ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
April 24, 2015
1:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recordings have started. Please go ahead.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi, everyone. This is Grace Abuhamad. Recordings have started. This is the CWG Briefing Webinar. This is the first of two identical webinars. Today the briefing will be led by one of the co-chairs of the CWG, Lise Fuhr. And I will turn it over to her. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Grace. And welcome, everyone, to this briefing regarding the final proposals for the CWG Stewardship. My name is Lise Fuhr, and I'm one of the two co-chairs of the group. My other co-chair, Jonathan Robinson, will be doing the briefing later today at 14:00 UTC. And as Grace said, it's two identical webinars.

There will be transcripts of those webinars, and those will be translated. We also have all documents posted for public comment, and those are being translated as we speak right now. And they will be posted as soon as possible.

You are very welcome to ask questions in the chat, but I ask you to write a queue before you write your question, and I will take those after the presentation. And you can also ask questions and this will also be a possibility after the presentation.

And you can see that Grace has posted all the relevant links to the right in the notes part, so please feel free to cover those and have a look at those. They're also on the ICANN website.

Next slide, please. This is our process. As you know, you might know that in March 2014 NTIA announced that they wanted to transfer the stewardship of the IANA to the global Internet community. And they asked ICANN to go ahead with the process, and this draft, this final proposal is a response to this request. And actually it's the ICG that sent out a request for proposal and asked three communities to give their opinion on how to do this transition.

And those three communities are, as you see on the slide, it's the naming community, that's one, the CWG Stewardship Group, it's the numbering that made the crisp group, and it's the protocol that made IANA plan. And all those three proposals has to go into the coordination group that will collect it and have one proposal sent to ICANN board and NTIA.

Our proposal, the CWG, are the same format as the others from the numbering and the protocol groups, and that is to make easier to compare. So you see the proposal has kind of a short form where you have all the headlines and an overview of what's been done, and then you have a long format with all the annexes, where you can dig into the details and see what it is and what the details are regarding functions like the CSC and others that we'll get into later.

The ITG will send the proposal to the ICANN board, and the ICANN is a stakeholder like everyone else. And the ICANN board has confirmed on the Singapore meeting that they would not alter the ICG proposal, but they will transfer the response to the NTIA.

But it's very important to note here that NTIA has underlined that they will not accept a proposal that doesn't have consensus. So it's important that the stakeholders sign off for this.

Furthermore as you can see on the slide, there's also linkage to the accountability group. And that is because as part of the CWG proposal, the naming community's proposal has parts that need to be dealt with the accountability group.

Next slide, please. What is the goal and what is the scope of the CWG IANA Stewardship Group? Well we'd like to produce a response to the ICG that meets the needs of the naming community. And in the naming community we have the gTLDs and the ccTLDs registries that are direct customers.

Furthermore we need the chartering organizations, those are the ccNSO, the GNSO, the GAC, ALAC and the SSAC, they need to sign off of the proposal. So this is also a very important part of this. And as we mentioned before, the scope is limited to the naming communities only for this particular proposal even though it's going to be merged with other proposals. But other communities worked on theirs and they have sent those to the ICG.

Well the CWG based our scope on the NTIA IANA function contract, where 11 functions are outlined, and we found that nine applied to names. Those are meant - those are the ones that are in black on the slide, and you can see it's ministry function, it's management of the root zone, management of the Whois

database, et cetera. So this was the scope. This was what we had focused on in the proposal that is sent out for public comment.

Next slide, please. And if we look at our timeline, our progress to date, well the CWG, again it's worked in a cover 2014. We are a total of about 150 in the group today. And members don't have a special status in the group. We have members and participants are equal basis in the group. It's only the part about the travel support of course for the meetings, face-to-face meetings in Frankfurt and Istanbul.

Well we have sent out - a first proposal was sent out for public comment in December 2014, and that was sent out in order to meet the timeline that was set by the ICG where they would like to have a first - they would like to have a proposal ready by the end of the January 2015.

Well we got 60 comments on this first draft, and those were analyzed and discussed during an intensive weekend in January. And actually the feedback from this was that the proposed model were - was too complex, it was not detailed enough, so we had to adjust our timeline and prepare for a second draft.

So the group continued to work in order to reach another proposal and to make another proposal, and we had to make a new timeline. So as you see, we've had many calls, many working hours, and many mails. And by having all this, we actually developed a new proposal. But I must say it's very impressive that we have had people being so active participating. And if you add it up, it's a lot of brain power that's been used on this.

Next slide, please. So how did we build our second draft proposal? We find it's important to kind of - to bring you through this journey, because it has

been a journey and it has been very - it's been built on continuous feedback from the group but also from groups from communities. So it's been a long journey for all. I know a lot of people have invested time and made a great effort to make this happen, and as one of the co-chairs I must say we're very impressed by how much effort people have put into this.

But internally we got very diverse input. We had a breadth of views within the CWG and within the broader community groups. We had really analyzed the comments from the first public comment, and on the basis of this, we started to consider additional views and perspectives of what structural variations for the post-transition models could we have. And we aimed for proposing these in Singapore, the ICANN 52 meeting in Singapore.

Well because of this, we had several structural variations that emerged in Singapore, including a hybrid model that combining the external to ICANN model and an internal to ICANN model. And actually as you see on the slide here, we left Singapore with seven models.

Furthermore, we had a lot of feedback on how our focus was in Singapore, so we incorporated this feedback and actually decided to change our working methods by creating agile design teams with a more dedicated focus on the operational aspect, while at the same time we're searching for a legal - a law firm that could give us legal counsel.

So - and from the very beginning, we had a desire for legal counsel early on, but it took some time to sort this out because we would really like to have a company that we knew would understand our world and understand the multi-stakeholder model, understand that it was nonprofit, and understand how to work with a group that's working like the CWG has been doing.

So we created a small client committee that was - that consisted of the two co-chairs, and we had two lawyers, Greg Shatan and (Martin Firman). All the meetings with the client committees has been recorded and transcripted (sic), so everyone has - it's been open and transparent, what's been going on in the group.

And by the 6th of March we retained Sidley Austin for legal consultation and structural discussions. This is the same legal company that the CCWG accountability group has entered with, and while Sidley as assisted our group with more than typical legal input, it's been a conversation with the client committee and also with the group as a whole. They were attending the Istanbul meeting and they have been attending our calls. So actually it's been a very active dialogue and a very responsive partner for the CWG.

Well in March in Istanbul we managed - the group managed to converge on two structural variations with assistance from Sidley, and we had some very constructive conversations regarding the two variations. And actually we called it, it was the internal hybrid model but it's been developed, so no model - it just stayed the same. But we've been very impressed by the willingness of the CCWG to compromise and work hard for a solution that was agreeable for all. It's a multi-stakeholder model when it works at the best. So it's been very constructive dialogue.

So now we have reached April, and because of this very good path of moving forward, well we have reached a goal of sending out a draft for public comments and we're going into the public comment with one structural proposal. This was concluded over two intensive working days, where we had two-hour meetings three times every day. Again, well lots of hard work and compromise from the group, and it's been great to see that we were able to

have calls and actually move forward with the group in a way that accomplished. This has been very impressive.

Next slide, please. As I mentioned before, we have a linkage and dependency with the CCWG. On this slide you can see the more structural dependencies. Well we have our ICG group and there is the CCWG accountability group, and we're a conditional on each other's work. Well why is this?

Well the CWG has a more, a special more direct link to ICG than the other groups because ICANN is the policy body for domain names as well as the current IANA functions operator. And the chairs acknowledged this dependency early on, so we started to coordinate with the CCWG as soon as the accountability group got started.

And since the accountability group had its first meeting on the 8th of December, well the first coordination call between the chairs was on the 12th of December. And by then our first draft was out for public comment, but this draft has been going - has had very closely coordination and updating of the two groups. So instead of doing double work, we have worked hard, the chairs from the CWG and the CCWG, to communicate and actually coordinate our work.

And we continue to do so. We have weekly coordination calls. Furthermore not to get too indulged into our own models, we have asked the legal advisors also to help us in identifying issues that are dependent on the work of the CCWG.

Next slide, please. As you see on this slide, there is a linkage in coordination and we have raised four areas for the accountability group. One is the ICANN budget. That is to ensure that the IANA functions are adequately funded but -

and the community can review the budget and it should have a level of detail, so there - it's possible to review what is - what the budget is being used for.

So we have sent in that the comprehensive cost should be transparent and there should be a minimum of itemization of all IANA operations costs down to project level. Furthermore, the CWG will actually submit those two recommendations for the current fiscal year '16 ICANN budget public comment, because we thought it's good to post this recommendation as early as possible.

Furthermore, we have some areas on community empowerment mechanisms where it's important that when the IANA review function that you will see later makes a recommendation to the ICANN board, it has to consider this recommendation seriously. If they don't do this, there needs to be a mechanism that gives the community a possibility to take action.

The third one is the review and redress mechanism, where we're recommending that the IANA review function is incorporated in the fundamental bylaws of ICANN. Number four is a different one, because that's appeal mechanism with focus on delegation, re-delegation for the ccTLD. And actually there was a design team that made a ccTLD survey on this specific issue, and it was concluded that the CWG work is not needed in order to create an appeal mechanism for the ccTLDs only.

The ccTLD community wanted to have this dealt with in the ccNSO community together with the framework of interpretation report that's been made. And - so this is an issue that's been dealt with later for the ccTLDs, but it's important to note that the gTLDs are still interested in having an appeal mechanism.

The CWG will continue to work with the accountability group on these issues, and we have over 70 individuals that overlaps those members, and we have a member, Cheryl, who's also very active in the stress test as the accountability group. And this has a direct link to stress test of some of our areas here. So there is a natural coordination and there is a coordination between the chairs.

Next slide, please. On this slide you can see the different design teams and their status. We had 15 design teams that were proposed. There were different priorities. Those were set by the co-chairs, and those were set in order to manage the workloads. We tried to only have three working at a time. That didn't really succeed on that, but we succeeded in getting most of this finalized.

And as you see, the primary focus was on the operational parts of the proposal, and the initial work of this was completed for discussion in Istanbul. And we finalized during the groups during the intensive meetings in April. And we had a lot of design teams that were linked or dependent on each other, so those also had to work together and have calls on - cross-design team calls.

Many of those design teams have received expert input and consultation from individuals external to the CWG stewardship, including from top level domain managers, NTIA staff, ICANN's IANA department staff, the CTO of ICANN, and the CFO. And the law firm Sidley Austin has also been very active in those groups. We're still working on DTA -- that's the IANA server level expectations -- on an agreement from this. But the drafts are available on the wiki.

We have six design teams that were addressed elsewhere or changed to be committees as the whole CWG team. As you see, the red team was more a combination of do we meet the NTIA recommendations, what are the

recommendations from SSAC, and kind of a stress test of are we doing this in a way that ensures the stability and security of the IANA function.

So we have, as you see, most of these are finalized. We furthermore have the relationship between the NTIA and IANA root zone maintainer. That's also in progress, but we are - we have put the headlines in the draft proposal.

Next slide, please. This is the actual model that we're proposing. You can see the left side of the slide shows a current status with the NTIA, and the right side is the proposed future status from the CWG proposal. Well it's important to view this why this is a symbolic presentation of the fact the proposed transition of IANA functions it's a legally separated entity, but it's a wholly owned subsidiary of ICANN as an affiliate.

Someone hasn't muted their mic.

As you see we proposed this separate - legal separation, but we think it should have an internal lightweight board. So it's important to underline the IANA functions space within ICANN. And this structure is important, but the detail's also very important and the detail is in the proposal and in the annexes.

On the first public comment, well we received the following premise for our work, and that was the customers were satisfied with the IANA function and with the IANA function staying within ICANN. So these - we have tried to actually draft a proposal from this premise.

But the advantage of having this legal separated entity is that it's impossible to have an actual contract between ICANN and IANA. And furthermore it (unintelligible) the IANA function in case of a future separation. Furthermore

this model suggests that we have a CSC, that's a customer standing committee.

And the customer standing committee is mostly a technical committee. It's proposed to be from the direct customers. It's two gTLDs, two ccTLDs, and liaisons from IANA and IAB. These should handle the day-to-day performance of IANA. They can escalate through the accountability mechanisms, and also the CSC can trigger a special review. But mostly this is day to day. It's overlooking the SLAs as being following, looking at the data and seeing that IANA meets the contract.

Then we propose an IANA functions review, and that has two functions. One is to have periodic reviews, where we envision the first one as being done after two years after the transition. Then we think it should be every fifth year, because you don't want to do those huge reviews too often.

But this is important to note that there is special reviews possible when needed. So it's not limited its scope or span of review, and it's not - and the outcome of a review could be a recommendation for separation.

So this review functions report goes directly to the ICANN board, and as we say this is ensured - how this is treated is ensured by the accountability mechanisms that the accountability group's going to work out for us in a bylaw. So it's very clear that part of our new structure is very reliant on any output from the CCWG. So that's why we have tried to make any proposal conditional on these outputs coming from the CCWG.

We have focused - the CWG has focused on the continuity and the stability of the operations, and that is why we think that any separation would only be needed in the case of an extreme and absolutely as a last resort when other

possibilities and options have been exhausted. So this is a structure that also the separation but it's hopefully never going to happen. But it is a possibility.

Next slide, please. Well what is the road ahead? We've made very good progress in just six months, and we still have some details that we're working on. And we will continue to work on these. So we can have a delivery of the final proposal to the ICG in June 2015.

So between now and then there is still some milestones that we need to achieve. One is of course that we need to analyze the public comments that we receive during the next 28 days. We need to finalize some details of the proposal. And we need to submit it to the chartering organizations for their approval.

So as you see, we posted this on the 22nd of April. We closed the public comment on the 20th of May. And we hope to deliver a proposal for the SOs and ACs on 8th of June in order to have this delivered after the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires for the 25th of June deliver a proposal to the ICG.

So during the public comment, we will continue to assess what implications are on the proposed post-transition structure. So that's section four of the request for proposal that was sent to us from the ICG. And we will analyze the fulfillment of the NTIA requirements. That's section five.

So these are - has been started but we need to get into the details and do a thorough analysis of this, and this is work that we're continuing to do during the public comment. We also continue to work with the CCWG to ensure that all the dependencies are adequately developed from that group.

Furthermore, we also like to encourage as many as possible to submit comments and encourage the different communities to present this proposal for their groups and actually encourage people to submit comments because it's important.

And well how can you submit any feedback? Well there has been developed a template to facilitate this input. It's a template that will make it easier for us, the CWG, to compare comments. So it would be nice if the different comments could be submitted in this template. It's not mandatory, but it's strongly encouraged that you use that template.

And it will allow for general input, specific comments per section as well. So it's a template that can help us and maybe help you to respond in a structured way, so. You can save the document in this template, so it's not a thing that's submitted online. You have to save it and then submit it as an attachment, so.

And as I said in the beginning, we actually have when you go through proposal we have a short one that has focused on the headline and an overview of the different function, and then we have a long one where we have all the annexes that describe in more details the work from the different design teams and on parts that's been developed in the whole group.

So this was a quick briefing on the model. I don't know if anyone has a question they'd like to ask or comments. You can put them in the chat. So the floor is open for questions, comments. We can go back to Slide 8 maybe to see the actual model, Grace. If you have questions for this. And you can do so by raising your hand or type it in the chat.

I see there's a question from (Jenton)Jian-Chuan Chang.

(Jenton)Jian-Chuan Chang: Yes this is (Jenton)Jian-Chuan Chang from (unintelligible). Could you turn to Page 9 about the internal comprehensive model? Okay here we go. Originally ICANN got a contract from NTIA, so I just wonder post-transition there is still contact there, but who should be entered this contract? Because NTIA is just gone. So who is the contract with ICANN in the PPI?

Lise Fuhr: Well thank you for the question. It's actually envisioned that now the contract becomes an internal contact between ICANN and the IANA board. But having this contract, it's being overlooked by the CSC. The customer standing committee is going to be the - well will be looking out if IANA fulfills the different conditions and the contract.

                 And you'll also have the IANA functions review that would do periodic reviews of do they fulfill the contract. So this is not normal internal contract between two parties, it's a contract that has an oversight from the CSC and the IFR, the function review.

(Jenton)Jian-Chuan Chang: Okay thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. And I see a question in the chat saying, "Could you explain again the makeup of the PTI? Did you say a wholly owned subsidiary of ICANN? Will the board members of the PTI be a subset of the ICANN board or independent?" That's (Susan Payne) who asked this.

                 Well it's not concluded, but it's envisioned that it's an internal board. It doesn't need to be a subset of the ICANN board, it's more to be employees of ICANN. So it's not envisioned to be ICANN board members, it's more to be ICANN staff.

                 And I see a question from (Peter)Peter (unintelligible). (Peter)Peter, go ahead.

(Peter):Peter Van Roste: Thank you, Lise. Would it be possible to give an overview of all the areas in the proposal where work from the CCWG accountability is essential to complete this proposal?

Lise Fuhr: Well part of this was actually done by the areas, but we need the accountability group for the escalations of the CSC and also for the IANA functions review. So these two areas are very important. Those are process accountability mechanisms where if you escalate something we need something to happen further above.

Then you have the budget where we need - we know that the accountability group are working on budget as part of this too. They have - they're working on - it will be a possibility to not reject the budget but send it back to a revision to the ICANN board. And we think it's important that this is also a part of our - our budget is a part of this.

And I see two questions. "Is PTI going to be a separate legal entity?" Yes, the intention is that you have a separate legal entity, but it's wholly owned by ICANN, so it can stay within ICANN and - but you have a legal separation, as we call it.

And (Steven) asked me if I'm proposing that ICANN staff compose the board of PTI. I was actually - no I'm not proposing that they should be. It's a possibility. It's a possibility that some staff can be. It's also a possibility that ICANN board members can be. It's not been concluded yet, so it's still an open issue, and the details need to be concluded on this.

What we think is very important is that you don't create - if you create a board that consists of too many parties, you open up for a new accountability

problems. So we want to have a lightweight and within the accountability measures that we have today.

Any other questions? Does a broader recall and IP functions would also be separated from ICANN and into the PTI? Well actually we're proposing that the post-transition IANA is legally separated, and that means that we're - that could affect the numbering and protocol communities. But it's not - it would only affect that it will - they have their contract with ICANN, and ICANN then needs to have another contract with IANA regarding work for those communities.

And I must say, I say this as I'm not completely sure on how we work with this, but there doesn't seem to be an obvious barrier or constraint in this structure to what the other communities and their proposals, so.

A new question from (Jenton)Jian-Chuan Chang, or is that a hand from earlier?

(Jenton)Jian-Chuan Chang: I think (Julie) comes earlier than me. Go ahead, (Julie).

Lise Fuhr: Okay. So (Julie), thank you. It seems that the CWG is very different from the other two communities about setting up a new entity and several Americanisms. Will (unintelligible) deal with the inconsistency or would the CWG try to sell this concept to the other two communities?

Actually I think it has been our aim not to make a proposal that would do anything to hinder the other communities, but it's up to the ICG to connect these proposals and make them work. And if there's any problems, we hope that they will highlight this as early possible for us. We don't find that there's any, well, constraints in this towards the other, and we know we have people

that are with ICG in this group in our group. So we would think that if there were any trouble, we have heard.

Does - okay. Now we're up to your question, ~~(Jenton)~~Jian-Chuan Chang.

~~(Jenton)~~Jian-Chuan Chang: Yes, yes fine.

((Crosstalk))

~~(Jenton)~~Jian-Chuan Chang: ...because the CWG and the CCWG are working in a parallel way, so I just wonder what will happen if CCWG is not ready to submit their proposal by June 25th? Because that's the ICG is going to submit the final proposal.

Lise Fuhr: Yes I think that's a very good question. But actually we have tried to envision and draw out as much as we could of dependency, so. I think it's up to the chartering organizations if they would decide on that they can't go on if they don't have the accountability mechanisms proposal at the same time.

And yes. Any other questions? I see - it doesn't seem like it. You're very welcome to ask questions. Yes, Jonathan, go ahead. Jonathan, I can't hear you.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi, Lise. Good morning, Lise. I'm sorry I was - my audio wasn't connected. Just a follow up on that relationship with the CCWG. We will continue to work closely with CCWG. And in terms of our - we are dependent and we are - our work is very closely linked, but it doesn't mean the timelines have to match exactly.

One of the really important things we're going to have to make sure over the next - over the period in the run up to June and towards the end of June is to

make our best effort to work closely with them and ensure that we very clearly articulate our dependencies and make sure that we are confident those are enshrined in the work of the CCWG. So our timelines don't have to match exactly for us to be able to depend on that work completely. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Jonathan.

Man: So yes, Lise, I'm just wondering on whether NTIA has any timeline to give response to the community after they receive the final proposal?

Lise Fuhr: Well to my knowledge we don't have any timeline on that. The only timeline we have from the NTIA is that we know that the contract with the IANA is due to end in September. But it has also been said that if that timeline was met, there is a possibility of prolonging the contract. But I think most of us would like to have this concluded, and I think that the - well the feedback from NTIA is we don't have - I don't have any. I don't know if you have, Jonathan. Go ahead, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Lise. I didn't -- it's Jonathan Robinson -- I didn't want to interrupt on that point. I think - but I agree with, we don't have an indication of the NTIA's timeline. We've had to work to our timeline to make best efforts to get things done in - as rapidly as possible, and we make the submission, and then the ball is their court, so to speak.

I wanted to respond to (Julie)'s question in the chat about, you know, how different or similar or compatible these proposals are. We've done two things to try and make sure this proposal is compatible with that of the other communities.

First of all, we have made it in a format which is directly comparable. So that is one of the reasons for preparing short format proposal so that it can be set alongside those shorter proposals and compared quite readily. However we also knew if we kept it that short, given that the detail that had been discussed within the CWG we ran the risk of people saying it wasn't sufficiently detailed enough. And in fact that was one of the comments we received in the first round of public comments.

So we tried to make that balance between making a proposal that was directly comparable in both size and format, yet also contains sufficient detail for those were interested in the detail. Moreover, I think it's true to say that it's the belief of the co-chairs, Lise and myself, that we haven't proposed anything which materially impacts on the proposals of the other communities. We have made best efforts to not, for want of a better word, interfere with their existing relationships with ICANN.

There may be some minor changes required as a result of this structure, but we don't think there are necessarily any significant changes in the way in which they work with IANA and the other two proposals or we don't believe they are significantly impacted by this proposal.

And that's been a key part of our thinking, that it's not our prerogative to do that and to the extent that we could, our intension has to have been to make the work of the ICG less difficult or as possible as it could be, because we were mindful of Patrick's point that if we didn't and there were serious incompatibilities or issues, it would come back to us and it would slow the whole process down.

But to the extent that we can, we've attempted to make our proposal comparable and intergratable with those of the other communities without compromising the independent thought that's gone into this proposal. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Jonathan. Okay. Any other questions? Did I miss anyone in the chat? No. Okay, Olivier, go ahead?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much. It's Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. I - I'm going to ask this question just to generate further debate of discussion perhaps. There has been a part of the request from NTIA was mentioning the world's multi-stakeholder and to basically say there needs to be a (unintelligible) from the multi-stakeholder community. Could you identify in the post-transition model where that multi-stakeholder component would have any kind of oversight or involvement? Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Olivier. Well that's a very good question, but some - part of it actually going to be within the accountability mechanisms where if there is any problems, you send it out there. You would also have the - I know that the CSC is mostly direct customers, so it's not aimed for being multi-stakeholder, but. The review team is a part where we could have some of this.

                But I need you to elaborate a little more on the multi-stakeholder, because part of this is also, in my opinion, how we envision this structure. So the aim was to have a multi-stakeholder process in making the actual proposal. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Lise, I think I would in some ways reiterate your point. This is - IANA clearly provides a service to the operational communities. To that extent, this is - this proposal is designed to be that the operational communities take that service and have oversight of that service through the CSC in naming.

However, there is a - this periodic review built in, as you noted, which will take place in the first instance after two years and every five years thereafter, and on special occasions, should it be required. And there I multi-stakeholder involvement through that, through the IANA function review, which is very important. It's broader than simply the operating communities.

And then in addition, the IANA function is envisaged by this proposal to sit within and contracted to ICANN. And as we know, ICANN has significant multi-stakeholder involvement and input and participation. And then as you pointed out, the overarching accountability mechanisms where it is envisaged by the CCWG that there will be an empowered community with full multi-stakeholder participation that has ultimate oversight of the ICANN function itself.

So it is in my mind there is a great deal of opportunity for multi-stakeholder input and oversight, and this is something the group has been mindful of and participants such as - or contributors such as Olivier have been very helpful in keeping us on track about. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you for really iterating, Jonathan. That was good. Yes and I can see that Patrick is mentioning there is process and there's also the solution that needs to be multi-stakeholder. And thank you for the question, Olivier.

Any other questions or remarks on this? Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much, Lise. Olivier again. And I've got another question which I think hasn't been touched on, and that's the stress testing. There was a significant component of - in the request from NTIA that the solution should be stress tested. I don't see in the diagram here or in the

process how will these - because I'm not quite sure the stress testing has done, but I understand that it's in the accountability thread, how will that feed back into this?

Lise Fuhr: Well thank you, Olivier, for asking that question too. Well I think in the red team we discussed as part of our stress test, and the section four, the RPF4 is actually the implication. We are not calling them stress tests, we're calling them something else. But I find that the implication and also that we have to align with the recommendations in the SSAC I think it's a fine document, is our kind of stress test.

And furthermore we have the accountability group that looks at stress test, where we have Cheryl doing this. So I think we are broadly doing this. It's not in the Slide 8, it's actually what we discussed that we're working during the public comment period on issues. And some of these issues are RFP4 and RFP5, where one is the implications and the other one is do we meet the NTIA requirements. So it's - I think it's because we call them differently and we will be doing this.

And yes, any other questions? It doesn't look like it. Well if you don't have any other questions, I won't let you sit here for 23 minutes. I will thank you all for participating in this webinar and it's been very helpful to have the questions from you. It's very good to have this as a kind of early feedback from the community.

So I think it's been good, and I hope you've had a - you got an overview of the proposal and I will urge you all to submit any comments to it, and use the template if can. That would be a great help for us. So thank you for participating and have a nice day, evening, morning, wherever you are. Bye.

END