ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
March 30, 2016
2:00 pm CT

Coordinator: The recordings are started.

Lise Fuhr: Okay and I'll kick – do you want me to kick off with the opening remarks?

Woman: Yes please, Lise.

Lise Fuhr: I don't have that many. I just want to remind you all that we're planning two meetings a week but this week we're only…

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: …okay I'll start again. I just want to remind you all that we're having two meetings a week but only if needed but from the agenda it looks like we are going to need quite extensive meetings at the moment.

                 This week though, we only have one meeting. And just before we start I think we should briefly discuss on how to make the notes because I saw there were some comments regarding either to make them very detailed and attribute the

statements to the speakers or the other one is actually to write a paragraph summarizing the discussion and outcomes without attribution.

And personally I like the last one because I think it's – we have the recording if anyone is interested. And I would actually prefer having the paragraph summarizing. I don't know if others – Avri, your hand is up. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes, thanks. This is Avri speaking. The other recommendation I had made that if we do need something printed with names attribution very often in meetings after the recording the recording is transcribed and then you've got that, you know, word said and names on paper as a reference. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Avri. I can't recall the answer to this. Myself I find it's a good idea so it's easy to get back and look. But you recall, Trang, what was the outcome?

Trang Nguyen: So, Lise, what we have – what we're going to try to do today is a pilot and see how it works is that we do – we will be providing the transcription of the call after the call. So the call is recorded. We'll also do a transcription of the call and the note-taking during the call will be limited to capturing just decisions made, questions that we need to take back and get answers for and any action items.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Sounds good. Yeah. I see green checkmarks so great, let's see how it goes after this pilot. Pilot is such a modern thing to do at the moment. Let's keep on. Okay if – and I saw that Chuck provided some issues or he wanted to discuss DTO under AOB. And I – well we should put that in the agenda too.

Trang Nguyen: Yes, we've reflected that in the agenda in the Adobe room but we haven't actually modified the PDF document to add that because that recommendation came in after we circulated the PDF but it's added here in the Adobe room.

Lise Fuhr: I can see that now. That's perfect. Great. Okay that was the opening remarks so let's get going with the implementation items. Trang.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Lise. The first item under implementation is the CSC charter. And – next slide please – what we're showing you here is basically the same list that we shared with you on the last call except for Item Number 7; that is a new item. And that item is around what happens after the ccNSO and GNSO approve a recommendation from the CSC.

We actually had a conversation with Lise after the last call and I believe Lise also had a conversation with Donna Austin. And the suggestion is that the implementation team works directly with Donna and the CSC design team on getting the clarification around these items.

Woman: Does everybody have a view of the presentation material?

Lise Fuhr: Yes. Yes.

Woman: Okay great. Some of us are having issues with connectivity and just wanted to make sure that everybody does have a view of the presentation material. Sorry for interrupting.

Trang Nguyen: Okay. Sorry about that. Yes, so I think the suggestion is that the implementation team works directly with Donna and the CSC design team to obtain clarification on these items. And then that would then be shared with the CWG. Lise and Donna, is that consistent with your understanding as well?

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: Yeah, it is. And I see Paul Kane is having his hand up. Paul.

Paul Kane: So I'll be very brief. I'm very happy for Donna to take the lead on the issue. Putting on the CC hat I'm afraid same repeat as I always make, the CC is a very diverse group and particularly for determining who the representative should be on the CC – sorry, CSC. There needs to be due regard making sure that both ccNSO members and non-ccNSO – ccTLD registry managers are accommodated.

                And I just would like to make sure, as Donna is taking the lead, that is carried through and reflected in the workings to make sure that the diverse group that comprise the ccTLD community is appropriately accommodated.

                Being quite candid, there will be many ccTLD registry managers who are not members of the ccNSO who don't want to be involved. So I'm not specifically mandating that there should be a place reserved exclusively for non-ccNSO members because that place may never be filled.

                But there should be a right of presumption that at least one – well one seat be offered or made available to non-ccNSO members. And failing anyone coming forward, willing to do it, then obviously it has to be filled with a CC member. But very happy for Donna to take the lead. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Paul. And you raise a very important issue. I see Donna is having her hand up so, Donna, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Paul. Thanks, Lise. So, Paul, my expectation would be that the ccNSO will develop processes around finding representatives for, you know, the minimum two ccTLD registry operators. But my understanding is that the ccNSO has always been conscious that there are ccTLD registry operators that live outside their construct and that they would find a mechanism that they would, you know, include the possibility of those ccTLD operators being involved in the process and able to be representative (unintelligible) that's their wish as well. I would think that, you know, Bart and Katrina would be very cognizant of that. Thanks.

Paul Kane: I have to say I share your view but I think we are discussing the charter and it's important that there at least as a footnote reflecting that bearing in mind you mentioned Byron. Byron has now gone. Byron is not chair of the ccNSO. People change. And we are discussing the charter of the body.

                 So I think it's just important that there be a note made to reflect the diversity of the group but I'm very happy for you to take the lead as I mentioned. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Paul, I'd like to add that whatever the implementation team and Donna is doing is not going to be the final call on this. We will bring it on to the CWG to have a final check. So it's not – there will still be possibilities to actually look at it and say if you – if you need your footnote or whatever is needed to ensure that non-ccNSO members are also taken care of.

                 And I see that Donna writes that it's not Byron but it's Bart and Katrina, the new Chair of ccNSO who is involved in these discussions now.

Trang Nguyen: Yes, and we actually did a brief informal meeting with Katrina and Bart in Marrakesh actually just to make sure that they are aware that there will be some work that the ccNSO will have to do. So that conversation has started.

Okay. Well very good. With that then I think we will move on to the next item for discussion which would be, if I recall correctly, PTI articles of incorporation. RZERC Charters. Yes, sorry about that. RZERC which stands for Root Zone Evolution Review Committee.

What we are showing you here is basically a term sheet for the RZERC charter. As a reminder, the RZERC is a committee that will be formed to provide the ICANN board with recommendations regarding operational and architectural changes to the root zone. The CWG proposal specified many of the items that we have incorporated here on this term sheet for you.

The composition of the committee is going to be one person from the ICANN Board, possibly the chair; a senior IANA functions operator administrator or delegate; the chairs or delegates of the SSAC, RSAC, ASO and IETF; and a representative of the Registry Stakeholder Group, the ccNSO, and the root zone maintainer or VeriSign. So that's what the CWG proposal specifies as the composition of this committee.

As I mentioned, most of what you see on this slide here reflects what's in the CWG proposal. The one thing that is not specified in the CWG proposal that we are adding to the RZERC charter is the item around oversight of the RFP for root zone maintainer is needed.

The background on why we've added this additional scope for the RZERC is that in the root zone maintainer agreement with VeriSign we are adding a provision that will allow ICANN to trigger a transition process to select a new

maintainer if via a community-driven consensus based process is determined that the transition to select a new maintainer is necessary.

So if the transition process for the maintainer role is triggered, we think that this RZERC committee would be the appropriate committee to provide oversight of the RFP process to select a new maintainer. So that's why – that's why this has been added as an additional piece of scope, if you would, for the RZERC. And this is reflected in a couple of places, as you can see there, in the purpose as well as in the scope of responsibility.

And then I see a number of hands up. Let me just cover one last item and then I'll pause for comments and questions.

The one other thing that I wanted to point out is that not reflected on here is how the RZERC charter can be amended. And we'll mention that we add that in for the next call. But our recommendation around that is that the charter can only be amended with ICANN Board approval after public comment. So that would be our recommendation in terms of amendment of the RZERC charter.

So I will pause there and, Lise, would you like to manage the question queue or would you like me to?

Lise Fuhr: I think you should do it. So go ahead, Trang, and manage the queue.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Lise. Paul.

Paul Kane: Thank you, Trang. I have to say I will read up on the background to this new group. I'm a little rusty with respect to this RZedERC Group. VeriSign historically have done a very good job at being the root zone maintainer and certainly if VeriSign wanted to surrender that role and not continue to do it

then I would see a role for making sure there was a process in place to smoothly transition it.

I feel a little uncomfortable a body just seeking to trigger it without good cause. And so has it been built into the process that VeriSign has to do something wrong before this process is triggered? But I apologize to the group that I'm a little behind the curve on what this is about. But that was just a question. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Sure, Paul. And let me clarify. What we are adding here in terms of an additional piece of scope for the RZERC isn't to allow the RZERC to have the ability to trigger a transition process to select a new maintainer. What the role that the RZERC is going to have is actually that if it is triggered then their role would come in which is to provide oversight of the RFP process to select a maintainer. But they themselves – the RZERC – cannot trigger, you know, a – cannot trigger a transition process to select a new maintainer.

There are provisions under – there are specific provisions under the agreement with VeriSign under which a transition process may be triggered. And as you said, I mean, we have had a very good relationship with VeriSign for many years so, you know, it's just like any other typical contract. There would be certain levels, service level agreements and certain terms that, you know, under which VeriSign would have to comply with and under which ICANN would have to comply with. And if any of those is breached certainly that could be a cause.

So from a contractual perspective obviously there is some of the standard stuff that you would see in a contract that could trigger a transition process but those are defined within that document. As it related the topic that we're talking about here in terms of the RZERC, the only additional scope that they

would have is to provide oversight if a transition process is triggered. They cannot trigger the transition process themselves. I hope that clarified that.

Alissa.

Alissa Cooper: Thank you, Trang. That explanation that you just gave answered one of my questions which was I was going to ask you what is meant by oversight? And I think just because the use of the word "oversight" is fairly overloaded within this whole context I think what you are describing actually to me sounds a little bit more like consultation. So, I mean, you can tell me if I'm getting this right.

But the, you know, this committee as I understand it from the proposal is meant to provide architectural guidance and recommendations about the root zone. And so in this case the way that this fits in is that, you know, if ICANN was going to put out an RFP to change the root zone maintainer it would make sense that the expertise of this group could be relied upon to, say, review what the requirements are that go into that RFP or potentially, you know, review aspects of the applicants to understand if they are capable of carrying out the duties of the root zone maintainer.

Is that – if that is the – an appropriate understanding of this role, then I would phrase it more as like a consultation as opposed to oversight just because I think a lot of people are a little leery of scope creep and mission creep for any new body that's getting set up in this process. And so to me that's the piece that makes it sounds like it fits in under the existing description of what this committee is supposed to do. So can you just comment on whether that is correct?

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Alissa. Actually that is exactly what the intent would be for the RZERC. And I like the word that you use, consultation, so we'll make a note of that and make that change here. That's exactly what we envisioned that they would be doing providing input into the sort of what should go into the RFP in terms of some of the criteria or things that we should be looking for. You know, of course ICANN would carry out the RFP process.

You know, we would collect all of the proposals that come in, you know, rate them by their selection criteria, that had been defined and then, you know, consult with the RZERC as to who has the relevant criteria to actually perform the role. So that's exactly as you described it. And like I said, we'll make a note to potentially change that word to say consultation.

Alissa Cooper: Okay, yeah, I think that would help because I think if it's described any other way it looks like mission creep whereas if it's just about relying on the expertise of these people in terms of architectural matters then I think makes sense.

Just a couple more comments on this.

Trang Nguyen: Sure.

Alissa Cooper: I do not recall seeing anything about the meetings, frequency or any of the details included in the meetings bullet here or about voting and quorum in the proposal. And so did you find these from the proposal or no?

Trang Nguyen: So not all of these are from the proposal. Obviously the – quorum was not specified in the proposal but it just seems to be the standard type of, you know, I don't think what we have here is anything out of the ordinary but it's not something that was specified in the proposal.

I'm looking through here in terms of meetings. There's some mention here in terms of in the proposal with regards to the fact that the committee should try as much as possible to carry out its work in a transparent manner and that sort of thing. And I think the frequency itself hasn't been specified – was not specified in the CWG proposal but the mode by which the committee should carry out its work is.

Alissa Cooper: Okay, yeah that matches my understanding. So all I was going to say about that is that given, you know, this is a committee constituted from the community and from the community proposal, I would say let's let those details be determined by the committee itself. In particular, I mean, the one that jumped out at me was, you know, why can't this group operate by consensus? You know, why would they need to vote?

And I think those details – there might be a year where they don't need to meet because, you know, we're architecturally stable and everything is great. So that would be my suggestion just, you know, keep this as close to the proposal as possible and let the group itself identify those details.

And I would personally – and this is probably a little speaking out of turn, and I know there's a long queue so I'll shut up soon. But I would say the same thing about the charter, the re-charter, I mean, I'm not clear on why it would have to be, you know, ICANN Board approved. It's like if this group comes up with an idea of a need to re-charter and the community supports that that seems like it should be sufficient and should be taken up, you know, whenever the committee and the community feel that's necessary so that's my last thought. Thanks.

Trang Nguyen: Okay thank you, Alissa. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. And to be clear, I'm speaking as the person who chaired the group that came up with all of this. A number of things that I see that I'm somewhat concerned about. First of all in the purpose the proposal was not only architectural changes but also significant operational changes.

Trang Nguyen: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: That's really critical and that seems to have been completely omitted from this.

Trang Nguyen: Yeah, I do see that. We'll make a note of that.

Alan Greenberg: Okay thank you. The next thing is the proposal made it quite clear that these people were not necessarily the wise men and women who made decisions.

Trang Nguyen: Right.

Alan Greenberg: This was a coordination group who would bring in expertise as necessary on particular issues and I think that needs to be focused on here.

Trang Nguyen: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: And that has an implication on something that was just mentioned of this concept of majority wins. That's just so wrong. We're looking at something where the whole stability of the – stability and security of the Internet is the question. This is not a majority wins. This has to be by consensus. And, yes, somebody could disagree, and that has to be made clear. But this is definitely not a majority wins.

And in many cases the recommendation may be made by these outside people who were brought in because they're the experts. The people on this group may understand DNS SEC but may not be the experts on DNS SEC.

Trang Nguyen: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: And so a lot of that I think has to be folded into that to make sure that we capture the intent of the group and that is to make sure that when we make changes to the root zone management how it's operated or its architecture that the overall Internet community believes this is going to be for the better and not for the worse. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Alan, for those. I've made notes of all of those. And will look into it. Everything that you said makes sense. Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Trang. I just look at the scope of responsibility for the RSEC charter. And one of them is to coordinate with the CSC as needed. And I was wondering is there a situation where we can – where they don't need to coordinate with the CSC? Because in my view it should be a mandatory to coordinate with the CSC in these respects or at least in form the ongoing conversations because the CSC is going to be an important part of the customers and this is going to be very much in the heart of the PTI work.

Trang Nguyen: So, Lise, what the proposal says and Paragraph 1155 is that the RySG and ccNSO representatives will ensure appropriate communications with the CSC. So I think it is envisioned that there would be frequent communication between this RZERC and the CSC. So we look into how the – how our language is reflected in this term sheet to make sure that it's, you know, captured that spirit and intent appropriately.

Lise Fuhr: Okay, thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan the third, for the record, according to the Adobe Connect room. Following on Alan Greenberg's points, I'm also concerned about the voting and quorum section here and agree that voting, majority vote probably, you know, is sending is down the wrong road.

                  And I think so does the quorum issue especially because the way this is set up right now you could have 51% or half plus one show up and then half plus one vote in favor of something which is essentially a quarter of the group and that could become, you know, a significant decision, again to the extent that this group is making, you know, significant decisions, which if we're putting the Chair of the ICANN Board on it that kind of puts, you know, a certain aura of significance on it.

                  I look to the GNSO Council and not exactly to how – I'm not exactly looking at the words in the GNSO procedures, but the way the GNSO procedures work in fact every seat votes except in very rare circumstances, you know, between having absentee and proxy opportunities, and sometimes – and also at least under consideration, you know, electronic ballots with time open for a period of hours or days.

                  But the idea is consistent with our consensus-driven mantra is that a decision in which only a small number of people participate and even smaller number of people win, in antithetical. So whatever we need to say that in these kind of – gets us to the point where everyone participates, especially since this is a small thin group, you could, you know, have a meeting where the ASO and

IETF representatives, you know, somehow don't make it and all of a sudden the numbers and protocol parameters are kind of out of the room.

Or if the Registry Stakeholder Group and ccNSO representatives don't make it well, all the registries are out of the room. That's – this shouldn't work that way. Thanks.

Trang Nguyen: Thanks, Greg. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. Just a couple more points. On the quorum I agree with Greg. And that was sort of implied by my statement that a majority should not be able to make a decision. You can't make decisions on something that's going to be critical to one specific aspect of the root zone without having the people there who are knowledgeable on it. So again, quorum is a concept that is – I don't think goes along with decisions by consensus and generally by very wide consensus.

The other thing is, again, the thing that you shouldn't call meetings on less than 7 days notice. I would presume that this group is going to be looking far ahead. Normally if IANA is going to be making some sort of change, this is not done on a whim on a moment's notice. On the other hand, if an emergency comes up I wouldn't want to see, sorry, we can't hold a meeting because there's 7 days and we have to wait. You know, this is the kind of thing…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: …that we hold the meeting in 5 minutes if we have to hold the meeting. So I think we need to carefully look at all of the bureaucratic parts of this and recognize why this group is there and make sure that we're not putting rules- in place that shouldn't be there. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Alan. And we'll also take another look at these and figure out what elements should be pulled from being specified in the charter and rather let the group, once it's formed, consider and define it and then perhaps put it into their own operational procedure type of document.

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Trang Nguyen: So we'll do that. Donna, you have your hand up.

Donna Austin: Yeah, thanks, Trang. I have two questions. So in relation to the purpose is this – is the purpose two points or one point?

Trang Nguyen: Those will be two separate points.

Donna Austin: Okay.

Trang Nguyen: Although I see your point. It could be somewhat related. I see where you're going with this. It's put as two separate bullet points if you would, or two separate sentences here. When the actual language of the charter is drafted we can consider how they may be integrated together.

Donna Austin: It's just the use of the semicolon that's throwing me so I didn't know whether there was…

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: …and and there. But if it's a period or a full stop. Okay so it's two purposes of this group. So the second question is that within the CSC charter, and

maybe, Alan, this is a question for you because I'm a little bit like Paul, I'm a little bit fuzzy on this.

There's an element of the CSC charter that says, "The CSC in consultation with registry operators is authorized to discuss with the IANA functions operator ways to enhance the provision of IANA's operational services to meet changing technology environments as a means to address performance issues or other unforeseen circumstances."

"In the event it is agreed that a material change in IANA naming services or operations would be beneficial, the CSC reserves the right to call for a community consultation and independent validation to be convened by the IANA functions operator on the proposed change. Any recommended change must be approved by the ccNSO and Registry Stakeholder Group."

Is it – because I'm just going back to – taking my mind back to when we had some discussion with the CSC. And I think David Conrad wanted the CSC to be that authorizer of any changes that were required to the root zone because there wasn't – there wasn't any way to do that. So I'm just trying to work out whether this part of the CSC charter is intended to relate to RZERC or not.

And maybe it's a – maybe it's a question we need to take away and think about. But I'd just – if Alan, you know the answer that would be great.

Alan Greenberg: I can try. I don't have that language you just read out in front of me and I'd have to look at it carefully. And whether it in fact meshed with the DTF recommendations on this group I don't know. It's quite possible that they didn't. This group is there to effectively to replace the NTIA. NTIA has been and is involved in virtually any change to IANA root zone operation, to the architecture, to the detailed operation. In other words, IANA could not rewrite

some major software that it uses to manage the root zone without approval from NTIA. As an example.

The NTIA, in fact, got involved in things far more detailed than that and far more specific than that. But this is – now NTIA did not do that by necessarily sitting in their Washington office and making a decision. They brought together knowledgeable people whether it's from the National Bureau of Standards on DNS SEC or other things, to try to make sure that what IANA was doing was going to meet a reasonable level of security, of safety and it was a good thing.

So this group is trying to bring together all of the various interested parties to replace that function. So whether it matches exactly with what the CSC said in the document I'd have to look at carefully. But this – certainly the CSC is one of the group that sits on this group and can bring things to this group. Ultimately this is the group that has to say yes, this is a good thing for the Internet and we'll go ahead with it.

And in that light I just noticed, I hadn't noticed it before, the third word of the purpose, to propose, is not correct. This group might propose things but they may be vetting things that are proposed by some other part of the community and IANA operational staff itself, for that matter. So proposed is not – should not be the operational word there. I'm not sure if that addresses your question.

And I don't think I can directly address your question without looking at the words and making sure that those original words on the CSC match – are the vision of how do we make crucial decisions with regard to the root zone and regarding, IANA, by the way, it's not just the root zone, it's the other aspects of the – of IANA's responsibility as well. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Alan. Paul.

Paul Kane: So very briefly, I'm just reading the top line, the purpose, "for consideration
                   by the ICANN Board." It is the PTI Board that is responsible or should be
                   responsible, will be responsible for the root zone management. Shouldn't it be
                   for consideration by the PTI Board? Namely that is the entity that is managing
                   the root zone rather than the ICANN Board which is more policy-focused. A
                   question, as I say, I apologize for not being up to speed on the documents.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Paul. So the CWG proposal specified that recommendations
                   would be made to the ICANN Board and that the ICANN Board will provide
                   formal approval of any recommendations. Alan, I don't know if you want to
                   chime in on that as well…

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Sure. Yeah, I can chime in on that. The PTI Board is responsible for the
                   operation of PTI and therefore the IANA functions it's doing. The ICANN
                   Board is assigned this task in lieu of the NTIA doing it as a body with wide
                   representation on the interests of the Internet itself. It is not directly related to
                   the other aspects of ICANN's responsibility and remit but it is a task
                   specifically assigned to the ICANN Board.

                   And that was the subject of a fair amount of discussion. And I think there was
                   widespread approval within the group that this is the – a reasonable body to do
                   this. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Alan. James.

James Gannon: Thanks. So very briefly, I think I'm getting a bit fuzzy on what the scope of this supposed to be because my understanding back during the CWG work was this was to be more focused on the technical stewardship rather than, you know, I'm seeing a lot of blurring of the lines between what the role of this group and what the role of the CSC is.

So I think we might need to take a step back and have a look and make sure that we're not, you know, crossing paths here between the two groups because I think what we have here in front of us now is possibly straying a little bit from what the original purpose of this group was.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, James. Alan, I see your hand is up. I assume you want to respond to that.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. I don't think we have strayed in crossing territories. This group is very much responsible for approving changes to how things are done either operationally how they're done, or if they're of substantial import or the architecture of the root zone itself. So I really don't think there is any overlap. The proposals may well have been originated in the CSC if they see some need but this is the group of wise people who really understand the nitty-gritty of what we're talking about to make sure that we're not going to do ourselves damage and, you know, stab ourselves in the foot.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Alan. All right, thank you everyone for that good discussion. So the notes I took away from that discussion is that we'll go back and take a look at these elements that are in the charter and determine what may be more appropriate for sort of a operational procedural type of document that the RZERC committee itself, once it's formed, can create.

I also have some notes here for us to go back and take a look at the votings and quorum requirements there and make some necessary changes. Some textual changes with regards to how we reference the RFP process, so perhaps using consultation instead of oversight. So we've got some of those notes taken down here. And we'll go and have another run at this document and then bring it back to you on the next call.

All right so let's move on to the next item which is the – next slide please – PTI article of incorporation. This again is sort of a form of a term sheet that we have for the PTI article of incorporation. There will be a name for PTI obviously. It would be formed as a California nonprofit public benefit corporation that will be 501(c)3 exempt, tax exempt.

It will operate for the benefit of and perform the functions and carry out the purposes of ICANN. It's sole member will be ICANN. Director liability is none which is the same as the ICANN's articles of incorporation. And then in terms of amendment of these articles of incorporation they can only be amended with ICANN's approval.

So I do see a big queue forming. Paul.

Paul Kane: I've already put my comment on email. I'm pretty concerned to see that the purpose has – is significantly changing from PTI from what IANA itself decreed was its purpose, namely to perform the central coordinating functions of the global Internet for the public good. I do notice, about a year and a half ago, the wording actually changed and I didn't spot it then.

But I think there is significant merit in defining the purpose of PTI to be that that IANA has done effectively and well for, you know, two decades or more just to be – to perform the central coordinating functions of the global Internet

for public good. If you want to go into naming, numbering, protocols, that's fine. But it's the secretariat function, not a power base. Thanks.

Trang Nguyen: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. This is kind of along the same lines as Paul. But I definitely don't think that the purpose of PTI is to carry out the purposes of ICANN. ICANN's purposes are much broader than the purposes of PTI. So I definitely think some work needs to be done on that.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Chuck. James.

James Gannon: Yeah, I'm very much in agreement with Chuck on this one. You know, the purpose of PTI is very much to carry out the IANA functions and their narrow technical remit. And I couldn't agree with what is down here as the purpose at the moment.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you. Thank you, James. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. I'm looking at the articles of incorporation for ICANN and, you know, up to a point they could follow each other. The first, you know, the general purpose is lessening the burden of government and promoting the global public interest and the operational stability of the Internet. I'm not sure if we need all that intro.

But the first thing is "coordinating the assignment of Internet technical parameters as needed to maintain universal connectivity on the Internet." Some of this might be a little obsolete but the general breadth is appropriate. "Performing and overseeing functions relating to the coordination of IP

address space. Performing and overseeing functions related to coordination of Internet domain names system."

But even this is starting to sound a lot broader than what PTI itself does and IANA does. And then it goes – where it really goes off the rails in terms of purposes is, "including the development of policies for determining the circumstances under which new top level domains are added to the DNS root zone system." You know, that's clearly not a purpose for PTI.

So, you know, in this case one size does not fit all. And, you know, PTI – and I'm probably saying the same thing everyone else has said before but just kind of by reference to the articles that exist that you can't just take those and move them in wholesale, there needs to be a substantial slimming down so we get to kind of the root – no pun intended – purposes of IANA. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Greg. Paul. Paul, was that an old hand or a new hand? Okay I see that you've taken your hand down. All right so thank you very much for that. We will take all of those points back and take another look at the PTI purpose. And we'll see when we can get something back to you for review by. We'll try to shoot for the next call.

Lise, it's about 13 minutes to the end of the call and I know several people on this call have a hard stop at 1:00 – at the end of the hour because we have to jump on another call. Should we pause at this point and maybe move to the next agenda item, AOB, I know Chuck has some things he wants to cover.

Lise Fuhr: Yes, I think that would be great. It's quite important. And if we have time we might revisit the document review process and timeline after that. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Yes, thank you.

Lise Fuhr: But I think Chuck should send his multiyear funding of PTI these issues and let's discuss it. Chuck, you want to go ahead?

Chuck Gomes: Okay this is Chuck. Okay. And I explained it in my email message on the agenda but I'll just quickly go over that. Design Team O met last week, the same day that the bylaws drafting group was meeting in LA on the CWG bylaws changes.

And so we took a step of faith and went out and acted without having time for CWG approval. We were fully aware that it was not – that DTO was not authorized to make decisions. But in order to get the bylaws group to work on it the day that they were working on it we jumped ahead of the process.

So my main question here is, is whether or not this will be raised in the working group call tomorrow so that we do hopefully get the approval of the full working group on inserting some bylaws language that would ensure funding beyond one year for PTI.

So really all I am asking for – certainly I welcome other discussion but is that this will be covered in the agenda tomorrow. Whether the final approval can happen tomorrow I understand it may take a couple meetings and some list work or something like that. But just want to make sure that that follow up happens so that it's not a DTO decision but rather a CWG decision.

And by the way, I don't – I've reached out to Becky to see if she can tell me whether – what was done in the bylaws drafting group last week and I don't have any feedback on that. Maybe somebody on this call has it. But anyway hopefully we'll get that shortly.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Chuck. I actually think it was really good that you reached out to the bylaws group even though you didn't have any decisions on the CWG because timing is essential here and it's better to withdraw a bylaw than have them remake it later. So to me I actually support that decision and we will discuss it at the call tomorrow.

We will also discuss – we have two other issues that was raised by Holly and Sharon regarding bylaws so there will be a lot of – not a lot but we will have to discuss these bylaws anyway. And I know – I'm not up to speed completely with the bylaws work. I'll try and do that tomorrow. But I know Greg Shatan was there. I don't know if you have anything to add, Greg. I can see you saying you're losing brain cells left and right. But…

Greg Shatan: I might have a couple left for this one.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Go ahead.

Greg Shatan: I did participate – yeah, I was not in California for the marathon sessions that took place. I have to hand it to the folks that were there for the better part of a week. But I did participate in the evening wrap-up calls that did take place and particularly the CWG one. I think that, you know, tremendous strides were made for drafting, you know, particularly the CWG related bylaws changes and ultimately the other ones as well.

I think there are, you know, a couple of outstanding questions that came out – there were a number of outstanding questions that were resolved on the wrap up calls and then resolved out in, you know, in the subsequent calls. So I think – not sure of exactly the timing at which we're going to see those. I believe that ICANN may have produced a – or a revised draft which is in the hands of CWG's Council now.

But it seems like generally speaking things are on track which, you know, given the fast track that was determined to be necessary is quite a feat. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Thank you. I don't know if we have time – we have 7 minutes left instead of having closing remarks I actually would like if we can briefly go through document review process and timeline, Trang.

Trang Nguyen: Yes, Lise. Of course. So what we have here is basically a process step that we thought could be used in order to review and finalize the documents that we would have to produce after we get agreement with you on the term sheet time.

So this specific process and timeline I think is applicable only to the RZERC charter and the PTI governance documents including the articles of incorporation, the bylaws, the conflict of interest policy and also the whistle blower policy probably doesn't need to be posted for public comment so that probably isn't applicable here. But it's only – this process will certainly be applicable – of course all of the other documents that I mentioned.

So the process as we envisioned it would be that ICANN would share with the IOTF the term sheet for these documents. The IOTF would review, discuss and then ultimately agree on those term sheets. What we thought would be the next step could be after that then the term sheets could then be sent to the operational community for review as well and any additional if needed.

And we recommended that review period be limited to two weeks. And then once all of the reviews and feedback comes back in and the term sheets are then finalized ICANN would then go and draft the actual documents to the

agreed upon term sheet and then before it gets posted for public comments certainly we can coordinate, you know, a review with Sidley if required.

And then it would then get posted for 30 days, we're recommending a 30 day public comment period. And then after that it would be finalized and presented to the Board – ICANN Board for approval.

So that's sort of the process that we had envisioned. And we'd love to hear any feedback that you may have.

Lise Fuhr: I can see Alissa's hand is up and I also have a comment. But, Alissa, go ahead.

Alissa Cooper: Thanks, Lise. Overall I think this looks good but I would suggest that this – the process will go more smoothly and more efficiently if the OC review and ICANN draft full document steps are reversed in their order so that you give the OCs an opportunity to review the full document rather than the kind of high level term sheet type things that we looked at today.

I think otherwise if you go straight to public comment having really nobody else in the community having seen the full documents I think you're going to end up with a whole bunch of comments that sort of could have been dealt with more quickly and more efficiently and in a, you know, in a much easier fashion than you receiving all of them and having to figure out what to do with them with only a single comment period.

So that would be my suggestion is to definitely get the full documents out for some kind of pre-review before a public comment. And then the public comment period might go a lot more smoothly.

Lise Fuhr: I completely agree with Alissa on this point. And I also want to add that we have discussed that the CWG is actually reviewing the full draft also so we have a – I don't know if that's included in the OC review because the OCs are, in my opinion, not covered by the CWG necessarily but I don't know how we can put the CWG into this process without delaying it too much. But it's requisite to have the CWG to review it.

Paul, your hand is up.

Paul Kane: So I'm just in agreement. I think the CWG needs to have time to review the high level descriptions. They're effectively ambassadors for the work that we are doing. And it's best that CWG members have signed off on the high level descriptions understand it so they can liaise with their respective groups. I do, at a high level, just a general concern.

We are racing at a phenomenal pace and I would – and I know everyone's been saying it for a long time but I would rather we just slow down and, you know, multiple calls per week and all this stuff, we're on overload. We've got day jobs. You know, it's really quite stressful (unintelligible) sure that we try and get this right. So I would prefer we slow down. I prefer we consult with the CWG and our respective communities before trying to push this through too quickly. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: I can see we're actually reached – almost the top of the hour so maybe, Trang, if you could revise this and we'll look at it again at the next call that could be good. We have the next call on Monday next week.

Trang Nguyen: Certainly Lise.

Lise Fuhr: And I see there is a lot of comments in the chat about we can't slow down, which is absolutely true. We, unfortunately, have a very strict deadline to meet in order to be able to have this transition. But I know a lot of people are dropping off now so thank you for participating and talk to you tomorrow or next week.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Lise. Thanks, everyone. Bye.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Lise. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Bye all.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you. Bye.

<div align="center">END</div>