

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Grace Abuhamad  
December 29, 2014  
3:00 pm CT**

Robert Guerra: So again this is Robert Guerra for CWG RFP 4. It's 5 past the hour and I'll be starting the call now. In terms of an agenda unless there's any comments there are kind of three main things that I want to discuss and go through. One is a review of the items on the tasks and the next steps from the last call, which I'll have listed in the next slide.

A series of updates which will include a very quick presentation from me in terms of reading through the transition implication sections of the other communities' proposals to the IANA stewardship so we can just have a sense of what the other two communities have prepared.

And then we'll go through updates from the different work streams. We'll start with 3, 2 and then 1 so it's in the reverse order that's mentioned in the agenda. And then do a review and talk about next steps including the next call.

In terms of the review of the previous call we'll go through these items and then ask for updates from staff and others. And these are taken from the minutes of the last call. Olivier, we had a conversation with him in regards to

the ALAC and in regards to their alternate proposal and timeline and additional timeline details that would be added to their proposal.

And just, Olivier, I see you're on the call now. I'm curious if you have an update for us in regards to the additional details that we discussed on the call. Floor is yours, please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks, very much, Robert. It's Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking. And there is no update at the moment I'm afraid on the timeline. We've got work on that and hopefully in early January we'll be able to come back with a timeline.

With regards to further details on that proposal we're still discussing these. And as you know that the moment being the holiday break it's a little difficult. And we haven't got any conference calls set up this week due to the lack of staff for this. But I would suspect that the next call I think is on the 5th of January and from there we'll be working on this. Thank you.

Robert Guerra: Great. Thank you so much, Olivier. In regards to the next point which was on the last call which is a call for volunteers. I believe that was circulated. Were there any volunteers that were identified to elaborate some of the additional paths?

Grace Abuhamad: Hi, Robert. This is Grace. There were no additional volunteers identified.

Robert Guerra: Great. Thank you. Yes.

Grace Abuhamad: I was going to suggest perhaps because it was during the holiday week for many maybe to recirculate the call for this week coming or maybe the first week of January.

Robert Guerra: That's an excellent idea. We'll probably do it in both periods as well so we'll do that in the review part toward the end of the call. The other items that was there was as well too which was in regards to the task list in terms of providing additional details on tasks for the different components of RFP 3 to be created there is a call for - the participants will recall to submit additional details to break down those additional tasks.

I reviewed the comments on the mailing list over the last week and haven't seen anything so I would add that also to - a pending item to also have an update on the next call.

In terms of the next two items I've had conversations with the co-chair, Siva, in regards to ways to aggregate the threats and the risks lists and I'll be presenting that a little later. That's one of the attachments that you should have received in the email if you're on the RFP 4 mailing list.

If you're not - if you didn't receive the document please let Grace and I know so we can make sure you're on the mailing list. And then some additional categories of risks and threat items which we'll get to in one of the next slides.

In terms of updates I thought it useful since the other communities have prepared some of their submissions either complete submissions or some of the draft submissions to see what they have included in their RFP 4 section perhaps to guide us to give us some details on what they've - how we may want to complement that. So I'll be presenting the IETF and the ones from the - ours as well.

In regards to the IETF the transitions implication draft that they have for comment they mentioned that, you know, structural changes are required for

the handling of the protocol parameters that no services are expected to change and that no technical - new technical or operational methods are proposed and that there'll be ongoing conversations and dialogue to spot any unforeseen issues. So it's probably the easiest of the transition implications from the different communities from the IETF.

In regards from the RIRs or the consolidated RIR IANA stewardship proposal, also known as CRISP, there is a bit more text in regards to how they structure their comments in regards to their RFP 4 and I'll have, I believe, two slides in regards to this.

First they have a section that describes the intents in terms of what they are proposing. And it's - puts is on the screen there which is to minimize the risks and to try to use existing frameworks that they may have and try to use those.

And there basically I've tried to summarize four kind of main points that they try to make is that using existing arrangements and not necessarily to have new ones and a shift from having the NTIA being responsible to use the NRO executive council which is existing structure that the RIRs have building again on an existing system that they have.

And it was mentioned in their proposal that they believe that this agreement can be established well before the NTIA target date and no service level changes or reporting is being proposed. So they have an existing structure that makes it easy for a transition to take place.

Are there any participants on the call that wish to comment on either the IETF or the CRISP proposal as they're out there, maybe provide a bit more nuance than I was able to summarize. Maybe Jaap would you like to make any comments at this time on those other communities' proposals?

Not hearing any comments I'll announce to the next section and we can come back to that later. In regards to work streams, as I mentioned, we'll go through an update on work stream 3, 2 and 1. And the reason we're starting with work stream 3, which was a discussion that we had on our last call in regards to scenario testing or the risks and how they could be aggregated.

And we discussed on our last call that it might be worthwhile to review, create a stress table to walk through them to see whether they're relevant or not to our RFP 4 discussions. That way we have a list that we could go forward and I propose that we will do that shortly.

And also in our last call we talked about not only that but also identifying the critical periods where their proposal should be tested and how that could occur.

Sorry, just go back here. Let me just check here. So if we could just ask staff if we could now go to the document that Steve has developed please. And what I propose is that we go through and put each of the different risks that are identified, try to categorize whether the risks that are numbered on the slide, see if any additional risks - threats - or threats should be added and whether they're relevant to our discussions now, possibly maybe relevant and could be discussed at a later date or should be excluded in our conversation going forward.

Steve, unfortunately, who developed this document could not make our call today and so I'd just like to go through with the group here and try to get a, you know, the group to try to allocate each different risk in the different category.

In regards to Risk Number 1 I'd like to hear what folks think in terms of whether it's relevant to our conversations in RFP 4, whether it's indirect or not relevant. This is for the cancellation of the Affirmation of Commitments. Is this a - something that we should discuss or put as a list of possible threats for RFP 4? Anyone wish to comment on this? Yes, Staffan, please. Go ahead.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Well I just want to say I think it's a good approach and hopefully we won't have to use all of these squares. But this is a good starting point and (unintelligible) approach just to say.

Robert Guerra: Great. While I have you, are there specific stress scenarios that you think are most relevant to our conversation? Could you just cite those please?

Staffan Jonson: I haven't looked into it too narrowly yet but so I wouldn't go on that yet but...

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: Okay.

Staffan Jonson: ...it's good approach at least.

Robert Guerra: Great. Thank you so very much. Any others? Perhaps my colleague on the SSAC, Jaap, do you have any thoughts on which of the stress scenarios are more relevant to our conversation for RFP 4? Jaap, go ahead.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes, well as I have said earlier on, I mean, a couple meetings ago, I mean, the problem with the - with this list is that with a lot of things on this list is that this is - I mean, there is no - all these things are too (unintelligible).

I mean, a lot of these things are (unintelligible) I mean, whether there is a term (decision) or not, I mean, as we all say there's no measurement of this list at all. I mean, there is no - it's very hard to get a lot of these things into the - in the transition discussion because, I mean, a lot of things which are brought up here are (unintelligible) whether there is this stewardship transition or not, I mean.

Robert Guerra: Great, Jaap. Thanks for your comment. So I'm assuming them if you wanted to go with a very narrow one I guess the one that is mentioned in the SSAC advisory stress - or Scenario Number 11, keeping it to a very narrow and focused would be better than having a more elaborate list at this moment in time.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Well not specifically on, I mean, whatever SSAC is saying - or SSAC is saying but especially which is relevant to the transition whether - what does change in the transition which makes it a risk above whatever (unintelligible) already.

I mean, we can have a long discussion about all the risk associated with things that might fail or might not fail and so on. But that's indeed way to - too wide. We'd have to focus on what makes it - the transition different in to whatever (unintelligible) there are.

Robert Guerra: Great. Thank you so much. Can I get a comment from someone else on this aspect? Avri, please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Hi, this is Avri. Assuming I can be heard? It is specific to the transition. For example, within the transition we're not sure that somebody's going to continue with the NTIA final check process. So that might be a place where if we don't, you know, institute a NTIA style fine, have all the boxes been

checked, last check is there a risk of (unintelligible) changes or considered changes or something like that.

That might be more in the nature of risks that we incur. And I don't know if I saw it in there, risks that we incur that are new in the transition. Cancellation of the AOC does seem like it is a general one. But it's also very specific in this case all sides say because it is the NTIA relationship. So it's - to the degree to which it's bundled in that it would be, you know, relevant.

Like to avoid jurisdiction, this is just sort of responding to Jaap's comments as I'm thinking about it is NTIA has required that it be in the US. Is there any problem with it not being in the US? So it's not necessarily flight to avoid jurisdiction but is the risk in change of jurisdiction because that's something that does change in the absence of the NTIA.

And I haven't gone through all of them. Some of them I don't see, you know, ignoring SSAC, GAC, XXX, etcetera, those are policy issues that then resulted in something but the NTIA coming or going doesn't seem to me to make a great deal of difference. And so perhaps subjecting (unintelligible) to that kind of test might meet Jaap's, you know, consideration. Thanks.

Robert Guerra: Great. Thank you, Avri, in regards to those two points. An additional point that was mentioned in an earlier conversation today I'm curious what people think in terms of adding an additional step which is the protest to the new mechanism makes too long and becomes far more contested and far less timely than it is now so a timeliness issue where a new system takes far longer to implement changes to IANA. Is that an operational risk issue that we should add to this list?

Steve Crocker: It's hard to imagine that things would take longer with NTIA out of the loop.



Robert Guerra: Great. Is that Steve, thank you. Again this is a - so this is the list. What I will ask is, as we mentioned on the last call, folks please to go through this. What I would like to do is to make sure that if there's some additional items or sources of stress in there that should be added that we add them to the list and then trying to make sure that we either include them as items that should be included in the RFP 4 conversation or not.

And I think, Avri, what you mentioned in terms of technical administrative checks and that being removed and problems for jurisdictional change be added. And if folks like Jaap and others believe that there are technical security in terms and just keep to that list then definitely we have the other items not necessarily being relevant to the conversation at this time.

Before I proceed are there other comments that folks wish to make at this time? If we could go back to the...

((Crosstalk))

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Robert, it's Olivier.

Robert Guerra: Olivier, please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yeah, Robert, I've got my hand up, I don't know whether - can you see it or...

Robert Guerra: I could not see it. I can see it now, please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Very strange. Okay, I'll have to check my machine. Just looking back at this document, this table, I wonder whether we have in there the

possibility that happened or that might have happened with US courts or any court at law asking for redelegation without following those procedures.

And I don't know whether - that's not a class action against ICANN, that obviously is a court or current has asks for redelegation. I'm looking here specifically at what happened with the Iranian top level domain and - I can't remember was it North Korea as well? This sort of stuff. But that might be an interesting scenario to look at as well and find ways to mitigate this.

Obviously under the current regime it would probably be that the transfer wouldn't take place even if it was asked for by a court because it wouldn't be following the right procedures and so the NTIA would have been able to block this. At least that's my speculation of how things could have happened. But I don't know without the NTIA how that would have worked or not. Thank you.

Robert Guerra: Great. Thank you, Olivier. Jaap, please go ahead.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Okay, well just as a reaction on Steve remark about, I mean, that there won't be delays if IANA drops out of the process. If I hear other - some of the discussions it seems that some people (unintelligible) something in place of IANA. And that might actually make the process way longer. I mean, it depends of course on exactly how that is done but that might actually be a risk that it will take way more time than it does now.

And the same with - the same it's not really sure how things like the contact or the (NTR) is going to function, I mean, this is at least that actually might change the current model quite heavily and so the players will suddenly have a new situation.

Robert Guerra: Great. Thank you for that, Jaap. I think related to - I think to the stress test too we discussed on the last calls as well too and I'd like to get some feedback from folks here and I think, Olivier, you made reference to this and what are the more critical periods where there should be kind of perhaps more attentive testing being done.

And I'd like to get a sense from those on the call when perhaps would - when they believe that, you know, when these critical periods might be. One would be perhaps during the period where events or the systems are running in parallel and there could be a handover from one system to the other. I'm just curious we haven't necessarily defined this as much.

Perhaps even if you wanted to make a comment in regards to what do you think the two or three most critical periods would be when we should be testing or looking at the system to make sure that it's stable and secure enough.

Steve Crocker: I'm not sure I have anything cogent to say. I'll give it some thought.

Robert Guerra: Great. Do others, Jaap, or Avri, would you like to make a comment on what do you think the top two or three critical periods are from the transition we're testing and announce this should be taking place to make sure all is okay.

With no comments I'll leave this again for the conversation and also ask for those that are developing proposals, Olivier and others, that if there are changes to the existing proposals that you're putting in for the ALAC and others to identify critical periods that would be most helpful.

Then switch to the next slide which is an update on work stream Number 2 which is a text that was circulated on changes that would have to take place

from the existing system going forward and transition path. Olivier, you mentioned that you were waiting to get an update. I also see that your hand is up. Please, Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks very much, Robert. It's Olivier speaking. And I apologize for being late from the previous slide. But I did supply the working group with a mind map of possible threats and mitigations for the different structures and bodies that were to be created. So we're looking here at CSC, MRT, IAP, etcetera.

And I don't know whether I should be looking at transferring these into that table that we have referenced here or is that out of scope?

Robert Guerra: I'm not seeing that document so if you could send that again to the list that would be great. And I think providing as much additional details I think that type of illustration would be helpful as we move forward so thank you for making that comment. Grace, please go ahead.

Grace Abuhamad: Robert, I just want to confirm with Olivier that this was the document that he sent around to the list following the call in November I think, is that correct, Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yeah that was correct, Grace.

((Crosstalk))

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yeah, it was a while ago. But I never had any feedback on it and that's why I wondered whether it was received or maybe it might have just been lost in the floods of emails that we've had.

Grace Abuhamad: Okay, yeah. So I'll make sure to forward that again to the list. I'll just re-forward your original email if that's okay.

Robert Guerra: Great, thank you for that reminder.

((Crosstalk))

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: I'll tell you what, Grace, it's Olivier speaking. I'll check if that diagram might have been updated. If it has I'll send you an updated one.  
Thank you.

Grace Abuhamad: Okay, thanks.

Robert Guerra: Great. So for work stream Number 2 there was a document that was presented on the last call for folks to review and to comment in regards to changes from the - the proposal from RFP 3. I'm curious if anyone has had a thought, sorry, an opportunity to take a look at that in regards to the list of changes. If they think it's fine, if there are any possible changes that are required. I see Olivier and Grace, do you both have your hands up? Are those new? (Unintelligible).

And wonder if you could put the document up which was RFP 4 transition implications, work stream 2 with a date of December 16.

Grace Abuhamad: Robert, having a little bit of a delay uploading the document here. Give me one more minute.

Robert Guerra: Sure thing. Thank you again, Grace, for uploading the document. And this is also - was emailed to the RFP 4 mailing list. Again, this is going through the RFP 3 proposal describing all the key aspects of the existing arrangements and what some of the changes would need to take place for the RFP 3

arrangements to be implemented. It is a very I guess nuanced description going through all the different roles and seeing what would need to be changed and some of the descriptions. You should all have that on your list, everyone. Grace, thank you for mentioning everyone has scroll control.

I would like to just get a sense of if folks have had an opportunity to take a look at this and if so if they suggest any revisions or changes in regards to this approach to go through the different aspects of RFP 3.

With no comments I think one of the important things that we will see in tomorrow's call, which is the call of the full CWG, is the descriptions I mentioned here, are assuming the model and the text that was presented in the draft for community circulation and depending on community comments and how are they seen in regards to agreeing with the model, suggesting changes or making it leaner, this will have to be revised accordingly.

But I just wanted to get a sense from the group if this listing of the changes is one that seems adequate and if so it has as an action item going forward so once we have a model for staff and for others to go through the description of the main sections and continue on using this approach and that we would modify it accordingly depending if we - if CWG as a whole modifies its model.

Get a sense - or do we have any disagreements from the group in regards to going forward with that approach? With no disagreements then I'll say that we have consensus going forward that is an approach that we can use going forward. Thank you so very much.

If we could go back to the slide please? We should be on Slide 13 which is work stream 1 which was going through the existing ICANN and IANA

technical proposal and trying to identify using the table of contents to see if there are specific terminology or terms that were relevant for our conversations for RFP 4 that was presented in our earlier call. I believe Siva sent a document for review and comment.

No comments have yet been received. Siva, I don't know if you're on the call and I see that you are, would you like to make some comments either via voice if you can or if not via text to present some of the work and the document that you circulated in regards to this? Siva, please over to you.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: Robert, I have no comments at the moment.

Robert Guerra: Great, did you receive any comments in regard to the text that you circulated about a week ago?

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: No. No, Robert, none.

Robert Guerra: Great. Can I get a sense from the group if Siva's text and the table of contents if there are any disagreements with proceeding in that approach? Olivier, Siva believed - he mentioned that there were no - he had no comments and he had received no comments. Great, so with no comments in regards to work stream 1 and no comments on the contrary we seem to have an agreement to - in terms of work stream 2 how to describe the changes.

On work stream 1 I'll leave for the next few days if there's any comments in regards to key turns. So we seem to be going on track and agreeing on what was discussed. It is the holidays though so a more lively conversation perhaps will be brought up a little bit later.

Go to the next slide here is in regards to if there's any comments from staff at this point in regards to - sorry, Olivier, your hand is up, please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yeah, thanks Robert. It's Olivier speaking. I realize I think I must be lagging or something. I put my hand up on the previous slide. I wonder whether within work stream 1 there is this question of the current IANA, what did you call it, process I think it's called, for any kind of transfer of stewardship from one organization to another and so on.

There was a vague discussion but I remember that took place where there was a request to ICANN to find out what the process was for a transfer. And the answer was we're not saying that this was confidential, has the request been made for - a DIDP request been made for releasing those documents? And if it hasn't then this needs to be done asap.

Robert Guerra: I recall we were talking about contingency planning and details that they might have in regards to that. Grace, I remember you replied to me. I'm curious if you could - if you could summarize your comments about - I see your hand is up, Grace, please go ahead.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you, Robert. This is Grace Abuhamad for the record. So, yes, Olivier, you're correct. We - I looked into whether the IANA contingency - business contingency plan could have been released and the response I received was that the document is confidential but if the - if anyone wanted to put in a document disclosure request that you're welcome to do that.

Unfortunately, staff is not going to be able to put that request in for you, that it has to come from the person requesting the information. And the reason - just that the information is confidential more generally is just because it contains plans, you know, in cases of emergency or transfer that kind of thing so it's



not the kind of document that would be public, you know, for security reasons and others.

But you're welcome to put in a DIDP and I can help you find the, you know, the form for that, things like that, but I can't put the request in on behalf of the group.

Robert Guerra: Grace, I'd be happy to do that as co-chair so you could tell me what details you would need from me and then I could maybe work with you and others to identify if there's perhaps a higher level table or higher level summary and after looking at it what could be revealed. So I'm happy to have that conversation offline with you and see if there's any additional details that can be provided to the group.

Grace Abuhamad: Thanks, Robert. I'll note that as an action item for the two of us to follow up offline.

Robert Guerra: I'm just curious, Steve, since you are on the call if there is anything that you might be able to speak to about this point. So, Olivier, I'm just curious if you could maybe restate your earlier comment and see if Steve might be able to comment even if it's at incredibly high level. Olivier, please.

Steve Crocker: You're talking about the - you're asking me about the release of the contingency plan?

Robert Guerra: Or - part of the contingency plan, I think it was discussed earlier, that there's a part of the contingency plan that there be a transition to another operator of IANA and if that were something that...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Crocker: I don't recall that I've actually ever seen the document we're talking about here. NTIA has been rather tight with some of these and amazingly has said, well, even the Board shouldn't look at it. You can imagine my reaction to that.

Robert Guerra: Okay.

Steve Crocker: So I don't actually have anything to say except that I wouldn't expect overly much from these things. They tend to be pretty obvious. I mean, if you were going to sit down and write a transition plan you say well imagine that ICANN disappeared how would you have a continuity for IANA? You know, you'd scribble down some ordinary things.

And I'm just making this up as I'm talking here. I'm not reflecting on anything that I know about. There's been quite a bit of work, I know, on making IANA robust so they've got redundancy and people in distributed places and they run drills from time to time on using people who are not in Los Angeles, for example so you imagine an earthquake or something.

Plus the other side of it is that the IANA function is not, you know, millisecond time critical. Imagine that you couldn't publish a change in the root zone for two days, three days or a week, how bad would that be? And the answer in the scale of things would be pretty low key.

Robert Guerra: Great, thank you. Jaap, you had your hand up then Olivier.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes, I mean, I'm - actually commented on the mailing list earlier on that I'm not - that, I mean, that I'm not sure what we should do with that information. Just as, I mean, Steve was just saying, I mean, this is - this is something NTIA asked ICANN to produce for the NTIA. And it apparently has been done

because, I mean, the evaluation of the contracts is at (2010) basically says it has been done.

I'm not sure what we can do with this information. And that's what - I mean, this is really, as far as you know, this is really some emergency things. And, yes, I mean, you change of the root zone which can be delayed a couple of times. It's actually - it's basically similar as any registry which you have some emergency plan when things go really sour very quickly. And I'm not sure where this fits in in the bigger scale things.

Robert Guerra: Great. Thank you, Jaap. I see the queue, Avri, you were next and then Olivier.

Avri Doria: Actually Olivier is showing as next. I put my hand up, I took it down and in the meantime Olivier put his hand up and then I put mine up again.

Robert Guerra: Okay. Olivier, please go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: I'm ever so happy letting Avri speak first. Please, go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. Okay thanks. I think that first of all thank you for clarifying because I was getting very confused whether this was an NTIA plan or an ICANN plan. Since it is an ICANN document it is a document that should be open to the DIDP so (unintelligible) that we write one that requests that document.

I find it interesting that, you know, the Board may not even be aware of it. But it might be, you know, older and previous this Board. So I definitely think it's worth getting. I think part of the reasons it's worth getting is in terms of us having to prepare such a contingency and to understand knowing what

(unintelligible) found satisfactory would be a head start for us. So, you know, that's kind of why I think it's worth pursuing it.

And especially with the lack of clarity about, you know, its existence and we're assuming its existence because otherwise the IANA contract would not have been given, we're assuming. I think getting it and just seeing how that all works and what the requirements are, you know, it currently would be helpful. Thanks.

Steve Crocker: If it might...

Robert Guerra: Steve, go ahead.

Steve Crocker: One thing that you said, Avri, caught my attention, the implicit assumption that it was satisfactory to NTIA and therefore was - I guess the assumption that it's satisfactory to NTIA and therefore that it's a satisfactory plan I think that if you imagine coming in fresh and saying...

Avri Doria: No, I wasn't going that far.

Steve Crocker: ...you know, what work has been done and the mere fact that it's been done before to satisfy NTIA would not in itself seem to me to be a satisfactory criteria for accepting it.

Avri Doria: It would be a clue, that's really what I'm saying, it's a clue. If something exists getting a clue on what exists and what had been satisfactory is a place to start. It's useful information. Thanks.

Robert Guerra: Olivier, please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks, Robert. Olivier speaking. And I absolutely support what Avri has mentioned here. I think it would certainly give us a clue and help with the type of contingency to look for in any kind of transition. I do have concerns sometimes though about the so called confidential documents that ICANN Legal seems to be putting in this unaccessible location even unaccessible to the Board.

And I wonder whether in the DIDP - I know that when one requests for a DIDP it actually appears to be an either all or nothing scenario in that, you know, you asked for the document to be made public and then you can have a look at it. But it then becomes public completely - you might wish to look for a backup or a sort of a second scenario if the DIDP is for publication of this is not granted then you might wish to be able to, as the chair of this working group, have a look at it in a controlled situation. I don't know what the control, maybe you signing an NDA or something, so that's for you to just look in there and see if there is anything that could be of help for it to be - to be helpful for us.

Or alternatively another thing could be to have the document as a redacted document. But I'm really concerned at that point if there is a redaction taking place that we would probably not be able to obtain that document in time. In fact altogether I am concerned that it might take weeks for this to be addressed and I'm hoping it won't.

And I'm hoping this is just we're spending too much time on something which we should be able to just browse through and say well, you know what? It's not helpful and we're just going to cast it aside. So I hope we can do this quick and as trusted person you could, Robert, you could be the pair of eyes that looks at them and either discards it or takes part of it and says, yeah, that's a good - it's good helpful thing for us. Thank you.

Robert Guerra: Thanks, Olivier. I mentioned a bit earlier that I would work with Grace and perhaps others and staff to, A, determine if the document can be accessed, 2, if it could be revealed and if not are there key parts of the document, perhaps a table of contents that could be or some other item, someone who's done a (unintelligible) sometimes a slide or a table of contents is enough for our conversations.

And what I'm hoping to do is just given that we have a very short timeline for this group and the information is critical to our conversations, at least getting a sense of it, we'll see whether, you know, what type of arrangement could be done.

And I think going back to an earlier comment as well too, it might just be enough to say that they are, you know, that these contingencies are just for emergencies that might arise and that may be an element that I don't think we had mentioned in terms of a transition implication that there needs to be a development of emergency procedures in case there's failure during that transition. And that can be a point that could be borrowed exact from an existing - from the existing process and just make a point on that.

So I'll work with Grace and others and to see to what extent and we'll hope that some information can be revealed. If not just the name of the document and that it exists will be particularly helpful.

And just from Grace, I'm just curious just given the dates when would be the first time that if - such a request were to be submitted I guess it wouldn't be until the first or the beginning of the year that work could begin on trying to develop the request document.

Grace Abuhamad: Robert, this is Grace for the record. So as you know ICANN is officially closed from the 24th of December until January 2. So in terms of putting in a request you could put one in any time but I think the first time that, you know, it could be looked at would be January 5.

And then - and going from there I don't - I can't speak and I don't really know the timeline for the DIDP process. I myself have never put in a request. And as I said, staff doesn't put in DIDP requests, it goes through the individual requesting the information. So, you know, the timeline depends on the amount of information requested and other things. So to answer your question I'm not 100% sure. But you could indicate the urgency in the request I think.

Robert Guerra: Thank you. Avri, you're making a good point on the chat that the issue is one of timeliness and also drafting the DIDP in that it may require a lawyer to get the language just right. And so we'd have to figure out the best way to do that. So that may be something that I would definitely have an item to remove for the next call.

And I would say one of the items to mention in the update for our call tomorrow that this is something that group is looking about and that we may require perhaps one of the lawyers on this group or one of the lawyers in the larger CWG to help us develop the language accordingly in that one of the first items that we would want to ask is what the timeline for possible answer would be. Great. Great.

So just let me turn back - I think we've had a good conversation on this. Let me return back to work stream 1, again which is the key turns. And if identifying the relevant terms that could be used in the proposal if there was any update, Siva, you - I guess we had this quick conversation earlier that you'd received no feedback. If you could send the document again to the list

for review I guess a second review. And if there's no comments we could proceed with the items that you have identified as key terms going forward.

Let me just go to the third and - the last segment of our conversation is in regards to going forward - and Grace, go ahead, please, your hand is up.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi, Robert. I just wanted to acknowledge that Siva has resent the document to the list and made his call for volunteers so his action item there is complete which is why I haven't noted it in the notes. He just sent it a few minutes ago.

Robert Guerra: Great. Thank you so very much. And what I have in terms of also some key items that we've talked about on this call was in work stream number 2 which was the - how to describe the changes. There didn't seem to be any comments in regards to that so that the text that was sent for circulation that staff should review that and if there's any additional items that need to be added that those be flagged.

And that document be included in the notes of the call for a round of comments. And that we would like to hear back from RFP 3 in regards to any changes that occur to their proposal so that document could be updated accordingly as well.

I just want to get back, one thing just in here in terms of items that had been discussed in an earlier call was one of timeline. Berry, you developed the timeline document. I believe I included that in the attachments as well. Berry, if you wanted to make any comment - and update us of any - if you'd received any comments in regards to the task list or the timeline document that you presented in our last call. Berry, please.



Berry Cobb: Thank you, Robert. This is Berry Cobb for the record. No comments have been received on it. And, you know, I think in terms of advancing this part of the fifth objective forward is really, you know, a true dependency on what ultimately comes out of RFP 3 before we can nail down any more details to that timeline. But anyway to answer your question no comments at this point.

Robert Guerra: I'm just - so thank you for that update. I'm just - for those who may be new to the call could you just please go over what the version 2 timeline was, which I believe was the more updated one and how that was built from the task list that was developed.

Berry Cobb: Yeah, Robert. They're both basically the same. One is an indication of working backwards from the September 30 date while the second one is just more a month to month version. But both contain the same 12 tasks that are listed there.

And then the different - or the details are the task lists themselves which again restating from the last call, can probably use more details should the CWG push this proposal forward in terms of details of setting up the Contract Co and the MRT and those kinds of things. So I think once we get better visibility out of RFP 3 a lot of these sub tasks for each of the four organizations would need to be built out further.

Robert Guerra: Great. And so then I guess a call for volunteers to provide you with additional details.

Berry Cobb: Yeah, I think we can, you know, just kind of keep this as an open action at least through the first week of January or so again until - or perhaps even after the intense weekend session on the 10th, you know, the outcomes or output of that might further inform this exact task list and the possible timelines.

Robert Guerra: Great. Thank you. So again if we could go back to the second to the last slide please which, again, just announces the next call as being on February 5. And I just wanted to check - this slide I have wrong so I guess the time is 1600 UTC, is that correct, Grace?

Grace Abuhamad: The time is scheduled for 1400-1600 UTC.

Robert Guerra: Great. So...

Grace Abuhamad: If you'd like me to change that I'm happy to do that. There's some flexibility there.

Robert Guerra: Yeah, I just ask for clarity that you should update the PowerPoint accordingly. Someone else wish to make a comment?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yeah, one point, it's January 5 - the notes of the call says January 6 maybe we should - we want to know which is the right date?

Grace Abuhamad: Yes, thanks Jaap. It is the 6th. And I'll make sure to update Robert's PowerPoint before posting it to the wiki and as a final document.

Robert Guerra: Great. So thank you all. We've gone through...

Jaap Akkerhuis: Thanks.

Robert Guerra: Go ahead, please? There was another comment someone wanted to make?

Jaap Akkerhuis: No I just say thanks for the correction.

Robert Guerra: Okay yes indeed. So again thank you all for the conversation. We do have a little bit more time but we seem to have gone through the agenda for the meeting. And look forward for a - everyone participating in the call tomorrow. And please do comment on some of the items that were mentioned for discussion on the list.

And we'll do an additional update and so I thank everyone for everyone's time and seeing everyone again on January 6 at the time and Grace will send that to us as well if she hasn't done so already so we have that in our calendars. Thank all and if we don't speak before the new year my new year's greetings to you all.

Steve Crocker: Nicely done. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Good-bye.

((Crosstalk))

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks, Robert. Thanks, everyone.

Man: Bye-bye.

END