

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
January 28, 2015
8:00 am CT**

Robert Guerra: This is meeting Number 6. I'm - I posted - I just circulated or with staff a possible agenda for today's call.

I'd like to make some introductory comments, review task and minutes from the last call and as part of that getting an update from the sub working groups that we have, particularly Siva's group on stress test and any comments that have been received in regards to that as well any comments that may have come in through other venues in regards to trusts that's tied to other comments have a conversation about trying to improve the working methods of this group, how is it that we could be more productive or when is it time to be more productive.

Seeing that the RFP3 conversations are getting a bit more advanced I'd just like to take stock and see how we might be able to mainstream our work perhaps a little bit more with that group.

But I'd like to open that to comments to the group as well as planning for the Singapore meeting and then discuss any other items that folks may have.

So that's a proposed agenda. In regards to an introduction and welcome I'm going to first take as attending those are - that are in the Adobe Connect room as well as Siva and that has dialed in.

If there are others that are audio only other than Siva if they could just dial let us know at this time, great.

And again we have had not had a couple of calls the prior weeks again because there was an intense level of activity in regards to RFP3. And I felt it best if for those conversations to mature a bit to have a sense of how we could plan our work and go forward.

And so and but thought it important to have a meeting before the Singapore meeting so we could assess the work that's been done, the items that we've agreed to in regards to work methods, get updates and then plan accordingly going forward.

So that's kind of a quick update for myself.

In regards to task and items from the last call I'd like to get an update from Siva who had circulated a document in regards to stress tests and other issues to one, to give us an update on the document, two, any feedback that may have been received at this time.

So Siva if your audio's good could you please give us an update at this time.
Thank you.

Coordinator: Excuse me, Siva your line is open.

Robert Guerra: I can't hear Siva as well.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: Hello Robert?

Robert Guerra: Yes we can hear you now. Please go ahead. If you could give us a update on the document and any comments received since our last call, please begin.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: So far still there is no participation on the stress test document. And I hope members of the group take - all take a look at this document and contributing. And apart from that I have no other updates.

And Robert I'm a very noisy environment. And I'm going to be on the road. And today I will be on mute. And if there's anything further that you would like me to contribute I will do that by email. Thank you and please mute my line.

Robert Guerra: Great. Thank you Siva. So thank you for that update.

I have received updates in regards to Greg Shatan who I'm not sure is on this call that the CWG on accountability has been doing some work around scenario and stress test as well.

And he had suggested to me and something that perhaps I'll do at this point is to have this group take a look at some of the scenarios that have come up and to see if it's worthwhile to incorporate some of that work into our stress test.

And also want to give feedback from others in regards to ongoing work that is taking place in RFP3 and if there are some stress tests are other issues that we'd want to include.

So what I'll ask staff support to do at this moment is there is a ECWG accountability scenarios document and if they could bring that up these in the Adobe Connect room.

And I'll just bring that up and Olivier I see your comment and we'll ask you also to comment on 3B after I just quickly go through this document and get the sense from the community here.

There are two documents which I will send to the RFP4 list after this call. And again everyone on the Adobe Connect the document is up. You can click on it to save the document and you'll be able to scroll it.

I'll just go through it quickly but just to get a comment that this CWG on accountability has come up with a list of not only 21 different types of scenarios or issues that can come up but in a secondary document is also trying to group what these issues or scenarios into a logical groupings that could be particularly helpful.

And in here are some technical issues in regards that could happen. And so I'm just if folks are on this group are also on the accountability and wish to comment on this document I'll open the floor at this moment in time. Anyone who wishes to comment on this document that's up on the Adobe Connect room at the moment. Olivier please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you very much Robert, Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking.
Can you hear me?

Robert Guerra: Loud and clear.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Okay thank you. I think it's a good thing that the CWG on CCWG on accountability is looking at these things.

What I was wondering is whether they already had our own work in their hands so that we don't duplicate the work both in RFP4 and in the Workstream 1 of the CCWG on accountability.

Is that the case or because I can certainly see that they're coming up with several points. But I wonder whether they're just not duplicating some of the work that we've done.

And they I mean we have a large number of scenarios at the moment. And this is just a small subset of them or it appears to be, you know, maybe not a small subset but a subset of them. How did they derive those if you know?

Robert Guerra: I know that I'm not following the Accountability Working Group as closely as others. I know that I think it's Cheryl I think is there and she's the author of one of the documents.

I think one of the tasks that I've identified I think going forward is to get an update from those working in that group and trying to see if they are - to coordinate our efforts a bit more particularly on the group that's working on stress test for accountability.

And one of the things I'd like to ask (Shiva) and his sub working group is to review these - the two documents that I'll circulate by email and see if, you know, we can merge them with our work and so just trying to coordinate efforts and then in Singapore just coordinate efforts a bit more.

And it's also why I've added an agenda item in regards to improving our working methods in coordination with others as well.

So I - to your question is I can't speak to the document as much but just wanted to share with this group that, you know, this document and another document which I'll show in a moment has been developed by the accountability group and that it echoes some of our work. Your hand is still up so I'll give you the floor again Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yes thank you very much for this Robert. I think that's an excellent idea. And certainly the earlier we can fold the input that we have from the accountability group into our own document and then share that document with the accountability group perhaps even let them know of RFP4 I'm not sure whether the people leading the charge in the accountability group are very much aware of the document that we have.

The earlier we can let them know the earlier we can merge the two documents. And perhaps that could be done on a Google doc or something so we don't have various versions with various angles of the different scenarios.

Robert Guerra: Indeed. One thing in terms of feedback to this group then for the larger CWG and I know it's - was raised in an email to the larger list earlier today is that Larry Strickland from at the State of the Net conference yesterday asked some questions for the CWG to consider going forward.

And I'm not - I've posted the link in the Adobe Connect room for folks to see. There's a section which is the NTIA would like to offer the following questions for stakeholders to consider.

I think that one of them relates particularly to our work. And I'll read that specific paragraph is that the draft proposes the creation of three or four new entities to be involved in the naming related processes.

Could the creation of any new entity interfere with the security and stability of the DNS during and after the transition?

And given the community will need to develop implement and test new structures and processes prior to a final transition can this be done in a way and a timeframe consistent with the expectations of the shareholders?

So I think what this means for us is that as, you know, on this call but also in Singapore and going forward is we'll have to - not only kind of high level stress test but perhaps with other colleagues in different communities try to identify very specific testing of the structures and the processes that will need to be implemented to see if proposed systems would be working well before the transition and during the transition period as well.

And so we haven't gotten to that nuance. And I think this is something that will be a question for the different communities for my SSAC colleagues and for others in Singapore that having that nuance will be particularly important particularly making sure I think a general comment which came not only from Larry Strickland but also from a congressional staff member which was at the meeting yesterday which is making sure the performance is as good or better going into new proposed structures.

So we haven't gotten into that detail. And I think that's a level of nuance that we really need to get into.

So I just wanted to make sure that if everyone hasn't seen the comments that are a bit broader that people see do see that. And I'll paste the text in the RP4 list right after this call as well.

I'm just curious having made that comment if there are others that would like to make some comments in regards to those comments in regards to testing and the need to get into more details said in perhaps possible ways that we could do that?

Does anyone wish to make a comment in that regard at this moment?

Not hearing anything what I'll suggest is (Shiva) I know that you're listening to this call that if you could please recirculate the link to the test that we've identified so far in the document. Please take a look at the items that are in the scenarios document that is here now.

And if it's worthwhile to incorporate new ones what I will ask you once you've done that today what I'll ask you perhaps is between now and Friday to - if you could just come up with a document that is each specific test and kind of the three or four options that we had which is they were critical now, important, not important and to ignore.

And I will include that in a survey that we can send out to have members of this group kind of be able to go through and assess the different items and so we can get a (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: So we'll send that. Great...

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: So does someone have the audio on? Someone has their audio on. Could that be muted please?

Great thank you. So that's a way that we had mentioned going through and trying to identify specific tests.

Going through as well too I remember in the past and I think (Yap) you're on this call as well too, could you please I think you had commented in the past in terms of there is possibly a priority type of test that we should identify and try to focus on first?

And so if you could remembering those comments comment again in regards to from your perspective what would be some high level testing or specific tests that we should be doing in the coming period?

I'm sorry what I mean is developing testing details. So (Yap) if you'd like to make some comments at this time please.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Well make two comments points. What I basically said is that you probably should do some kind of mind map how these things interrelate to each other. I mean that was one of the ideas I had.

The other idea I mean I just - the other comment I wanted to make and I was just missing the remark about what to do is for the remark about Strickland.

When I heard the remark Strickland made I mean I had noticed that it makes a real different between the risk and testing for I mean the transition and for IANA accountability itself.

And if I look at Siva's list I mean most of the things are not really related to transitions. They all have to do with ICANN accountability whether or not IANA is involved.

And I mean I - what I really think at first we should trim the list of Siva which is just related to transition for a start because the way the list looks now it's there is no beginning or end and how to address all the things that are the list.

Robert Guerra: That's all very good comment Jaap And I - what I would suggest is I think going forward just a good suggestion and categorizing or trimming the list what I'll ask as well and will ask that this be copied as - or added as a task item is for the existing list that we have to add a column in regards to if people believe it is an item involved in the accountability transition or another issue going forward in so we can do that.

And trimming the list would be particularly helpful. So that is a good item and a good suggestion Jaap

All ask staff as well too just to give a sense in terms of how the CWG accountability has done this and maybe a possible way for us to group the stress test is if we could pull up the other PDF that I circulated which is proposed contingency scenarios document please, if we could move to that for a moment?

So the document that hopefully will come up now is one that in terms of grouping what we might want to think about as well too. And, you know, I'll ask Siva and I'll participate in this as well is sort of having a laundry list or a huge list is ways that we can better group them.

And there we go. And so the way the accountability group is they merge them in regards to how the different items in the previous list could be merged.

And these are insolvency, failure to meet operations, legal legislative, failure of accountability and failure of accountability to external stakeholders.

And so I think I task it going forward. And what I would like to have some discussion in the next few days is trying to categorize the list as well too.

And so I will ask Siva to merge the list that we have so far.

And I will send out a survey that will be sent to everyone on this list. And hopefully we can get ideas and try to group the items that we have so far and will try to use that list going forward.

Would that be particularly helpful approach so that's an approach that I think will be helpful going forward?

So (Yap) is that - would that be helpful I guess going to your earlier comment in reducing and trimming down the items, prioritizing them in groupings of by topics?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Well just have to look at this the first time. But yes, this seems to be the direction I mean at least when it's a way to trim the list down.

And for details we might see whether this is - these are lists which are specifically to the translation or I are more just more generic risk I mean...

Robert Guerra: Yes so try to come up with a but having a I guess a document like this which will have a proposed set of testing scenarios and group them into major

categories is a key task that I would like to do over the, you know, over between now and Singapore in reducing the list and so we can discuss them in that way going forward.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes I mean what we - what I find difficult about testing scenarios is, you know, I mean what is the metrics people are going to use to do resells? Because I mean a lot of these things has never been done before so whatever you compare it, that means when test fails or not.

Robert Guerra: By mentioning that I guess it poses - has me ask you and others perhaps on this is that the issues of metrics I think would be particularly helpful.

Are there metrics that we should try to use and are there, you know, that type of information which would be of useful?

Do you suggest any specific metrics that we should be using or data that we should be using to run the testing through?

Jaap Akkerhuis: No. I'm just raising the question. I mean I'm at loss in suggesting anything here so that makes it hard.

I mean maybe all the people have ideas or have experience in testing organizations like this but I don't. I mean I'm testing technical stuff, not organizations.

Robert Guerra: Great, thank you so much Jaap. This may be a question as well too that we will suggest for a follow-up is if folks could contribute to this list or the MCW list in regards to metrics or data that could be used as we for the scenario testing period and what is that comparison data.

The first thing that comes to my mind is if a goal is to have at least the same level of performance that exists now at least we can try to have a conversation with NTIA and IANA at the Singapore meeting to try to get, you know, what are some recent changes in regards to naming that have occurred over the last year period and then try to run that through scenarios or structures that we create as part of our proposal and try to see what the changes would be in regards to time and efficiency.

That could be the one particular way to do that and then compare.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes. It would be very useful what strictly to know what strictly means to have done a proper test. You know, it's just waving your flag. And there's nothing concrete there.

Robert Guerra: Great. So I'll ask maybe as an action item for staff that if say that the RFP4 group wishes to have a meeting with IANA staff and possibly NTIA at the Singapore meeting and whether that's a formal meeting or just a conversation so we could just raise this question I think would be particularly good.

Ideally what it would be good if someone could volunteer on this group to develop that question in writing which we could transmit ahead of the Singapore meeting so that way if a meeting is not possible we could at least for NTIA get a written response from them.

Jaap Akkerhuis: And if I may add something to this, I mean the CWG Accounting Group, I mean they also should come with something.

I mean there's also mentioned of that's some testing should be done. And I guess they will ask the same question.

Robert Guerra: So I know that some coordination between - a meeting between the two groups are planned. But definitely I'll discuss that in the coordination meeting call that we have ahead of the Singapore meeting. It's an excellent suggestion. Thank you.

So that's in regards to testing. I think in regards to timeline I think which was...

(Bart): Robert? Robert? Greg has raised his hand.

Robert Guerra: Greg has now raised his hand.

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: Thank you (Bart) for commenting that. Greg please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Hi. It's Greg Shatan. Sorry I've joined a bit late but in listening to the call over the last little while and looking at what's on the screen it occurs to me and maybe as I said, missed things because I joined a bit late.

But that scenarios or stress situations maybe we should be looking at them kind of in layers or in causes and effects.

These are with the exception of number three really talk about effects of stress factors on ICANN reorganization.

It seems to me that - and I think this kind of relates to the issue of data and metrics is first you have to decide what it is you're measuring before you decide how it is you're measuring it.

That you need to look at how each of these or we need to look at how each of these contingency scenarios would affect the IANA function, the IANA group itself and maybe that's the, you know, the reason for talking.

You know, the meeting that you want to have, that we want to have in Singapore is to say okay well if ICANN, you know, is insolvent what happens to the IANA functions? You know, and what specifically happens?

You know, do they lose personnel, do they failed to respond timely, does their equipment shutdown, does their office equipment get repossessed, you know, what are the effects?

And I think that's where our task kind of diverges from that of the Accountability Group which is also looking at bad scenarios.

You know, they're - they have to look at perhaps everything they could happen within ICANN. And maybe that includes IANA.

But really we need to look at just what the effect of any of these, you know, disaster scenarios is on the IANA function itself.

And I think we almost need kind of a second list of what are the bad things that happen at NTIA or at IANA or with regards to the IANA functions or the people performing the IANA functions or the equipment used to perform the IANA functions or communication with the RZM and the like?

And then you decide kind of how do you measure that and, you know, what is it, is it uptime is it hours, is it full time equivalent personnel -- whatever it may be?

So kind of need a list of the kind of a secondary parade of horrible. This is the big picture parade of horribles. And then we need the IANA specific parade of horribles. Thanks.

Robert Guerra: Great, thank you Greg. Olivier your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you Robert, Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking. And reading those risks it strikes me that the Board Risk Committee has indeed worked on this as well.

I had a recent conversation with Mike Silver and Ram Mohan about Board Risk Committee and the risk framework, risk management framework that they were working on.

It appears that the official line is they have identified many risks; they have put together many contingency efforts to mitigate the risks. But due to the sensitive nature of this information, since of course you could show a way on how to get ICANN to stumble or at least hit ICANN where it might be vulnerable, this information is apparently confidential.

So I'm not quite sure how or whether we could have access to that or what the politics are around it. But I certainly see a lot of what's written here is very probably already in that report. And I haven't got access to that report, by the way, it's just I was told that this risk management does exist and the risk mitigation framework does exist.

Robert Guerra: Thank you, Olivier, for that. There was a - I think one of the pending items that I've not done yet is Grace did get in touch with me I believe it was earlier this week in regards to the access request for documentation. And so that's

something that I'll try to do before the end of the week, circulate it to this RFP 4 group.

That being said, I think something an addition, I guess, item to add for planning for ICANN Singapore as a item is perhaps having a meeting with the Board Risk Committee would be particularly helpful in trying to identify whether it's an access request or some other means to have a conversation with them and what provisos might be needed to have a sense of the more sensitive details and perhaps of the nondisclosures required to look at it.

But it would be particularly helpful at least for me as co-chair, and maybe one or two other members of this group as well because it would definitely help us leverage existing work that ICANN's done but also help formulate the testing framework and RFP 4 a bit better so good suggestion, thank you very much.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: And Ram Mohan and Mike Silber are the co-chairs of the Board Risk Committee just for your information. Thank you.

Robert Guerra: Great, thank you. So in regard to another item that has been discussed as well which was - Berry, I see you're on the call as well too. You had circulated an updated timeline to the list, I'm just wondering if there are any comments or feedback that you'd received from this group in regards to that document which you had circulated during our last call.

It looks like we lost someone on the line. Berry, if you're there could you make a comment in regards to the timeline comments and if there's silence I will assume that there has been no comments.

Coordinator: I'm sorry, sir, if you're asking for Berry Cobb he is no longer on the call.

Robert Guerra: Thank you so very much for letting us know. Great. Olivier, please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Robert. It's Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking. And I haven't got the timeline in front of me, in fact the timeline was in Visio format which I couldn't open.

But I have a strong feeling that timelines are going to be moved around a little bit. Are you meaning the timeline of all work or was that the timeline of the transition timeline itself?

Robert Guerra: It's the transition timeline. And I think it was more not necessarily the duration of the times. I mean, that's something that...

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yeah.

Robert Guerra: ...I think I - will likely have to be...

((Crosstalk))

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: ...yeah, T plus one month plus two months, etcetera, etcetera, yeah. It looked fine to me when I finally got a hold of a PDF. But that said, I'm not sure - may not be able to brief you up on RFP 3b but the timelines will obviously be different for - if one scenario is chosen against another scenario being chosen the timeline is geared at the Contract Co-option and of course now there are two other options which are going to arrive on the table. So I don't know when we can discuss that.

Robert Guerra: I think maybe one thing - a very brief - you had raised your hand in regards to update on 3b. I would just ask for a short summary in regards to transition implications of RFP 3b. And I think I would ask Greg instead of giving us a

large update on RFP 3 maybe I think would be your sense of any updates in regards to RFP 3 that this group may want to take a look at.

So I'll ask that - I'll ask Allan to comment first, then get an update from Greg and then get an update on 3b from Olivier. Please, Allan, go ahead.

Allan MacGillivray: Thank you, Robert. Actually I was just going to give a little update on 3b if that's what you're looking for.

Robert Guerra: Please, go ahead, Allan.

Allan MacGillivray: Can you hear me?

Robert Guerra: Loud and clear.

Allan MacGillivray: Okay. Just to say currently, and following our meeting yesterday, we are working to make a contribution to the discussion document that will be circulated prior to Singapore as the basis for soliciting feedback and input from the community that will be present there.

The document will have a separate chapter on a so-called internal to ICANN option. And within that there will be two variants, as it were, of that - of the so-called internal to ICANN option, which will not include the Contract Co.

The first of these will be based on and hopefully, you know, authored by the proposal that was made by auDA in the last week or so. And the other - and the dominant feature of the other proposal is it includes a trust.

The other option will - will be similarly structured but it would just not have a trust but rather would rely on amendments to the ICANN bylaws to create

arrangements and to create a body or bodies that would be analogous to MRT/CSC. So as we speak this is sort of being written up and that's really that. Thank you.

Robert Guerra: Thank you, Allan, for that update. Greg, did you want to add anything in regards to group RFP 3 work that's taking place as it relates to RFP 4?

Greg Shatan: Sure. Thank you, Robert. Greg Shatan again. Yeah, RFP 3 has continued to move forward on fleshing out the Contract Co related model. Our most recent call went over and try to come up with more detailed outline of the structure and of Contract Co; see if we could find areas of convergence or at least maybe bimodal convergence in the kind of two positions that each have reasonably strong support.

And we also touched on the functions, although not directly. I think that, you know, it goes back to - well those may be reasonably well understood by now but it also probably needs further detail.

And I think that, you know, as the structures are - structural details are built out, you know, clearly those can be, you know, used to populate disaster scenarios with a little bit more detail. And our next call will be Friday.

Thanks.

Robert Guerra: Great. Thank you for that, Greg. So one thing that I think for that update and just seeing some of the text chat and some of the other conversations that have taken place I wanted to move on to improvements to the working methods of this group and how to possibly best coordinate and - with not only the other - with the RFP 3 group but also with the accountability group.

As I had mentioned earlier I'm meeting with those groups, seeing some of the documents and making sure that members following the accountability group flag items as it particularly helpful and meeting with them in Singapore will be helpful as well.

But what I wanted to share some of my thoughts and maybe get thoughts of others as well is not try to get all the different work siloed in ways that whether it's my engagement or others in this group, in RFP 3 and going forward, ways that we can try to coordinate the efforts in some of the simultaneous work going on.

What I have tried to do in the RFP 3 conversations, and Greg and Allan, would appreciate your comments, what are bet ways that as those proposals are begin developed that we try to anticipate and ask staff or members of this group to work on RFP 4-related items.

I know that for discussions that have taken place over the last couple of weeks there's always been a question of timeline and in regards to implementing RFP 3b or other items there's been a check to see how long the different items would take.

I think, Greg, you mention now that for the auDA proposal and I would say the - one of the 3b alternate proposals is it's important to develop a list. And so might I suggest that a question for auDA if they could be helpful is for - have them help us identify maybe some of the steps that would be required for testing and also what are some of the processes that would be needed for some of the structures to be created.

So I'm just curious to hear from both of you and maybe from others ways that coordination, collaboration could be enhanced and how the RFP 4 group worked could perhaps be improved in Singapore but also going forward.

Greg, would you - I'll open the floor for your for comments and others that want to raise their hand, please do. Greg, your comments would be appreciated.

Greg Shatan: Robert, I actually stepped away for part of what you were saying, could you very briefly summarize kind of the...

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: Sure. One of the things as the RFP 3 work is going forward - I want to try to get comments from this community on the work that this group has done so far and ways that it can improve going forward as we'll have to be developing far more detail going forward. And so if you had some constructive comments in regards to how we could coordinate and collaborate with your group and the accountability group and others as well too. So just a very short sense of...

Greg Shatan: Sure.

Robert Guerra: ...work methods that we might want to improve going forward.

Greg Shatan: Yeah, no absolutely. I think that's a very good point. I think first between RFP 3 and 4, you know, we should view this as an iterative process, you know, somewhat of a ping-pong match. And I think it may be helpful, although obviously there's a, you know, fair degree of overlap in the personnel on the calls, it's not, you know, complete overlap and the agendas are different.

So what I would say is it would be helpful, for instance, for the RFP 3 group to - and even for 3b as well perhaps or, you know, I'll let 3b speak for itself - to review the work to date of the RFP 4 group and see how that can be applied to the structures that are being, you know, reviewed and revised by the RFP 3 group.

And that, you know, kind of in midstream stress testing, you know, should be used to strengthen the models, whatever the models are whether it's the trust model, the kind of golden bylaw model, the Contract Co model or even if there's another model that comes out of or refinements of those models that come out of our legal consultation. Apply the stress tests while we're building them, not, you know, at the end when it's just kind of an ex post facto analysis. So I don't know what the Latin is for during facto but that's kind of I think what we need to do.

And maybe a vice versa to, you know, look at the, you know, a kind of boiled down version of the structures that are currently on the table and take the exercise of trying to apply the scenarios to those structures. I think that, you know, one of the things we probably don't have the luxury of is waiting for the model - fully cooked nor, you know, based on my iterative kind of program should they be fully cooked before start applying stress tests to the scenarios.

And I think it does have to be applied. They do have to be applied to multiple scenarios, we can't wait to arrive at a single final scenario even - and then stress test that; I think we've got to, you know, do each of them. You know, unfortunately in rushed projects one of the inefficiencies that's unavoidable is working on issues in parallel rather than serially. So I think that that's what I would say is that we need to kind of actively apply stress tests to models and apply models to stress tests.

And I would say that with regard to the accountability group, and the Board risk analysis that's also been, you know, circulated to the SOs and ACs lately for comments is to try to have a kind of direct dialogue with those - with the subgroup or work stream or work team or working party, whatever they're calling it, in the accountability group that is also dealing with kind of putting up scenarios and, you know, actively comparing all the lists of scenarios.

You know, as I indicated before I think the application in our - we have a more specialized application ultimately because our end game is solving for potential risks to the IANA functions and to the oversight structures whatever they may be that we put in place post transition. But in terms of, you know, harmonizing and synchronizing the list of risks at the enterprise level to IANA - to ICANN enterprise level the risks list is - should be pretty similar.

We may discard some because they could have no possible effect on the IANA function but I think even that - we should discard that in a public fashion, in other words, it should be listed and resolved because people will look at our list versus the accountability group's list and say they identified this problem that could happen with ICANN and you didn't and why not, you know, how would this risk play out in the IANA function and IANA function oversight arena.

And we've, you know, we need to be able to say yeah we analyzed that and we resolved that it would, you know, not have an effect, you know, that particular type of risk would not come down to an affect as well. So those are kind of my thoughts in response to that. Hope that's helpful. Thanks.

Robert Guerra: Great, thank you, Greg. And I see, Allan, that you're saying that you're in agreement with Greg in regards to that as well too. Olivier, before I go to you, I think something too that we've discussed earlier on these calls as well in

terms of a feedback back to the RFP 3 process is something that I guess one of the items that we had agreed in regards to a framework going forward is as the RFP 3 proposal or proposals get proposed also detailing what the changes would be from the existing arrangement and existing contract.

And so there had been an early document that had been circulated, I think been prepared by Bernie that basically went through at a very early stage what the changes would be. And so that's something that we can discuss on a next call. But that's something that would have to be - come out of the different groups is, you know, what the changes would be going forward as well and timelines we've discussed as well and what the different proposal or proposals, what their proposed timelines are.

So, Olivier, please, your hand is up. Go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Robert. Olivier speaking. And I agree with Greg that we should be operating in parallel and therefore developing scenarios for 3 and 3b and the two different scenarios of 3b.

However, I must caution the group into pedaling in thin air or pedaling in air because the RFP 3b, for example, has resolved that they would not be having any further calls until the meetings in Singapore for the simple reason that we are really waiting now for the answers to the questions from legal advice.

And, you know, there are now three scenarios there so - and we're not really quite sure what the advice is going to be on those three scenarios whether they're even workable. So I do have concerns about plowing forward full speed on these scenarios and being told in the future that the scenario we've been working on doesn't work and is not feasible and therefore that would

certainly make a certain number of people in this group feel like they've wasted their time. And I wouldn't want to be in that situation. Thank you.

Robert Guerra: Thank you, Olivier. I think it's maybe - I think one of the challenges, I think as Greg mentioned, to the timelines that we have, there are a certain amount of work that needs to happen in parallel and it may not be the most efficient way and so trying to navigate the best way to do that is helpful.

But the way I see it is what our questions and items that as proposals get developed should be thinking about and making sure that those closer to the proposal know what questions are being developed and try to answer them would be particularly helpful. So, Greg, I see your hand is up. Please, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Robert. Just, you know, briefly in response to Olivier, I think that, you know, those kinds of inefficiencies are frankly unavoidable and people shouldn't feel bad about that. I don't think it's, you know, particularly a waste of time.

One could also envision a scenario where we got a blessing from the legal review that a particular scenario was kosher from a particularly - from a narrow legal perspective but, you know, we might identify in RFP 4 totally unacceptable risks and have to (unintelligible) for that reason.

And so therefore I think, you know, we can't get ourselves into what Avri calls the deadly embrace where, you know, no part can proceed before the other part and so forth like the - go back about 100 years, which is even older than me, but the characters Alphonse and Gaston who are forever saying that the other one should go first through the door and neither of them ever gets through the door.

You know, this happens in my line of work all the time. You can be working on a litigation and working very hard preparing for trial but also working very hard on trying to negotiate a settlement to avoid trial. You can be working on trying to bring a company public but also try to be working on a private financing scenario incase the IPO doesn't look like it's going to fly or, you know, the market isn't in a good place for it.

So parallel processes are just a fact of life and especially when you're working against, you know, time pressures. I'm not saying that we have to, you know, run around with our hair on fire but at the same time while we're not pedaling in thin air I think we are perhaps pedaling on temporary roadways and on roads that we are - that are being built kind of directly in front of our bicycle. So I think it's just kind of the way it needs to be.

Not that we're going to build a labyrinth and finalize documentation against other things that are in mid-stream but I think the exercise needs to take place; that's the essence of an iterative process is that you, you know, bang things back and forth until, you know, both are relatively far along. So that's my 2 cents. Thanks.

Robert Guerra: Great, thanks for that. And, Olivier, I see your hand is up so I just - don't want to spend too much because there's a couple of things that, you know, wanted to go forward because I wanted to try to wrap the call at the top of the hour.

But, I mean, I think it's just working in parallel is something that we need to try to do and it may not be the most efficient way but it should be done in a way that best coordinates the efforts as kind of the approach that I'm taking and we just need to improve that a bit more compared to the way we've been

doing it before. But that's kind of my general view. But you hand your hand up, Olivier, please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks, Robert. It's Olivier speaking. And I agree, working in parallel is fine but we will have to wait for a legal advice from the - for the three different scenarios. And I guess it might come together or it might come at separate timing. But we will have to wait until we get that in order to be able to have a finalized set of scenarios. But of course, starting work on the scenario is fine. And, yeah, that's it. Thank you.

Robert Guerra: Great. That being said so thank you, everyone for your feedback on ways to improve working methods going forward. And I'll try to make sure and (unintelligible) in some of the other discussions to try to improve that going forward and structure our work accordingly.

In regards to the next item that we had, we - planning for ICANN Singapore, I think at the beginning of the call we mentioned possible meetings with others and so I think that's been discussed a little bit before. And we'll try to send everyone an update in regards to that if not by the end of this week by Monday of next week in regards to suggestions.

It would be possibly good on the list but also as folks on this group think it's so worthwhile to have a meeting of the RFP 4 group that we try to structure some time. And so I'd like to ask that, as an item, people please, on the mailing list for RFP 4 please indicate if they are interested in having this specific group meet and if so then we'll have to do a Doodle in regards to a time.

And then in terms wanted to open up if there are other items of business that folks wanted to raise at this moment in time in regards to our meeting. I don't

know if it will be - I just want to maybe get a sense from this group if there's a need to have a meeting before Singapore or not? My sense is that I'd like to have some activity on the list and ready some of the issues in that regards. And I'll raise some of the RFP 4 issues on the other RFP 3 calls that I see as being a bit more important at this time.

But does anyone want to offer any other items for comment or discussion at this moment in time? Seeing no hands up I will then await until Friday if folks think there's a need for this group to meet before Singapore. If not I look forward to seeing some of you in Singapore and then we'll try to plan a meeting immediately after Singapore as well. So thank you, everyone for participating in this call and it's 7 past the hour and see this as closed and look forward to seeing you in the different calls and in Singapore. Thank you so very much. And please stop the recording at this time.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks, Robert. Bye.

END