

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
December 30, 2014
3:30 pm CT**

Coordinator: Excuse me, the conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect. Thank you.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you. This is the RFP call on the 30th of December at 2130 UTC. I will turn it over to Cheryl to continue the call. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Grace. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. And I want to remind you all to state your name before speaking because it does make life a lot easier when one is going back over the transcripts.

The other thing I would like to ask you at this stage is if anyone has any updates to their statements of interest recognizing, of course, that some people who have been away over the seasonal break may not have got back to updating things that have changed at the end of the calendar year.

Just a reminder, however, that your statements of interest do need to be kept up to date and a policy of continuous disclosure.

The standard operational procedure for attendance at these calls is to take note of those who are listed as participants in the Adobe Connect Room. But also we recognize people do often need to just dial in.

So if anyone is only on an audio connection, only on the phone connection if you let us know now we'll note your name.

Not hearing anybody - if anybody does wish to make themselves known later to Grace please do so and she will add you to the attendance list. Excuse me. I need to clear my throat.

We do have a couple of apologies today. I note that not only has (Jap) sent his apology but I believe (Lisa) has also sent her apology. Normally the co-chair of the Working Group joins us here in RFP 5 but she's unable to make today's call.

Grace are there any other apologies we need to note?

Grace Abuhamad: No, that's the only apology. Thanks, Cheryl, for noting that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. All right then moving on let's get straight into the review of action items from the last call. And I've ticked - I do apologize for the birdie morning chorus. But, hopefully my voice will come over the Australian native birds that are very busy talking in the background.

We have a couple of action items listed in the agenda on the Wiki space one of which is ticked because (Bill) did send a text related to statements he made on our last call almost immediately after the call.

And I don't believe (Bill)'s with us today so we won't discuss that until he is at a future meeting.

The other action items most of which I'm sure have been done but we'll tick them off once we've all agreed that that's the case, first one is for staff to pull together further material or information that relates to Criteria Number 3 from the listing of NTIA 5 criteria, the requirements and to see what the needs and expectations are of the customers for the IANA function and are they being met.

We're aware based on some of what's been discussed last meeting that of course the ccTLD community have got some of this material. That will be an ongoing action I'm sure for a little while.

And I would recognize of course that staff had not only had their vacation or seasonal break time but they've also had additional and very busy times in some of the RFP and other calls that are going on at the moment even though the office is technically closed.

Grace you have your hand up. Over to you.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you, Cheryl. You actually covered most of it for me. I just wanted to point out that we may need to push this action - it's - from staff to next week just because we've been closed and so it's been a little bit difficult to collect all the material.

I've put out some feelers but haven't received any responses yet.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Grace. Cheryl again for the record. And I have no problem leaving action items open as long as they're continuing need to be done, things that

have to be done week to week of course. This one of course is something we want to have as probably ancillary documentation for our section of work.

And we certainly would want to be referring to it when we talk about how our proposals from the Working Group as a whole do or do not meet and to what extent they meet the requirements the NTIA has put out in terms of Number 3. So that will be an ongoing action item.

The next one which is unchecked is - and I'm afraid it really is unchecked to start drafting with text and table. And the reason we are saying text and table is that is the current agreement on how we will proceed with our section of the proposal document so that we can act as a checklist and to - ah, a checklist for the work that predominantly is coming out of RFP 3 and 4.

We've got a Wiki page put together. The Wiki page is listed again in your agenda. And I am somewhat disappointed to say with the exception of staff the only person who's been playing on that space is me which is all fun and good. But I don't get to write the whole of this section. It is a workgroup activity.

So if you are in a position to browse to that section, that Wiki page and if you don't mind Grace could I just get you to pop that link of the Wiki page into the chat so people can head across to that at their leisure as well while we're talking about it?

What we've got there is a very initial skeletal draft which we will be now continue to work on even though RFP 4 and 3 are still continuing.

We - I've made a note (David) it is clearly text that is draft only and will be subject to frequent up date and change and that people should check back regularly.

That's a note predominately for people who may be visiting this page who are not active members of this particular RFP grouping.

I would like to think that you will all be quite frequently visiting this page and making edits, suggestions and updates.

I've left the comment section open on this Wiki page, so general population or people without Wiki logins can make a comment. And if you make - if you find a comment there and you are logged in please feel free to as relevant insert it into the main page if that's what is needed.

I've also asked that if we're making changes to the document itself as we develop the text on this page that you annotate it with initials -- and I like to use color as well -- wherever possible and you do not delete that rather square bracket or strike through if needs be so we don't have just one person writing over someone else. It's one of the quirky things about working on wikis.

It is possible of course to go back and look at revisions but it's probably easier if we can track changes as much as we can.

At this stage we've put together a section which starts with an introduction executive summary. And we need to pat out all the text there. And I'll look forward to seeing some more drafting being done on that.

We have then a following section which I've currently used it as 5.1 which is simply the specification of our task.

And to remind you all of our task, the five NTIA requirements that we need to be able to attest to at the end of our process are the following.

That the proposal that we are putting forward from the community - Cross Community Working Group as a whole supports and enhances the multi-stakeholder model, that it maintains the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet to DNS, that it meets the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of the IANA function. And that's the one I referred to earlier out of our action items from last week.

It maintains the openness of the Internet. And of course finally that not insignificantly that the proposal must not replace NTIA role with a government led or inter-governmental organizational solution.

And on that I would remind those of you who were at the last weeks' call and inform those of you who were not that we have already discussed under the maintenance of security, stability and resiliency of the Internet CNS that it's probably desirable that whilst it is maintained in the NTIs goal the suggestion was we would probably like to see it moving forward as ways of enhancing the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS. So that's something you'll see in the lower sections that's open for discussion.

That following section then goes to a table which at the moment is sitting at Section 5.2. It is purely a one column listing those five requirements I just read out one column with basically a (bullion) choice, had we all, had we not (assessing) our - in our opinion. That's yes or no a section or a column where we can detail and make some notes into how in what way and to what extent we believe the requirements are met.

And I've also put in a space for probably an affirmation statement by this work team or some un- other text material.

This is meant to be high level and very much a slightly expanded cliff note version of what it then follows in the text section which is Section 5.3.

And that is text based on the materials that will be coming out of the RFP 4 and RFP 3 but specifically where we can say things like the transition proposal supports and enhances the multi-stakeholder model by and then insert the details.

I've put some very skeletal text there for us to start working from. So it should be at the very least a set of statements which in turn prove for the want of a better word that those requirements have been met.

So that's the review of the action item and some extent a preliminary for one of the later agenda items in today's call.

I hope you'll forgive me for taking that much time on it. But that really is the bulk of our work. And it is something that we all now need to knuckle down and start doing some drafting and text development on.

If you produce text and you sent it to the list we will reproduce it into the Wiki page. The Wiki page is acting as the master archive on all this. But we're perfectly open to having text iterations developed on the email list or of course on some form of collaborative platform as long as it's one that everyone who wants to contribute has access to.

And finally as a last action item is to ensure that everyone has access to the editing tool in the Wiki. And Grace I believe you would like to just bring us

up to date on a minor delay if anyone hasn't had previous access to the wiki of when we may or may not be able to get them with their logins and passwords. Over to you Grace.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you, Cheryl. I actually haven't received any requests from anyone in this group regarding wiki access which means I think most of the group has an account. The delay is for the other group where a few people who are new to the ICANN community altogether haven't received wiki accounts.

If there's anyone in this group who doesn't have a wiki account I'm happy to help you get that set up. And mostly likely it'll be early next week.

But I think everyone in the group currently has an account.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Terrific. That's a double on that. It's Cheryl for the record. If you all just double check that you do have logins so you will be able to edit the Wiki page.

And if you don't, get that to Grace. Then when the office opens early next week that will sorted out with IT. Thanks very much for that Grace and I think we can tick off a couple of those actions items now that we know when they're going to be able to be getting access to the editing tool.

I'm looking to see yes, we do have Avri on the call now which is great. Avri the next agenda item is all over to you. You've got a generous ten minutes if you would like to bring us up to date on the activities of RSP 3 and 4. Over to you Avri.

Avri Doria: Avri speaking. I don't know that I'll need a full ten minutes but we'll see.

In terms of RFP 3 basically it's last meeting was before the beginning of the discussions of the analysis of comments. And it was still focusing on the issues related to the MRT and the CSE, the Multi-stakeholder Review Team and the Customer Standing Committee and basically focused on composition of the MRT and looking at questions like too many groups, how to represent enough groups, the proportional representation to consider and a lot of discussion on those issues.

And at the end of that discussion the wrap-up was basically an indication that a smaller MRT is better. But whether that ends up a consensus point and of what size the sizes were ranging I think from 17 to 27 in terms of the counts.

And that - on the CSC the questions were whether is just the customers of the TLDs, the GS and the CCs whether there also needs to be experts there in various forms of (unintelligible) security stability, root server security, et cetera, whether there needed to be a policy implementation expert.

And that discussion extends to whether beyond just customers or beyond just customers and experts one also needs to go multi-stakeholder representation et al in that one.

The conversation again tending but not necessarily the consensus point is that an even smaller CSC is better and one that is strongly oriented to direct customers seem to be what was the trending viewpoint during that call staying away from calling anything decisions of consensus at this point.

In terms of RFP 4 basically timelines are being worked on. What's being looked at is there was a review of the IETF and the NRO (Chris) proposals and their look at arrangements.

And then there were basically updates on the workstreams. One of the actions that's going on there is looking at the stress test and seeing which ones are actually pertain to the IANA transition and which ones actually pertain more to the accountability issues.

And there's a little bit of a - the options of a clear boundary, a clear line at this point. And so there's discussion going on there.

And then there was discussion on trying to obtain the continuity and contingency plan which turns out as confidential the staff supporting the RFP 4 if unable to take the request further for us.

So the group was looking into filing a DIBP for the documents that IANA put out or ultimately to go for a FOIA to NCIA in terms of obtaining that information.

It's not even certain of how pertinent it is. It's more to give a clue to the discussion but the chairs are taking that further. And I guess that's about it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Avri. Cheryl for the record. Somehow it seems to have taken a lot longer to get to those points I (unintelligible). I thought they might have been a lot more detailed.

But I think most of us have probably got almost call fatigue at this point after last week and this week. So what I want to do is make sure that anyone who's on this particular RFP 5 group and who hasn't been on the number of calls that a few of us have been one if you've got any questions for Avri from either RFP 3s activities or RFP 4s activities please feel free to ask them now.

Avri I'm sure has got a heap more she could tell you on all of this because there's been quite extensions discussion on some of it.

So if there's anything you don't understand or think you want to look at in greater detail now please raise your hand.

And of course you can always put it to the list as well and Avri would respond there. So step forward now if you've got any questions for Avri on RFP 3 or 4's activities.

Not seeing any hands go up and nobody making a noise, still Cheryl here for the record.

Avri with the time table coming out of RFP 4 is there a - an end date that we may be able to start planning for?

Avri Doria: I haven't seen one.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No.

Avri Doria: The whole issue of the timeline and I think a lot of time gets spent on talking about the timeline and the can we make it, can we make it issue.

I have not actually yet seen a - any attempt at a backward breakdown.

I don't know in terms of looking at anything that is in any sense post definitive where then this group can start answering the well how does that still, you know, how does that answer the NKA question. Nothing's really gelled to that point yet.

So there's trending at - as I say. But, you know, in fact the only trendings we've got at the moment are that there are modules, as I say the MRT and the CSE in some form with some name seem to be, you know, modules that will exist.

So perhaps looking at those modules as the analysis on those goes deeper may be stuff we can start, you know, chewing on here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Avri Doria: But the rest of it goes beyond that so but certainly no dates definite.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In other words - Cheryl for the record. In other words I suspect it'll be one of those rush towards the end pieces.

So the more general text drafting that we can get on to so that we just sort of plug in the critical points towards the end and perhaps what we'll have to do is a fair bit of square bracketing work we will have a set of alternate texts that we're predicting we may be able to run with. But it might be very much last minute before we can decide which of our choices and square bracketed texts will end up in our section.

Is that how you think it might be, Avri?

Avri Doria: Certainly that is one way to go. I think that after this intense weekend - and I doubt that many people will be writing much text over the next two days.

But I think that after the intense weekend that's coming up that starts Friday and goes through the Saturday or Sunday or I guess starts Saturday for some

people and goes through Monday what- however it works. But anyhow that should certainly give us stuff.

And there may even be time - I don't know how that time is great being broken up. But there should - could certainly be even side activity that we could engage in in this RFP during that process.

One would hope the analysis by then of the comments should have been solidified. From everything I understand it will be. And we're supposed to come to some consensus points.

As soon as we come to any consensus points in three test them in four, you know, we've got stuff to chew on in five.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, Cheryl again for the record. That brings us towards the next agenda item of course which is looking more in greater detail as to what we might be able to put into our section drafting.

But it also raises the point as to whether or not on this weekend, intensive weekend 9, 10 and 11 is there a block of time which might be able to be utilized towards the end or perhaps at a midpoint an end of those proceedings where we could gather virtually because I doubt that too many of us will actually be face to face and take from what will be a fairly larger amount of data point I would like to think and perhaps even building a consensus from our RFP 3 and 4's activities and start doing more intensive work in our own section.

Is that something that this group thinks is a worthy activity for us to try and schedule in?

I'm going to take silence as agreement people. Okay, in which case Grace can I ask you to work with the coordination of the whole time and space thing during that weekend of 9, 10 and 11 and see whether we can have a block of time somewhere where RFP 5 people can gather and perhaps synthesize what's happened at our midpoint. That would be somewhere, either mid to late on 10s activities schedule and again at towards the end of the 10, 11.

And then we can get back to the group and see whether we can fit that into our individual calendars and diaries as well.

So hopefully we'll be able to do a bit more work during that weekend for our own purposes.

Obviously many of us will be also contributing to the other ISPs and the general work as well.

But I think all the work we can get done prior is going to put us in a much better condition towards the end because there'll be an awful rush otherwise.

Guys go ahead please.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you Cheryl. This is Grace Abuhamad for the record. So just to confirm you're looking for potentially two...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Two blocks.

((Crosstalk))

Grace Abuhamad: And...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Two blocks of time.

Grace Abuhamad: ...two blocks of time. And one other question would be whether or not, you know, depending on how the chairs decide to schedule the blocks for the weekend if you would be willing to have those blocks be part of a larger call you would rather than these separate.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm happy to get what other time works. I recognize...

Grace Abuhamad: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...there is a huge amount of work that needs to be done on that weekend. And I certainly don't want to make RFP 5 an (unintelligible) on the time that has to be spent to get three and four more effectively, you know, served along. But we're sort of between a rock and a hard place.

But if we can get some space I think it could be very productive. If we can only get one space then so be it.

So I see Avri. Avri over you.

Grace Abuhamad: Okay I'll look into that. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Yes hi. This is Avri speaking. I think the idea of certainly towards the end of that weekend and as I say I have no concept of how the chairs are thinking about that weekend.

But certainly at - towards the end of that to look at what we've done and to spend some time asking the RFP 5 question of beyond this multiple group of people that are here it seems to me a good use of the (full income). So I would

think that at least one of those towards the end would be good to be a more inclusive thing. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Avri. Cheryl here, couldn't agree with you more. I think it's that's a golden opportunity that we can't pass up if it can be worked with the co-chairs.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you Cheryl, thanks Avri. I'll make sure to work something out whether, you know, separate blocks or not. I'll get back to you on that. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Terrific. Thanks very much for that Grace. We appreciate that. Any other thing anyone else want to make any comments or statements on this?

If not I'm going to ask you all now to spend a little bit of time recognizing that a lot of people have had themselves spread rather thinly.

But if we could go now to the drafting Wiki page again and just make sure that the group here -- and noting not everyone is here -- is happy with how we're starting to structure this.

In other words if we have probably no more than three subsections in our part, one being a general introduction and definitional piece including a specification of our task which is the sanity checking exercise, one that is a tabular or simple to read fairly high level representation on how the five requirements are being met and with some annotations and detail to be allowed on each of those and then a text based section which at the moment we're referring to as an expanding or expanded text based section where we will address the five requirements in perhaps some greater detail.

If that - if you're comfortable with that approach then what we will do is in preparation for our work on this weekend is ask each of you to bring forward some particular points that you might want to already text in particularly in the expanded text section.

So for example with the five requirements at the moment they're - we're looking at or we're intending to write them as statements. And statements may only be part of what you want to have in this section.

So we'll assume that there's going to be a minimum of the five statement paragraphs which would be an ascertaining of the proposal supports enhancements a multi-stakeholder model that it maintains at the moment we've got and enhancers, the security stability and resiliency the Internet GNS, that the needs and expectations of the customers of INR are being addressed.

And here we've got material that we're aware of for example some of the survey and established data points that we could look to the openness and the Internet has maintained how that's done needs to be a statement.

And of course probably the simplest sentence will be one that we can make showing that it's demonstrably not replacing the NTIA role with a government led or inter-governmental organization solution.

There's certainly no tending or trending of that going to be the outcome from the proposal that this wider working group is putting forward.

But we do have to draft I think a politically sensitive and savvy paragraph about that. We can't just say, no, it's not.

So that one in particular I'm hoping someone will like to step forward and grab the initial pinning responsibility for.

And indeed I'd like to ask that each of those expanded text sections might get somebody to own them.

Not that you will be the final and only pin holder but just somebody to get the initial drafting of material started now in advance of what we realize will be more plug-n-play happening after the 9th, 10th and 11th.

So who would like to put their hand up for doing a bit of the pen work on the very important paragraph that the - I suspect politically savvy one to do with the fact that the proposal will not be replacing NTIA role with a governmental or intergovernmental organization one? Do I have a willing person to step forward?

Silence is deafening. Oh come on. All right, as tempting as it is for me to volunteer people what we might need to do then is put to the list these - the skeletons, these five paragraphs and ask if someone will step forward to own doing a bit of text on each of them unless I can convince some of you to step forward at the moment.

I do realize that we don't have everybody here. And I certainly realize that most of us are spread extraordinarily thin at the moment. So I'll go against my natural inclination of being rather pushy and I won't start volunteering people.

But Grace if that can be an action item for us to put that through to the list and indeed the wider list we might get a couple more volunteers to join RSP 5 that way.

Okay, all right then. So anyone wishes to make some changes including to any of the drafting that's already on the Wiki page. I'll just reiterate again it's open for any and all of you to do so.

If you don't feel comfortable doing things directly on the wiki or you prefer to use the email list that is fine. But the wiki will be the ultimate repository because it is the public repository of their drafting process to perhaps bring this section to a somewhat earlier than planned end because I think you're all suffering from call exhaustion I'm going to make one last call for any comments.

I'm only going to ask a second associated action item to be listed on this agenda point. And that is to also circulate to the list -- and I do mean to the wider list here Grace -- the link to this wiki page and invite contributors to put suggestions either in the comment box at the bottom or via the edit tools that are there.

Berry, over to you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Cheryl. Berry Cobb for the record. Just since we're kind of in this section I wanted to circle back to the action item that - relating to staff acquiring the materials as it relates...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Berry Cobb: ...to criteria Number 3.

And I guess maybe I am asking kind of a clarification question for what it is exactly you're looking for.

You know, when I read the exact ask of RFP 5 to meet the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of the IANA functions and clearly this does relate back to the overall proposal that's still being worked on, on RFP 3 and parts of 4.

And I think that it was brought up in our last call that the ccNSO has conducted a survey I finally just started taking a look at this survey. And I - it's quite extensive so I haven't read through all of it. But I'm not so sure if there are certain parts of it will apply here or not.

But I think my concern about this or the clarity that I am looking for is how this survey will actually feed back into accomplishing this task when it really seems more in tune with once we do have some sort of proposal put together that the representatives of the CWG that are the customers of IANA would actually provide input on this. Does that make sense?

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb And let me follow-up. I guess I'm kind of partially tasked to the registries have put anything together. I'm not aware of anything but I will certainly bring out the bloodhounds to go try to find some things.

But I'm not so confident that they have anything as close to maybe what the ccNSO has put together.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks for the question, Berry, Cheryl for the record. And of course there's good reason for the ccTLD community to have a lot more in this because of course their use of IANA is markedly different as (Steve Carlton) pointed out in earlier calls today.

And as clients even with the NTIA renewal of contract they're taking the opportunity of having touch points there to say what they'd like to see in terms of changing or development of better service level agreements and those sorts of things.

So there's been a longer ongoing dialogue there. so it's unsurprising I think that we're going to get more one community as TLDs than we will out of the others in terms of the client's information.

But the question still has to be answered. And that is what do we expect to put in our section that allows us to make a statement that says the proposal is meeting the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners.

So the ascertainment of them, so there's an existing material is foundation to say this is the existing expectations and customer satisfaction and inverted (commas) that we have found.

And it appears hypothetically I admit that the proposal when we know what it's going to be is not counter to meeting those needs or enhances those in the following ways.

So I'm not sure that we're looking at a neat metric here but rather the ability to have a little bit more of an anecdotal we believe it's not going to do any harm to the customer relationship between global customers and partners and - of the IANA functions.

Have I managed to confuse you now Berry or have I managed to help you slightly?

Berry Cobb: No you definitely helped me. I guess to respond to that in terms of actually completing the bullet Number 3 there it - I think if we do have an action to send back to the larger CWG to seek more assistance with this particular subgroup.

and I'm wondering if it's may be worth to specifically call out that we need someone from the ccNSO or from I'm sorry, the ccTLD community and the gTLD community to join this group if we don't already have them.

Because I think that they would be in a better position to answer that particular bullet three.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure, happy to have that as an action item. And apart from anything else we would certainly welcome more members to RFP 5 recognizing of course that people may not have the human bandwidth until their current working RFP 3 or 4 slacks off a little bit. So we are asking a lot of people I do know.

But yes, I think a call for specifics and the reasoning for that specific to meet the need and expectations of global customers and partners is the question might lure them across to us. So that's a good thing to do.

We did have some discussion last week on this. And under the normal rules of not making any decision in any one week do we want to put to the list our notes from last week or do we just want to allow the Wiki page to stand for itself?

Do we need to annotate the Wiki page more now to explain to people why we need to answer these questions?

That's a question for all of you who've looked at the Wiki page that I'm just a little concerned that if we just have people look at the table as it is now without the benefit of the conversations we've last week and this week - sorry, last call in this call it might be confusing or we just manage confusion on the list as it comes along?

Berry you're my sanity on how confusing I can be, over to you. I thought you had your hand up Berry. Oh, you say the line dropped, perfect timing. I've got a self-requestor talking at my window and we've got to give Berry back on the line.

Okay well we'll come back to his comments on what we might need to entertain and annotate on the Wiki page before we push it out to the public a little bit more and the rest of the group. But if we can make sure we get that input in that would be good.

I'd also appreciate other people looking at the page with fresh eyes and asking themselves the question if I wasn't part of the conversation that developed this page would I understand what it's asking for?

Berry has written into the chat. I might recommend that next CWG call we bring up the wiki form specifically as part of RFP 5 update and re-highlight the objectives to be completed there.

That is an excellent, excellent plan. I will undertake to do that. And if we can - I don't think we'll need more than probably five minutes or so to do that.

But it would mean that whoever is staff support for that call that they'd need to be prepared to display the Wiki page because it would be much easier if we couldn't talk to a shared space where everyone is looking at the page.

Right, okay, that's captured that. Anything else needs to be brought to the discussion for today on our drafting exercise?

And I want to thank Berry very much for him thinking so clearly on all of this. We appreciate that. No, no one coming in on anything?

Great. Okay that means we can now move to our next agenda item. And that is a call for any other business? Is there any other business?

We were going to bring up the what do we do on the intensive weekend but we've actually covered that earlier on other points in the agenda so we're getting our work plan organized for this RFP 5 group to have some session or two during the intensive weekend.

Is there anything else anyone wants to bring forward? Not seeing anybody, not hearing anyone, excellent gaining time. You might all get a couple of minutes of your lives back today.

Reviewers, any of our action items? We've got several action items which you can see in the notes section on the Adobe Connect. I just want to make sure everyone's had the opportunity to read over these and to be happy that they have been effectively and accurately captured.

And I'd also asked staff is there any clarification that they might need for anything that is an action item on them?

All right, we're all clear? All set, excellent. Terrific. That just brings us to our next call, note the S plural. We are running towards the end of the time allocated for proposals to be put together.

Yes we know time is an issue that just about every one of the RFP groups and the Cross Community Working Group as a whole has been discussing.

But we do have to assume that we will have drop deadlines that are in existence so we need to keep pushing on these times.

Our next scheduled call is for Wednesday the 7th of January. And it is set 30 minutes earlier than today's call. But we'll just give staff to make sure that still is the case.

Currently we have it as 2100 to 2200 Hours UTC on the 7th of January. Is that still the case or correct according to Grace? Excellent.

We will then be having our sessions yet to be confirmed in terms of time and day UTC that we're requesting staff to arrange during the intensive weekend.

I guess we then need to know do we believe we will need a call in the week following the intensive weekend? My personal feeling is probably yes.

So do you want to set a call now for the 12th, 13th or 14th of January for what may very well be final drafting? And if so I would suggest that such a call if we can get it scheduled into our calendars might be best scheduled for two hours because it would be a final drafting call?

And if that's the case Grace I'll get you to work out the exact timing on that. Perhaps you might want to put out a Doodle poll. But more importantly you'll have to juggle it around all the other calls that you're getting information on from all the other sections?

So we've confirmed for next week, we will at next week's call also then hopefully have confirmation and the results of the Doodle for one in the week of the 12th of January.

And we will also have our sessions planned on the intensive weekend as well.

Well ladies and gentlemen I want to thank all of you very much for the time you taken especially after what has been a almost set of back to back calls for the last two days for many of you.

We do appreciate that this is your volunteer life albeit a very important issue that I'd like to recognize. And I'm sure staff and everyone involved will recognize from their own personal perspective what a huge amount of work is going on and what a great impasse it is on all your time.

And that includes I'd like to particularly call out staff who really do give up work to carry bricks when they manage all our calls here but to do so over traditional break times I think is exceptional.

So I wanted to put that to the record with my thanks and I'm sure everyone else's as well.

It then leads me to bring this call to a early close which is a very pleasant and exciting thing to do from my perspective because I've certainly had enough calls and to just ask you all to take the time preferably with a cup of caffeinated beverage in hand to have a look at the Wiki page and we'll introduce it to the wider group as suggested at the next call for the Cross Community Working Group next week.

And the other thing that gives me great pleasure apart from saying talk to you all next year is to wish you all a very Happy New Year and if you are traveling please travel safely.

Thanks you one and all. And (Bart) I believe you were taking notes so every time I said Grace I should have been saying (Bart). I apologize. I hope you don't mind me thinking of you as Grace, (Bart). We could discuss that later.

Okay Happy New Year to you all and by for now. Thanks guys. Call can end now.

END