

---

RECORDED AUDIO: This meeting is now being recorded.

TRANG NGUYEN: Terrific, thank you so much. Well welcome everyone. Thank you for joining today's call. This is the transition program facilitation management call on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of May 2016.

This monthly call was started awhile back, as a mechanism to share with you timelines relating to the IANA stewardship transition, so that you have visibility and predictability into the work that we are doing. So on today's call, we'd like to briefly review the ICANN bylaws timeline with you.

Then we'll move into the CSC, or Customer Standing Committee. And RZERC, Root Zone Evolution Review Committee topics. Some of you may have received an email from Jonathan and Lisa today regarding these two new bodies, that the CWG stewardship recommended be formed. So we'd like to take just a few minutes and talk about them a bit. And then we'll open it up for any other business, and then close out the meeting.

Any questions or comments before we go ahead and get started?

All right. Well let's move on to the next slide then please. Thank you. And maybe you can release the ability for people to zoom in and scroll, that would be terrific. I know the graphic is a bit small there. But we wanted to show you this slide that has some of the USG key dates on it, at the very top in the orange bar there.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

And then some of the ICANN key dates in the, I don't know what color that is, sort of the brownish greenish color, bar in the middle. And then at the bottom are the key days relating to the ICANN bylaws drafting process. And as you can see, you know, the next sort of key dates for us as it relates to the bylaws drafting process is May 27. That's when NTIA expects to receive the adopted ICANN bylaws, so that it can complete its review and issue a report on June 10<sup>th</sup>.

So as you know, the draft ICANN bylaws were posted for public comment on April 21<sup>st</sup>. We're now a little bit over a week into a 30 day comment window, and we're monitoring the public comment forum as well as any discussions that are ongoing in the community, to be prepared as possible to address any comments that come in as part of the public comment process.

And this is because, as you can see there, when the public comment window closes on May 21<sup>st</sup>, there isn't a whole lot of time for us to summarize and analyze the comments, and make any updates as necessary, and then also for the Board to then adopt the bylaws.

So this is a very tight timeframe that we'll be working with. So we're keeping a close eye on all of the discussion that are ongoing, as well as any comment that will be submitted to the public comment forum. We'll also be keeping a close eye on that May 27<sup>th</sup> date there. So with that, I'll just take a pause and see if there are any comments or anything that anyone on the call would like to share, as it relates to the ICANN bylaws.

---

Okay. I see Andrew typing in a comment in the chat room that IAB will certainly be sending in a comment. Thank you for that Andrew.

And then Thomas, please go ahead.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks very much Trang. Hello everyone. This is just to let you know that the CCWG is reviewing the bylaws and we have calls scheduled to discuss whether the draft bylaws match exactly what we had in our report. And there are a couple of questions where our group discusses whether the draft bylaws accurately capture the spirit or even the language of our report.

But as I should say that are not a lot of questions surrounding this. So we will use the opportunity of the public comment period to file a public comment in areas where our group perceives the need for maybe clarification or change.

It would be premature to speak to the outcome of that, but just to let you know that there are only a few things that our group discusses. So again, we would like to go on record thanking the drafting team who have done an excellent job in translating our lengthy report, 350 pages including appendixes in the updated bylaws. Thank you.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Thank you very much for that update Thomas. That's great to hear that the CCWG is having an ongoing discussions as it relates to the bylaws and we'll be getting some feedback on that. And Nurani, I saw your

---

hand come up a little while ago, did you have anything that you wanted to share?

Okay. All right, thank you. Anything else on ICANN bylaws?

All right, well great. It looks like there are some discussions that are ongoing around this, and we look forward to receiving any comments. Let's then now move on to the next topic of the CSC and the RZRRC. I see that Lise has joined. I don't see Jonathan in the Adobe Connect room.

Lise, we didn't have an opportunity to coordinate on this, but I have... Oh, Jonathan is on. Hi Jonathan. Apologies, we didn't have an opportunity to coordinate on this. We have prepared a couple of slides with a very high level overview of the CSC and RZERC. And I didn't know if either one of you would like to talk to these, or I'm happy to talk to them and then you can add any comments if you like.

All right, terrific, thank you Lise. Then I will go ahead and just provide an overview of these two bodies, and then Jonathan and Lise can chime in. As I mentioned, the CWG proposal recommended that two new bodies be formed. One of them is the Customer Standing Committee, or CSC. The CSC will be formed to essentially provide oversight of PTI's performance against the service level targets that will be included in the ICANN PTI contract.

And it will also be undertaking remedial action in order to address any poor performance by PTI and as part of that process escalate any performance issues the ccNSO and GNSO. The other thing that it could also do is review and recommend changes to the performance targets

---

for PTI. The CWG proposal recommended that the CSC be comprised of members and liaisons. The numbers will be from the ccTLD, so two ccTLD registry operators, and two gTLD registry operators. And then additionally and optionally, one more member could be appointed from a TLD that is not a ccTLD or gTLD, so that would include dot [inaudible], dot [inaudible], and dot gov.

In terms of liaisons, there will be one liaison, or they can be one liaison, appointed from each of the SOs and ACs. So as you can see there, one liaison can be appointed from the NRO or the ASO. One from RSSAC. One from the GNSO non-registry, so essentially the registrar stakeholder group, or the non-contracted party [inaudible] of the GNSO. The ALAC. The GAC and the SAC. PTI could also appoint one liaison to the CSC as well.

And again the CSC roll is to monitor PTI performance for the naming services only, and that's why you see the arrow with the eye pointing to just the naming function, and not all three functions for PTI. So let me take a pause there and see if Jonathan or Lise would like to chime in with any additional thoughts or comments.

Jonathan, apologies that we couldn't hear you before.

Jonathan and Lise, if either one of you are talking, you are mute.

LISE FUHR:

Jonathan has lost audio and he will log out and come back again, and I think we would like to take this [to the?] RSSAC, and then chime in at

---

the end. So if we can take both committees and then we'll add our comments. Thank you.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Thank you Lise. Let's move on to the next slide then please. The Root Zone Evolution Review Committee, or RZERC, is the other committee that the CWG had recommended be formed. This committee's role will essentially be providing the ICANN Board with advice as it relates to architectural and operational changes to the root zone.

That is going to be its primary function. The RZERC will be comprised of the, a representative from the bodies that you see there below, from the ASO, SSAC, the registry stakeholder group, the IETF, the RSSAC, the ccNSO. One representative from the ICANN Board, one representative from the root zone maintainer, and one representative from the PTI.

And again, the primary role of the RZERC is to consider issues relating to the operation or architecture of the root zone, and then advising the ICANN Board as it relates to those types of changes. So that's a very high level of the CSC and the RZERC.

And I don't know Jonathan has logged back in, or has...

LISE FUHR:

No, it seems that he's not there yet. This is Lise. But I can briefly inform you that regarding the RSSAC charter, you send it to us to circulate that for the CWG. And the plan is to send it to Dev to the CWG with a two weeks' comment period. And we have a meeting coming up in 10 days' time, and we'll discuss it further there at that call.

---

So that's in process for the CWG to review and comment on. And I know Jonathan would like to talk to the email he sent out, that we discussed and sent out earlier this week. I don't know if he has joined yet.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Thank you Lise. While we wait for Jonathan to dial back in, maybe what we can do is to move on to the next slide, and take a look at the timing of when things will actually occur on both the CSC side and on the RZERC side. So maybe we can do that while we wait for Jonathan to dial back in. Next slide please.

So this next slide is the RZERC, it's on the RZERC formation process, and timeline. As Lise mentioned, we have been working with the implementation oversight taskforce, and with Alan Greenberg who was the design team lead on the RZERC topic, to finalize a draft of the RZERC charter.

As Lise mentioned, it will be circulated to the CWG for a two week review period. After the CWG review, we will be posting the charter for a 30 day public comment period. So currently we're anticipating that that would occur in the middle of May through the middle of June. And then after that, the Board will consider any public comments received, and then also approve the charter.

After the charter is approved, ICANN will be reaching out to the organizations that we showed you on the last slide, to ask that they make an appointment. And so that the RZERC can be formed by the

---

middle of August, which is when ICANN needs to submit the implementation report to NTIA.

So at a high level, that is sort of the steps, next steps that need to occur in the timing around it.

Next slide please.

So now, if we take a look at the CSC, in terms of the timing around this, the CWG stewardship proposal has already included a charter for the CSC. So we don't have to go through the process of actually defining a charter, because it's already there. So that the process that we have, or the implementation activities that we have around the CSC, is to actually define a process by which we would be reaching out to the SOs and ACs, so that they can then in turn, use its own internal processes to appoint candidates to the CSC.

The process is a bit more complicated on the CSC side because they're actually candidates, there are numbers and liaisons that needs to be appointed by the various SOs and ACs, and then forwarded on to the ccNSO and GNSO Council, who would then make a final approval of the final CSC membership composition. So there is a little bit more steps involved, informing the CSC, and we've been working with Donna Austin as well as with Katrina, who I see has joined us today. And figuring out the details of those processes, and on drafting the requests from ICANN to the various SOs and ACs, so that they could start their appointment process.

The timing that we are tentatively looking at for the CSC is to issue that request to the various SOs and ACs or appointing body, sort of in the



---

middle of May, or a little bit after that, but certainly within the second half of May, to [inaudible] the process. The various SOs and ACs would then be encouraged to use their own internal processes to appoint candidates, at the time that they deem appropriate for them.

I know that some SOs and ACs would like to start the process sooner rather than later, and then there are some that would need to go through the process of defining their own internal processes first, before they can appoint candidates, so that may take a little bit longer. So the timing in terms of when they want to [inaudible] the internal processes is up to them.

All that we ask is that the various appointing bodies, appoint the candidates by, towards the end of July so that those candidates can be forwarded to the ccNSO and GNSO Council, to make a final approval by middle of August, certainly before we have to submit our implementation report to NTIA.

So that's a high level overview of the steps involved in forming the CSC as well as timing that we're considering. This timing is still under discussion, so things may move a little bit, but as of today, this is sort of the timelines that we are considering. Alan, I see you have your hand up, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Two points. First of all, I note that the liaison positions are optional. So although the ACs may wish to have a liaison immediately, there is no obligation for them to, and that should not act as... Them not appointing someone in time, should not delay any of the

---

other processes. That notwithstanding, since the ccNSO and the GNSO have approval rights over the candidate, it would be really useful if sooner rather than later, they tell us what the criteria is they're going to use for that approval. Thank you.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Thank you Alan. You are right that the liaison position is optional and not mandatory. You did raise an interesting thing that we haven't considered, and will probably need to have some discussion, which is that if they don't initially appoint a liaison, but if a particular SO or AC does not initially appoint a liaison, the GNSO and ccNSO then proceed to approve a final composition of the CSC membership, including members and liaisons.

And then at some point after that, the SO and AC that did not initially appoint a liaison would like to now appoint a liaison, how we, you know, what would that process look like? So we'll make note of that and think about that a bit.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Trang, if I may have a follow on. There is always going to be turnover in this group, it has to be an ongoing process to name someone after the beginning. So regardless of whether the ALAC, for instance, names someone they want, there has got to be a process for approving new people as we go ahead.

---

TRANG NGUYEN:

Yes, certainly Alan. And I think that the consideration there is whether or not, or can the process be extended to cover that scenario as well? I think it can be, it just hasn't been one of the things that we have considered. And then if I can address your second question, which was the criteria for the GNSO and ccNSO approval, that will be included with the, when ICANN issued the request, former request for the SOs and ACs to appoint candidates.

But essentially, the ccNSO and GNSO is not in a position to really challenge the SOs or ACs approval, the consideration in terms of the final approval of the full composition of the CSC will be to ensure there is diversity in terms of geography and skill set. And we're taking that under advisement. So thank you so much for your comment.

There are several hands up now, and so let's see how we manage the queue from here. Steve, Steve had a question, Steve Crocker has a question in the chat room. So these date... Are there dates that for the first meetings of the CSC and RZERC? And then another comment is that I think it will help makes this feel more real to the appointing bodies, if there is a date of the first meeting. Thank you Steve.

And I do see your hand up. Was that your question Steve, or is there anything else you would like to add to that?

STEVE CROCKER:

No, I raised my hand for an entirely different matter, but thank you for repeating my questions in the chat room. That was just advisory to the, to move things along so that the appointment process feels real and is

---

taken seriously by the, seriously there is a long tone to it, but it provides a sense of urgency to the appointing bodies.

Different comment, the reason why I raised my hand, is that [inaudible] set of slides and you're going into, I think, exactly the right level of depth for each of these things. The question I'm asking myself is what is missing from this picture in terms of the whole, the totality, and one area that I think is less visible to everyone, is the cut over process, the agreements with VeriSign, all of that that is happening sort of behind the scenes in a way, or at least handled in a different fashion.

But I think has to be, have some level of visibility so that we have a complete picture of the transition process.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Thank you Steve. Thank you for that. And we'll take a note of that. We currently, you're right, we currently don't have dates for the first meeting set for the CSC and RZERC. But we'll make note of that suggestion. And see what we can do. And then I don't see Lise's hand up, but [inaudible] Lise did you have your hand up and then was it taken down?

I think you were next in the queue. If not...

LISE FUHR:

I just withdraw and pass it over to Jonathan. Thank you.

---

TRANG NGUYEN: Got it. Thank you very much, Lise. Jonathan, please go ahead.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks Trang. Two points. One is a question I suppose. Is it certain that this CSC charter, as defined in the proposal, bylaw? I just want to be sure that that's not a draft charter, and/or check there. That's one. Second, I think, I guess following on from Alan and Steve's point, when we make the call for appointees or for... When we send out the call for the various appointments, even if we don't place a specific date to indicate when we expect the CSC and the RZERC to first meet, it's kind of a sort of call to action, or reminder that that [inaudible] says that it makes it somewhat more real.

So my suggestion is that we may not want to pin down the exact date a call, or even a month when we anticipate those meetings taking place. Thanks.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you very much Jonathan. Alan, is that a new hand Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just as a follow on to my last comment, even if the ccNSO or GNSO are only doing, going to reject someone based on balance and diversity, there still needs to be clarity. If for instance, they decide that there are two North Americans on the group, who gets rejected? Is it arbitrary? Are they going to pick the liaisons because liaisons aren't important?

---

And therefore, essentially favoring the statutory members? We need some clarity as to how the selection is going to be made, to really allow this to go forward properly, otherwise, without that kind of clarity ahead of time, it's really putting the ACs and the other groups doing liaisons, in a very awkward position for knowing how to pick and what to do. Thank you.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Thank you very much Alan. One of the things that we are considering is asking that the SO and AC do their best effort to appoint a primary candidate and a secondary candidate, and to have as much diversity as possible between the two candidates so as to provide the ccNSO and GNSO Council with some flexibility in terms of forming that final composition of the CSC membership.

So that's one way that we're looking at in terms of trying to address that issue.

Nurani, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

Nuraini?

NURAINI NIMPUNO:

Sorry. [Inaudible]... from a numbers perspective, early on when we [inaudible]... numbers community to representative in this review process, as it pertains [inaudible] and as the numbers function, so in a review crisis. [Inaudible]... ASO just to make sure that [inaudible] would be helpful to get some sort of official clarification on the [inaudible] so

---

that there is now waiting for any of the liaisons from the [inaudible], yeah [inaudible]...

TRANG NGUYEN:

Thank you Nurani. Thank you for that clarification. Yes, we do note the end, the comment that the CRISP team had met to the ICG awhile back relating to this. We wanted to share with you here just sort of the what the CWG stewardship proposal had recommended on certainly as much and before not a requirement for all of the SOs and ACs to appoint a liaison.

And so thank you very much for that clarification.

Any other comments or questions relating to either the RZERC or the CSC?

I saw a comment in the chat room about potentially a timeline relating to the PTI and we can certainly, we do have that and we can certainly share that on the next call.

Okay. All right, well if there is nothing else around the CSC and RZERC, let's open it up for any other business, at this point. I had mentioned that we shared with this group some information relating to the PTI formation timeline, etc. and we'll do that on the next call.

Is there anything else that anyone would like to bring up under any other business?

Jonathan, please go ahead.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: ...I don't recall that [inaudible] bit of an audio outage for a while, but there will be some work going in the near future in and around the legal of the PTI articles of incorporations, bylaws, and so on. So that's another track of work, that I don't think I saw mentioned here.

In addition to and in coordination with the work on the ICANN [bylaws]...

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you Jonathan. Yes, we did not cover that topic on today's call. But thank you for that reference. You're right, there is some work ongoing around that, and we can certainly share more information in terms of timelines, and by next month's call, I would assume that we would have a draft that would have been circulated, at least for the PTI bylaws and articles of incorporation, circulate it for review.

So we should be able to share some additional information around PTI development call. Andrew, you have your hand up. Please go ahead.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yes, thanks. So the, I guess this is maybe another concern about waiting another month to get sort of status on PTI. So you just said that you think that they'll be stuff circulated around the bylaws for PTI and so on in advance. So does that mean it's going to be circulated among this group, or publically?



---

Because if the answer is, well, we don't have any status to report yet, but in a month you're going to see something, then that's okay. But if what you're saying is we're not going to hear anything for another month, I'm a little nervous about that.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Thanks Andrew. No, actually work is ongoing. We have actually been working with the implementation oversight taskforce on sort of the process for review of these documents. And we had a discussion with the group last Wednesday, and received some feedback on that process, and then we'll be reviewing that process again with the group on this week's call, which is, I think, scheduled for tomorrow.

But no, work is ongoing. We'll anticipate that we'll have a draft of the PTI bylaws and articles of incorporation that could be ready to be shared by the end of this week. So sort of the process and next steps and how to work with sharing that information and working with [inaudible], is something that we've been in discussions with the implementation oversight taskforce on. So Jonathan has his hand up, let me go to Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Trang, just to support you, and I hope I didn't cause any concern about the [inaudible], yes, the IOTF, in the implementation oversight group, we will make sure we will get a process ironed out. We'll work through that, and share that and work with that of UT as a whole, and the [inaudible] committee to the CWG to the extent from external lawyers.

---

So there is a process going on, Andrew, and it won't be silent until the next meeting of this group.

TRANG NGUYEN: Eleeza, please go ahead.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So yes, just to bring forth something I said in the chat, I think there, as people have just said, there is the work going on with the articles of incorporation, the dialogues of PTI, there has been also going to be the ITN PTI contract, two big pieces of work where there will be solicitations from the operational communities and from the public for comment, all as we saw from the earlier timelines that were shown in this call.

And of course, not very many months and potentially overlapping and so on. And so I think my comment about the PTI timeline in particular was that better to have all of those people know in advanced that their comment is going to be sought, and that they will have, you know, potentially multiple different 30 day periods to collect their thoughts and provide comments on financial document.

Better that they know that in advance, so they can plan for it, because those things are a little hard to plan for, especially in the summer sometimes. So I agree with the sentiment that getting the timeline out to people, so that they know in advance, even if the actual documents, and so on, are ready to go for public comment, would be very helpful.

---

TRANG NGUYEN:

Thank you very much Eleeza for that. We actually have been discussing sort of a timeline with the IOTF, or the implementation of oversight taskforce. I wanted to share it with that group tomorrow, and then maybe, after that, we can circulate it to this group, this TTFM group as well.

Jonathan, is that a new hand?

Okay. All right, so we'll make a note to circulate the timeline around the PTI formation including the bylaws, the articles of incorporation and the contract. When it's anticipated, things will be drafted when the community review process would take place, and when the public comment period would take place.

So we'll make a note to circulate that to this group.

Anything else that anyone would like to bring up?

Okay, seeing no hands and no other comments in the chat room, I guess we will go ahead and close this month's call. We have taken an action to circulate the timeline around the PTI processes to the group, so we'll do that at the, probably later on this week after we've had a chance to share it with the IOTF first. And so, the other thing that I'd like to note again is to keep an eye out for the communications and information as it relates to the RZERC charter, and as it relates to the CFC formation coming from ICANN soon.

So thank you so much everyone for your time, and for joining today's call. And we will talk again next month. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**