

ICANN

**Moderator: Glen Desaintgery-GNSO
December 23, 2014
8:00 am CT**

Robert Guerra: First presenting.

Coordinator: The recording has started thank you.

Robert Guerra: Thank you so much. I will present an agenda for this call. Take any comments in regards to the email that I sent out yesterday. And then go forward. So if you go to the next slide please this is the proposed agenda for today. This is described in the email I sent out yesterday. We will review the background again. Also get an update on call items or items from the last call. Sorry for not including that in the agenda.

Do an update in regards to the three different workstreams that were discussed on the last call. And then do a review - sorry and then any discussion. And then finally, review of the timeline and next steps. Are there any comments in regards to the agenda at this time?

Great. We can proceed to the next slide please. This is just a reminder that RFP 4 is to describe how changes proposed in RFP 3 are implemented. What needs to change? What are some of the security and stability related issues?

What are changes? What are stress testing? We will get into it in the different workstreams. And then there are two co-chairs, (Steve) and myself.

Next slide please. Here are previously call items. So I am just going to - if my voice - is this any better? Is my voice better? Yes it is. Sorry about that.

I will just turn this up as well. All right and so I just would ask Grace rather from staff if we could just do a review of some of the items from the last call. If there are any updates from staff or others that were needed. Can we do that at this moment in time? Thank you.

Grace Abuhamad: I have it thanks. I am pulling up the notes from last time right now. Okay so the only action item we have from the last meeting was for Jaab to follow up with Kim Davies regarding the technical checks. I don't know if Jaab oh he has his hand raised. Excellent.

Jaab Akkerhuis: Yes okay this is Jaab Akkerhuis speaking. I have some contacts with Kim Davies and this is not complete section of the tests and basically technical requirements that you find on the (INS) site. And with this kind of loose formulated way of how this - where they are actually looking for it.

I will pull out URL quickly. But there is not a big document details of the test. Something I can actually mention because so many styles of doing the same thing. So in the end it is always kind of a judgment call.

I mean what is actually being tested on. But it also occurred to me since the (MGIA) actually tells you that the tests are done by (PHI) as well. It might actually be something to ask (Keith) to what they do exactly if you really want to see the details.

Yes, one second. While I was talking I was trying to find the URL and URL is will now be in - it is now in the chat window.

Robert Guerra: Thank you very much Jaab for that. Were there any other action items from this point? I will include some later as we go through the workstream items. But were there other key updates to talk about at this time? Great thank you so much for that.

Jaab Akkerhuis: I guess you are asking Grace. I was wondering whether you were asking me or Grace but I guess it was me.

Robert Guerra: I was just asking Grace thank you yes. So Grace we are going to jump now as I mentioned to Slide Number 8. I had some extra slides which I forgot to move for those which is why we are jumping to Slide 8. On the call last week we decided that it would be good to slip the work of RFP 4 into three components or three workstreams.

One that describes the current situation, reviewing the ICANN technical proposal and trying to identify some key terms that we would agree on. That would be useful for this RFP going forward. Key terms, Number 2 describing the transition path. What specific changes needed to be required to be detailed? And Number 3, testing.

Next slide please. I mentioned in the agenda that I sent yesterday. Again detailing this a little bit in regards to detailing the current situation.

There was discussion if we could use some key terms from the ICANN technical proposal particularly from Section 1 through 4 which was more of Table of Contents that identifies some of the key items.

And if we could use this as a template going forward. There is a comment over the last week to see if there is any agreement, any disagreement or any suggested changes (unintelligible).

And then there were additional relevant terms that needed to be added in that proposal as well. And so the agenda item that I had identified is that we have a conversation now on (unintelligible) these three sections and whether the lack of input at this point means that we can go forward or that we have a consensus going forward.

So I would like to get some comments from those on the call right now in regards to if there has been a review of this item by folks on the call or if we need to revisit. I will open the floor for a few minutes. I am just sound check again. So again are there any comments on Workstream 1?

I will now switch to - next slide please. Workstream Number 2. There is a - this is the transition path in describing some of the changes that would have to be done to use this thing IANA contract going forward.

And there was a proposed text that was presented that was describing the - I guess the consensus text in terms of format how each of the different items would have to be described.

And then there is a conversation last week as well in that certain communities had proposed a slightly different alternative proposal. And that it was important to describe some of the transition paths.

And so that was the item that was discussed. And some of the items I would like to open for conversation now is one, are there any comments on the transition path description? How that needs to be done?

Two, could we get an update from the ALAC the transition path. And then a conversation as well in regards to some key elements whether it is a table or description or format to describe the transition path that this RFP and support should be going through? So I will open the floor now if there are any comments. Please.

And then (Olivier) I see you are on the call as well too. Could you give me please an update in regards to the ALAC proposal and has any work been done in regards to incorporating a transition path section to the ALAC proposal? Thank you.

(Olivier): Thank you very much Robert Guerra. This is (Olivier) speaking. Can you hear me?

Robert Guerra: I can clearly.

(Olivier): Okay thank you. I am always checking because sometimes it has happened that nobody can hear that I am doing my whole schpiel speaking to no one. Anyway, the ALAC has worked on its proposal and are refining its proposal. You will have seen a proposal that was sent to the public commenting process.

We are now also looking at the - some of the - well some clearer and if you want some more focused information on some of the proposal that clearly I think this is going to be part of a broader discussion that we are going to have with the CWG. I have noticed that there are now not just one alternative

proposal but several alternative proposals which have been sent to the comment period.

And I think what we might have to do is to - I am not quite sure how the working group will work on this. Perhaps it will have to do a matrix or something to find out the commonality for the different proposals and the different ideas there.

But we are kind of refining our own ideas. As far as the timetable is concerned. Yes we are building one. We have got one in draft form but not everyone has come back to us yet on our working group to say whether that timetable is good or not.

It is not vastly different from the timetable that this working group has put together as far as the next few months are concerned. So ultimately it is very much based on the (SCWG's) proposal and just a couple of things have to happen.

Instead of creating a new contract code there would be the creation of some committees of some sort. But it is broadly very similar. That is all I can give at the moment. As soon as I have an updated and confirmed copy from our ALAC working group I should be forwarding this over to the RFP working group. Thank you.

Robert Guerra: Thank you (Olivier). Milton you are next. Please go ahead.

Milton Mueller: Good morning. I just wanted to say the problem with many of the - well with any inherent problem with any internal ICANN solution is that they are relying on the output of the accountability working group, cross community working group.

And since we do not intend on know what is going to come out of that and indeed the results of that working group are essentially subject to an ICANN board veto. It would be very difficult for these internal ICANN alternative proposals to provide any kind of a transition path.

They are basically saying (unintelligible) on the other cross community working group and don't do much with this one. So there is a bit of a problem there.

The other observation I would make here is it is pretty clear from the comment period that the internal proposals are not that broadly supported. So I just think we should be focusing more of our time on the refining the proposal that we have.

Robert Guerra: Thank you Milton. Just maybe a question to you in regards to the internal ICANN proposals given this workstream. Should we be asking those supporting that to include details that would need to be required for them to be formally adopted by the ICANN board proposed changes?

Should they be getting in details apart from just saying it will go to ICANN to take a look out? There are some details that should be worked on. Details at this point or should we just kind of put a parenthesis and just wait? Milton for that reply and then I will go to (Olivier). Milton please?

Milton Mueller: You want me to talk again. No I just say I would defer - I would table these proposals until we seem to be much closer to consensus on the external proposal.

So - and again you cannot know. I mean you could say ICANN boards have to accept this, that or the other thing for us to accept an internal solution. But you don't know whether they are going to accept that until the other CWG is finished.

Robert Guerra: Great. Thank you for that Milton. (Olivier) your comments now have a comment as well. Thank you.

(Olivier): Thanks very much for this Robert Guerra. Indeed Milton is right. We don't know if the ICANN board is going to accept those recommendations on the accountability track and how that is going to progress.

The timetable which we are putting together is based on the work of the accountability working group timetable. And that shows that things will be ready by date XYZ, et cetera.

And so we are tabling that not only with those recommendations have been made by the accountability working group but then these will have been implemented and put forward or at least in the process of being implemented.

Of course we are still at very early days at the moment and I am not sure how soon these things will happen. I think everyone doesn't know how soon these things will happen.

But one of the things though which is apparently quite clear and I know while I believe there is some support for that and I hope that it is majority support for this. Is that the accountability work is closely linked to the stewardship transition work. At least the Thread Number 1 of that accountability work. And so if we are to build a timetable of implementation, I have a feeling that the implementation is going to be delayed by the accountability work.

The NTIA has made it clear that they will not proceed forward if the accountability work is not dealt with too. I am not sure whether that translates as in anything to do with Thread Number 1 or Workstream 1 of the accountability process has to be fully implemented and accepted by the board, et cetera or et cetera.

Or whether it says, well as long as all of that is on paper and the plan is there and the board is giving its green light or its approval that it will proceed forward with the implementation of these recommendations. Then the green light is there for the IANA Stewardship transition to take place.

That I don't know. And (unintelligible) on the interpretation of other people in this working group. But my interpretation for the time being is that the two processes are linked and so we are very likely to see some - such a link between the two that if we do propose an internal to ICANN position.

And I don't like using that word or that - I don't like calling it this way because I don't think it is an entirely internal to ICANN position but we will have to do this.

If we have this internal to ICANN solution I don't think that it will be in any way that much different from the other solution that is totally external to ICANN.

Because in both case, the NTIA will not proceed forward with the transition if the ICANN accountability track hasn't been dealt with. And I know (unintelligible) Workstream 1 track. I hope I haven't been too long. Sorry about this. Thank you.

Robert Guerra: Great. Thank you (Olivier). I just want to maybe - my quick thoughts of being co-chair for RFP 4. The conversation we are having now is Workstream 4 which is transition path and trying to describe those details from either the main proposal or alternative ones.

And we have seem to kind of shifted away. So I think what I will defer whether we have consensus on, on one proposal or another. I will leave for the co-chairs of the larger, CWG because I feel it is a little bit out of scope in terms of the conversation here now.

What I would like to capture though is, you know, some critical elements, items in regarding to documenting the transition path that should be described. And I think the other item that hasn't been discussed yet is for because of there are all these comments in regards to proposals. Some additional alternate proposals are being proposed.

I would like to maybe refocus our conversation here in regards to what are some key elements to describe what are possible changes that need to be implemented?

A comment had been made earlier in regards to a summary or a table that is being described from the different alternate proposals. And so that may be I would say for SAS support and others if they could describe that and help me with others that work on that I think would be good.

And I would like just then like to ask others, you know, what are key elements in regards to a transition path that would have to be implemented and how that could be described?

Could we focus on that conversation a little bit and I would ask I guess as an action item as well too for the co-chairs of the CWG from this RFP is how to proceed in regards to, you know, the alternate proposals and where to focus more attention or not.

I feel it is a little bit out of scope for us right now. But we can talk about some common elements. So on the common elements are there any specific comments on what should be included in the description of the transition path at this point?

Does anyone wish to comment on that? I will raise an item as well that was mentioned in the last call as well too. Was not for the transition path. Also the timing that might take place for the different items.

So there was a text that was circulated I think from Berry from (unintelligible). Circulated an updated timeline. I just would like to get a pulse of I guess of those on the call.

Have folks reviewed that document and are there any issues or suggested revisions they would like to be made to that? So bring that up. Thank you. So Berry could you just maybe just quickly go through these and then I would like a comment from everyone on this. Please Berry to you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Robert Guerra. This is Berry. So as I think I mentioned on the previous RFP or call. This was kind of assigned as an action item from Greg. And of course this is an objective of the RFP for drafting that needs to occur.

The original version was based off of working backward from the September 30, 2015 deadline. And then there was some feedback also to include a monthly based view.

And then of course in the text below is just kind of some very high level attempt of trying to outline what some of those high level paths would entitle. Mostly just trying to draw correlations or connections between the four groups that would be working together and how they would be staffed and et cetera. Defining some of the process and procedures on how they would operate those kinds of things. As well as once they were defined that there were any bylaw or any AoC changes that would possibly be necessary.

Again, all very high level at this point. What this document doesn't contain at the moment is kind of the - what is being classified the internal to ICANN option and I believe that the ALAC would - they do have a soft copy of this version. I understand that they might be working on their own kind of timeline based on that.

Of course there are dependencies to the (CPWG) with that as well. But if ALAC does have any feedback about some of their high level timeline I would be happy to make any modifications to include into this document.

But basically in summary, this particular version doesn't include any alternatives at this point in time pending more details of these alternatives.

Thank you.

Robert Guerra: Berry, your thoughts before we get to other comments. If you have any comments in regards if we wanted to add details of alternate proposals here on here.

Would you suggest perhaps putting in slightly different colors to compare it or what would be a best way to compare timelines of variations to the proposal or alternates?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Absolutely I could use kind of a reddish hue to the colors to differentiate between Proposal 1 and Proposal 2. I am welcome to any kind of feedback that the group may want or have.

Clearly they are going to look pretty differently I suppose because certainly I think one of the alternatives doesn't include a contract code. Therefore that would probably shorten up some of the other duration on having to sign any contracts and those kinds of things like (unintelligible) Step 11 would probably be omitted.

But at any rate, I guess (Olivier), you know, if you kind of could at least draft some high level tasks that you believe for the ALAC version that you might have. Again I would be happy to draw one up and to (unintelligible) include this in a document and then we can include a secondary task list.

Robert Guerra: Great thank you Berry. (Olivier) please.

(Olivier): Thanks very much Robert Guerra. This is (Olivier) speaking. And I am looking at the moment at our draft proposal or draft timeline. And I don't see that many changes. I am looking at Months 1, 2 and 3 which would have the forming of the different committees that we are all looking at.

And in conjunction with that there will be the forming of any of the committees that the ALAC has proposed forming. And apart from that there isn't any other change to this.

But of course that doesn't take into account the direct input from the ICANN accountability side of things. And that is where we are not yet ready to come out with a serious proposal if you want on this.

I mean with a final proposal on the timetable because we obviously have to get more view of what the accountability process is going to yield. When and how and whether we might have to change that timetable a little bit based on this.

And I will discuss this with my colleagues in the next few days. Maybe even the next few hours and hopefully as soon as we have got something we can send it to the (unintelligible). Thank you.

Robert Guerra: Thank you (Olivier). I think also as we go forward as we have slightly different proposals I guess I would like to get comments in regards to the different, alternate solutions or comments proposing changes.

We are going to have a slightly different lists of tasks identified with each. So I just like to get a comment. Is that a - should we go through that now for the different comments, or should we wait to distill down a smaller set of - I'm saying for the different alternate proposals?

We have ALAC and I guess you're going to get to us in regards to some of the different tasks and some of the different timelines, but we have more proposals on the table right now.

Are there comments from others in regards to how best to deal with that?
Berry if that's a new hand, please go ahead and then I'd like to open up the floor for others as well please. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Robert Guerra. This is Berry. Yes I just wanted to kind of reiterate or maybe if I didn't say it clearly reemphasize I think what's most important is the task list portion of this document.

Clearly I think it's probably a derivative out of more of the - of refined discussions going on about some of the functions that are and processes that are occurring within the MRT or the CSC.

But - and I suspect that those further feed this task list from an implementation perspective. But I would ask that maybe this particular subgroup focus more on the task list from this bulleted version because that ultimately creates the visual version, right.

You know, these visual timelines are really just the lipstick. We're more focused on the content and some of the key tasks that would actually be required to set up this particular proposal here as well as any other proposal as well.

You know, what are some of the core elements that need to be done? Again this was just kind of my own thumb in the wind take at some of the task here, but for instance to form a Contract Co., you know, I only included these four.

I'm sure there's probably several other key tasks that would need to occur to actually consider that particular task complete. Thank you.

Robert Guerra: Thank you. Would there - I'd like to maybe make a call for volunteers. Are there others on the call that perhaps would like to help assist Berry and I in reviewing the existing task list and seeing if additional details would like to or should be added?

Can I get either hands or a comment from someone to speak who would like to help volunteer to help with this as well too? It would be good to have additional persons involved.

Any volunteers? Anyone would like to kind of - before we go to just an update that's presented next time, is there anyone that would just like to review further or provide some comments on this between now and our next call?

Berry as you mentioned you asked that - suggestions to the RFP for our list would be welcome. I'm just trying to identify if some folks could spend some time between now and the next call commenting on this.

And if not - so I'll ask if folks have comments on the list and if there's any volunteers on that as an action item for hands between now and next week, and also in regards to if there are any specific comments in regards to task lists for the slightly different proposals.

Berry in addition to the task lists I'm assuming that length of time would also be helpful as a variable if that's possible.

Berry Cobb: Absolutely. This is Berry. Absolutely. You know, these durations are also a thumb in the wind if anybody has any. You know, I think the only one that I'd feel confident about knowing would be if we went out for public comment for the setup for any of this because that's, you know, about to be set at 40 days.

We'd probably have a longer comment period but in terms of implementing like the IANA automation, I really had no idea what the scope of that is so I could - I'd welcome feedback from that.

And I think that that would probably be something that applies to either of the proposals. You know, certainly the duration for setting up any of the four - the groups or organizations, you know, is three months - sound reasonable?

I'm not really sure. I think the other important part, which is Task 10, the CCWG Accountability, you know, their present timeline for delivery is approximately June.

I know that there is a desire to try to advance that forward and have an earlier delivery date. But at this point until the Workstream 1/Workstream 2 components are more refined it's hard to understand what that delivery would be, as well as depending on the scope of what Workstream 1 would be as to how much of an implementation that would actually require as well.

So I'm again kind of grasping at - for air in terms of understanding the duration.

Robert Guerra: Great.

Berry Cobb: So any feedback from that perspective would be helpful. Thank you.

Robert Guerra: Great. Thank you. And I again just wanted to flag this amount of detail would be very welcome on the list. I just wanted to go through it that we do - would be good to have these type of comments back and forth with others, particularly those that are suggesting or proposing alternatives.

Having those type of descriptions or comments would be very much welcome. If we could go back to the main slides please and to I believe it's Slide 11, which is Workstream 3.

And where this differs is as opposed to going through the tasks and some of the items, it was documenting the issues, the risks, the threats. Sorry for this filing mistake on 3.1.

That might arise (sic) - that might rise and there had been a - so this is where we had a call for volunteers. One of the volunteers I believe can't make the call today.

And I think what I want to have a conversation on that is to documenting the risks and threats -- next slide -- as well as identifying the key periods in the proposal.

We go back one. And so I - maybe like to go to Jaab first or others in regards to what are threats or risks and then we're going to go to - Staff had suggested that this is also being discussed in the Accountability Group and some of the items that were discussed there.

So if Jaab I can maybe open it up to you and any comments you wish to make in regards to risks or threats that are key ones that had been mentioned in SSAC Advisories or other things that we should be looking at. Jaab please.

Jaab Akkerhuis: Well it's - I would say it's hard to - on the top of my head because - well I mainly know about technical risks and, I mean, but what I see in the conversation a lot especially in this group that people are look at the - more the risk of processes which go along and don't end up anywhere.

I mean, that might be, I mean, it's - that always makes the conversation slightly difficult and - but a big risk I see is that people are actually create many processes with all these extra, I mean, MRT and with the extra entities.

There are things that needs to go quick or that just go quick and not really happening - are stuck inside the bureaucracy. I mean, it's one of the bigger problems I see there.

And that's a risk for the technical operation of the network. I mean, the other is bureaucracies that - with business interest are carrying - hampered with delays in plans, things like that.

But - so what probably may do - probably I think what to do is do a kind of - I forgot how it's called - mind - we make a drawing what influence what and kind of a mind term and take it there, I mean, and sort of - and take it from there as being a start for looking at what the risks are.

If we're trying to - I forgot. I mean, there's a term for that and which I seem to forget. And then you can draw a tree for what are the risks, but doing it particularly from shooting out of the hip - it should be difficult.

Robert Guerra: Great. Thank you. Thank you Jaab. So the one bit of feedback that I did receive from Staff and others is trying to take some of the conversations that is taking place in the Accountability Working Group.

If you - Grace if you could put that up as the slide please. This is perhaps a set of threats and issues that we should take a look at going forward.

Jaab Akkerhuis: I mean, a lot of the things which comes to mind is the whole interaction between the NTIA, the IANA and see it as - see this as part of - it's actually really way more administrative than anything else.

And the way people are talking about all the entities which are going to replace these relations - lot of more policy layered stuff carrying into it. And - which don't - long into this - actually this fairly simple, more administrative tasks. Next.

Robert Guerra: Great. Great. Thank you Jaab. What I see there is basically a - and I see as perhaps one of the issues is to have as lightweight and efficient a process as possible in trying to compare the different proposals, and having as a baseline the very administrative technical role that's a lot quicker.

And the different proposals might add an amount of delay or administrative burden that might be quite...

Man: Good.

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: ...right now. Correct. Great. Thank you. I think one of the - as I was saying I wanted to share this email or discussion with RFP 4 and trying to go through it just to see if - one, if there's a consensus on the recommendations in terms of how to look at this; and two, if there's some additional components that perhaps could be added.

I think one is recalling SAC 69, particularly Recommendation 3 and that the community should investigate and clarify process for handling sanctions and restrictions and how that might interfere with the stewardship transition.

And so what might happen is that political developments might change in different parts of the country, and perhaps have the different proposals that's a possible - a threat.

So that's maybe an example, which is external. Geopolitics triggers enhanced sanctions and how would the different proposals or the different components deal with that?

So it's maybe one item to add. Another item that was discussed in this discussion we had which was adding some additional items in regards to generic risk management - that we may want to add to the list of threats or issues that could come up.

If you can scroll down a little bit here please, I'm starting with the section - just one second.

Man: May I have your attention please?

Robert Guerra: Sorry. Having a fire test where I am now so I'll try to go and pause any - and so there's an item here that starts with antitrust action. Could you please scroll to that section please?

Grace Abuhamad: Hey Robert Guerra this is Grace. I had everyone on scroll control but I can...

Robert Guerra: Okay.

Grace Abuhamad: ...relink the document if you'd like.

Robert Guerra: That's okay. If you could just ask everyone to just move to the list of items on Page 1, this is a more exhaustive list in regards to business threats starting with antitrust actions and going on to new regulations.

And going on this is a list that I think could be good to be added in terms of threats or issues that could - should be added to the analysis for threats. If we then scroll down they're proposed I think different ones.

So to help with everyone might I suggest that a compilation - all these different threats be put together into a list? And if they overlap - so they

include not only business threats but also some of the issues that had been mentioned early on here, which is ignoring advice of different supportive organizations, insolvency, if the application - if there's a change that comes after the fact, issues with the GAC and elsewhere.

So there's a - quite an elaborate list. I'm curious if anyone is familiar with these and wishes to speak with them. If not I will ask that we do a compilation of all these together and have that circulated to the list maybe the next day or two for the list to review and see if there's any additional details or revisions that could be made.

Does anyone wish to speak to these possible stress tests that were mentioned in the other - in the Accountability discussions or general comments that folks wish to make? Jaab please, the floor is your.

Jaab Akkerhuis: Well I've looked at, I mean, the stress test as well and we do things. And - but, I mean, some of these risks are so much out of the wall and I note particularly to the problem of the transition.

I mean, it's just a, I mean, a major correctional fraud with ICANN. Just pick around the world. I mean, this will probably happen a lot of places and will be much more a signal through earlier than it will influence.

I mean, the IANA functions - if it has the IANA functions you'll see it completely. And what it really here is that some of these points raised here - yes they do exist but, I mean, the reality factor is very small and...

Robert Guerra: Thank you Jaab for that. In addition to the timing issue that you mentioned earlier, is there any specific transition or IANA related stress tests or threats

that we should be referring to or that we can include in the conversation in the next week before the next call?

Jaab Akkerhuis: Well - and - but - I can see is that it's not only the time. It's also, I mean, raising policy points in something which is a pure and administrative factor. I mean, that might complete middle of, I mean, the real purpose of the IANA functions.

I mean, there is - as an example, I mean, one of the examples in the - I noticed somewhere was that when the new regulations within a country is starting to ask things to be changed in IANA and, I mean, these things are happening all the time and this is nothing new there.

I mean, it's only the policy matter. It has nothing to do with how the IANA for instance execute it. I mean, it's all policy.

Robert Guerra: So...

Jaab Akkerhuis: I mean, it...

Robert Guerra: Go ahead.

Jaab Akkerhuis: I mean, it's - that's an example. You know, every time in the - this is a real life example. Every time that the new - they change of course and they do - apparently do this every year now.

I mean, there used to be a time that every new government pop up at IANA, and one was doing the delegation being moved to them and then next year it went to the other group.

And this is not a function of IANA. I mean, this is function of, I mean, basically what happened there is that IANA always gave pushback, you know, and first figured it out yourself what really needs to be done before you come to us.

And there's no way how IANA can actually do anything with these type of things and internal political struggle. I mean, the same will happen when for instance suppose the people of each side get into big fight and they split, and then who's going to get the delegation?

This is going to be a big mess. I mean, one of really the thoughts - and our history that occasionally these type of things happened and then it was up to the others to decide who's getting the delegation.

And we always stayed out these fights and, I mean, it's a risk that if IANA is - or whoever's running the root to their history, it's carrying into the base like that and then the politics are taking over a pure administrative function.

Robert Guerra: Great. Jaab thank you for your comments. And let me suggest possibly a way forward for this particular item. So we have a list of different stress tests or tests that have to be identified.

I suggest that Staff or - aggregate this list and what we do is on the discussion on the list once we have the list we can very quickly identify what people's thoughts are on whether it is out of scope, already included in the policy process, in scope for IANA or some other comments and go forward because I would just like to - for each of these items identified it's good that we have a list and that we just identify is it in scope or not to include in the list of threats that need to be included.

And then for the ones where we have consensus which are possible threats going forward, we can make sure that - to include that in the proposal so that way we can have a little bit of this conversation I think on the list and that's the way to go forward.

I'm also looking at the clock and possibly since we are losing some folks I think that's maybe a just - way to wrap this part up. And then going forward to have some of that conversation unless others wish to speak to this point right now in regards to - I'm going through this list now.

I just want to see if there's a show of hands at all for others that wish to comment on this as well at this moment in time. If not we'll just do that. Great. Thanks.

I think if we then go back to Slide 13 and we have a - our next call for December 29. We've already talked about if we just - sorry, if we - I think the item before our next call which is Item 4 here which is - all right, let me just - let me take over here.

If we can jump back to Slide 5 please - great. This is kind of the timeline that we have really showing kind of where we are in time. The deadlines for submissions have come in.

As is mentioned in an earlier call it's really important for all the participants, all - everyone that's being involved in the CWG conversations to go through all the different proposals and comments that are being mentioned to have an active conversation on those - on the generalities of the submissions on the main CWG list.

Apologies for the alarm testing noise. And then what I would suggest that in regards to transition implications for the different items that those please be flagged with folks not related to the RFP 4, but important for the conversations to try to summarize if there are thoughts on - everyone on ways to compare, contrast the different proposals that that be discussed on the list as well.

And then in regards to RFP 4 we've identified a couple of different items on here. We just finished with the possible threats or risks and trying to aggregate that just to see which ones are in scope or not, and then going forward commenting on the timeline as well the tasks for the different proposals.

And as we're going forward we've also identified December 29 as our next call. If you just go back to the very last slide or the second to last slide which is Slide 13 - so we've - Grace has identified 21:00 UTC on December 29 and I will ask for folks to comment. Before I wrap up, (Olivier) please I see your hand is up.

(Olivier): Thanks so much Robert Guerra. It's (Olivier). Just a quick question. ICANN is closed between Christmas and New Year. Does that mean that Grace and Staff will still be checking their emails at that time although ICANN is closed?

Robert Guerra: Grace please go ahead.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you. This is Grace for the record. (Olivier) you're correct. We - Staff will be checking their email and be working; not all ICANN Staff but specifically the Staff support for this project to make sure that we can reach the timeline that was set out by the CWG earlier this year.

(Olivier): Okay thank you.

Robert Guerra: Great. And so what I would ask, as we didn't have as many comments on this call but we did have a larger participation on this call, is either to me privately or on the RFP 4 list please make some comments on the different workstreams that were discussed today, particularly in regards to the different proposals and how to describe how they could be implemented and also compared.

I think that would be particularly helpful - Workstream 1 which we didn't spend too much time on which is some key terms that we agree on going forward and also in regards to the risks as well.

I do ask - the list has been particularly quiet in my opinion. No doubt it's the holiday season but we also have a lot of proposals that have been submitted that no doubt folks are going through.

And so I - as people go through that I'd just ask that the flag for transition implications be made. And look forward to at least this number of people participating on our next call on December 29 and that the conversation increase online.

So with that I'd like to bring this call to a close and thank everyone, and wish everyone a great holiday season and obviously everyone online and see everyone next on the 29th. Thank you so...

END