idea of when they could provide this...

Alan Greenberg: No. I'll know better during the ICANN week. We're in the process of setting up a selection committee for this position and a number of other positions. I have just fast tracked another position that we wanted to have filled for Helsinki. Whether I will be able to convince the group to fast track another one in advance of having a formal process set up is questionable. So if we can we will. But I have no level of certainty that that's something I can sell or not.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks very much Alan.

Trang Nguyen: All right. Well thank you so much everyone for that. Seeing that there are no other questions - that there's some exchange in the chat room between Russ and (Jonathan) with regards to the IANA IPR. And confirming that ICANN staff will be providing our understanding of what the remaining steps need to be in order to complete that process and sharing that with the community.

So I think that is it in terms of topics for today's discussion. Is there anything else that anyone would like to bring up before we close the call?

Russ Pangborn: Trang, this is Russ. What you just said I'm not sure what it meant. You're going to share the timeline and milestones with the community, you're going to share the resulting document with the community?

Trang Nguyen: Russ, we'll be sharing the project plan. So sort of what we understand to be the remaining steps that need to be done in order to effectuate the transfer of the IANA IPR by September 30.

Russ Pangborn: Okay. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you. And Greg, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. I think, you know, a couple of things. Just if there's anything that (Jonathan) or (Lisa) or myself or any of us, you know, who are embroiled in the IPR, what we can do to help your understanding of where things stand, I'm happy to do so. I'm sure the others are as well.

In terms of where things stand, there were high-level principles that, you know, have been drafted. In terms of where they stand, the CWG has received comments back from its Council raising some concerns and issues that we need to work through.

So and those have been - in turn have been circulated to the IPR collaborative groups. So the other two parts of the community have (seen) that advice. It's - I'm not entirely clear where the other two groups stand, you know, in terms of their legal advice.

My understanding I believe is that the protocol parameters or (IETFs) need to be final with the document as is. And that there was, you know, one fairly,

you know, not broad suggestion from numbers community with regard to potential change in the (lease) kind of structure but not really any of the particular component parts.

So that's kind of my understanding of where things stand. And not exactly sure of what the plans are for the next steps. But, you know, others can speak to that, you know, obviously whenever the next call is to deal with the IPR group and the next call of the CWG or meetings thereof. These will be obviously front and center. Thanks.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you Greg. And thank you for the offer that you made. We will certainly share the project plan (unintelligible) that we've drafted with these key milestones and dates with you for - with the IPR Group for review before we share it more broadly just to make sure that our understanding of the remaining steps to be completed is accurate.

Okay. Okay. That was very good. Anything else before we close the call? And (James) is typing something so I'm just going to give it a second and see if there's anything else. And he went away.

All right. Well in - and you (Yugo), is that a new hand? Did you have something before we close the call?

(Yugo): Yes. Trang, actually one person - I'm sorry. I can't remember who but has shown interest holding the IOTF call during the Helsinki, not the update session but a normal working session. I just wanted to ask the group if that is something that everybody's interested or would have time to do so or if we should just go ahead and schedule the next meeting for a week after the Helsinki.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't think I'll be having time. Cheryl.

Trang Nguyen: Yes. Agreed.

Alan Greenberg: Alan. There's no chance that I will be able to fit something in at the last moment.

Trang Nguyen: Yes. Okay. And there's several people in the chat room agreeing that something after Helsinki would work better, so, okay. Very good. Thank you so much for that feedback.

All right. Well thank you so much everyone for your time today. If you are traveling to Helsinki, safe travels. And we will see you there.

Woman: Thank you.

END