

IANA CWG Meeting #6 (13 November)

Attendees:

Members: Wanawit Ahkuputra; Jaap Akkerhuis; Donna Austin; Fouad Bajwa; Graeme Bunton; Olivier Crepin-Leblond; Eduardo Diaz; Avri Doria; Lise Fuhr; Robert Guerra; Erick Iriarte; Staffan Jonson; Elise Lindeberg; Vika Mpisane; Greg Shatan

Participants: Wale Bakare; Mark Carvell; Stephanie Duchesneau; Amr Elsadr; Lars-Erik Forsberg; Tomohiro Fujisaki; Chuck Gomes; Alan Greenberg; Tony Holmes; Stacey King; Yasuichi Kitamura; Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen; Cheryl Langdon-Orr; Yrjo Lansipuro; Allan MacGillivray; Camino Manjon-Sierra; Plamena Popova; Kurt Pritz; Matthew Shears; Mary Uduma; Peter Van Roste; Jiankang Yao

Staff: Grace Abuhamad; Bart Boswinkel; Berry Cobb; Marika Konings; Bernard Turcotte

Apologies: Martin Boyle; Phil Corwin; Desiree Miloshevic; Seun Odejeji; Jonathan Robinson

***Please let Grace know if your name has been left off the list (attendees or apologies). ***

Proposed Agenda:

1. Welcome & Roll Call
2. Notes from last meeting, review of action items and project plan
3. Status on work – subgroups
 - Subgroup 1, 2A, 2B
 - Subgroup 2C
 - Subgroup 3
4. Update on F2F meeting agenda
5. Any other business
6. Summary of action items and agreed items

Notes & Action Items

1. Welcome & Roll call

Reminder expected standard of behavior send by email by co-chair

2. Notes from last meeting and action items

- RFP 3 rapporteur appointed (Greg Shatan)
- Open item Rapporteurs RFP 4 and 5 to be appointed before F2F
- Lise to review Principles document and send out to the list before F2F meeting
- Review of Project plan
 - Critical path: RFP 3, RFP 4,
 - 11 Business days to open public comment period!
 - Berry to include legends on icons in next version

3. Status on Work- updates

3.1 Subgroup 1, 2A and 2 B (rapporteur Chuck Gomes)

- Easy to identify comments and edits
- All review comments and edits made. RFP 1 and 2A
- RFP 2B: all if comments put in redline in document
- Section 1 includes reference to IANA Functions Contract. References questions ICG RFP

3.2 Subgroup 2 C (rapporteur Allan MacGillivray)

- Triage IANA Functions Contract): Focus is on issues that may be important for proposal provisions that likely to need to be retained
- Issues document:
 - Allan to do mapping between RFP 2B and RFP 2 C (second document)
 - Note email to list from Robert Guerra, about exemption NTIA re root zone arrangement from OFAC
 - Issue may vary, depending on jurisdiction under which oversight committee functions
 - How to deal with RFC 2 C, should be included in proposal? Due diligence to check whether issues are covered off in proposal, not part of the proposal itself (CWG paper)

3.3 Subgroup 3 (rapporteur Greg Shatan)

- RFP 3 two calls, 3 straw man proposals, all "proposal" follow same structure, View vertical (flow) /elements and horizontal. Horizontal view: interchangeability of proposed elements. No intention to limit as such
- Matrix document and individual strawman has been posted in Google document
- All: look at Google document and add contributions in Matrix and Individual strawman docs
- Greg to consult with staff on how to include contributions on list in documents
- Greg to post email on RFP 3 elements to email list to solicit reaction
- Two additional pieces that need to be considered, How elements in RFP 2B and 2C will be replaced in proposal
- Question: Could this be turned in Google sheets (not DOCS)? in order to add columns, easier to add comments and suggestions
- Need to consolidating quickly to meet timelines, and focus on converging alternatives
- Need to include documents in chat in documents re RFP 3
- RFP 4 group will need to start writing process> RFP 4 requested to start its work asap

4. Update on F2F meeting

- Explanation of agenda
- Timeliness will be kept strictly in order to remote participation changes to agenda to communicated on line as well to assist remote participants
- Suggestion of professional facilitators: Short amount of time to organize properly, no facilitator better then bad facilitator. No consensus around idea. With clear objective of single proposal goal of meeting is very clear.

5. AOB

Call ending 1h in advance. Greg suggestion to use remainder of time on RFP 3 – Lise accepts this suggestion but asks for reading of summary of actions and agreed items before turning the floor over to Greg.

6. Summary of actions and agreed items

- Rapporteurs RFP 4 and 5 to be appointed before F2F
- Lise to review Principles document and send out to the list before F2F meeting
- Berry to include legends on icons in next version
- All review comments and edits made. RFP 1 and RFP 2A.
- Allan to do mapping between RFP 2B and RFP 2 C (second document)
- All: look at Google document and add contributions in Matrix and Individual strawman docs
- Greg to consult with staff on how to include contributions on list in documents
- Staff to check whether Google sheets could be used for matrix document.
- Greg to post email on RFP 3 elements to email list to solicit reaction
- RFP 4 requested to start its work asap

Reconvening RFP 3 (15.30 UTC)

Continuation of discussion RFP 3

Please see the recording and transcript to review this session.

Chaired by Greg Shatan

Take live edits in documents (Grace)

- Could other options be considered, how to reduce the number of alternatives
- Any alternative is up for discussion
- Reiteration of elements in Matrix
- Comments of current participants
- Put in comments something around participation of SO/AC's in committee
- Why should there be an external oversight, with external independent IANA? Avoid to create two independent bodies.
- comments on Legal Status
- Jurisdiction is not part of discussion, Incorporated or non-incorporated, -> liability of participants in committee
- What is composition of committee?

- How will security and stability interests will be build into oversight body? Checks and balances in group makes feel more comfortable.
- Security and stability role of ICANN, no change as result of strawman 2 & 3?
- Robert Guerra to send note on element to the group
- Possibly IANA security and stability. To date no role IANA security and stability , if no change in role -> no need to include.
- Need to understand the consequence of proposal, before taken definite point.
- Note if policy is not in interest of registries, limiting oversight only to registries counterproductive
- Documentation to replace NTIA Contract
- Reiteration what is in the matrix
- No time to build contract, term sheet should be possible
- How will naming Proposal be matched with other proposal going to be matched and by whom
- Need by group to check feasibility of matching proposals. CWG members are encouraged to look at other proposals.
- All, continue work on Matrix document in Google docs and Pro's Con's doc
- Call closed at 16:00 UTC
- NOTE: changes should be made in suggestion mode and by person (not anonymous)

Transcript

The transcript is available here: [Meeting6_13Nov.doc](#)

AR: [Meeting6_13Nov-ar.docx](#)

ES: [Meeting6_13Nov-es.doc](#)

FR: [Meeting6_13Nov-fr.doc](#)

PT: [Meeting6_13Nov-pt.doc](#)

RU: [Meeting6_13Nov-ru.docx](#)

ZH: [Meeting6_13Nov-ZH.doc](#)

Recording

The Adobe Connect recording is available here: <https://icann.adobeconnect.com/p7em3cl2qse/>

The audio recording is available here: <https://icann.box.com/shared/static/kqne0frpt0wi5m46590q.mp3>

Documents Presented

[CWG-Stewardship Project Plan](#)

[IANA CWG RFP Section 1 Proposal Version 2 - 12 Nov 14 Redline.docx](#)

[CWG-RFP2A-10NOVEDITS-RedLine.docx](#)

[CWG-RFP2B Proposal 10 Nov 14.docx](#)

[REVISED TRIAGE OF IANA FUNCTIONS CONTRACT - CLEAN.docx](#)

[ISSUE FLOWING FROM IANA FUNCTIONS CONTRACT Nov 12.docx](#)

[Strawman Matrix.docx](#)

Chat Transcript

Marika Konings:Welcome to the IANA Stewardship Transition CWG meeting of 13 November 2014

Eduardo Diaz - (ALAC):I will be in an out of the adobe connect but will be connected all the time through the telephone bridge

Robert Guerra:I'll be calling via the telephone bridge as well. waiting a bit to call in..

Bernard Turcotte - staff [support:good](#)

Wale Bakare:My participation in today's call will be now till 1440, then back at about 1515

Yasuichi Kitamura (At-Large):hi, all

Bernard Turcotte - staff support:Jaap go on mute

Matthew Shears (CDT):hello!

jaap akkerhuis SSAC:Bernie, I just did.

Wale Bakare:Hi all

Grace Abuhamad:@Jaap I muted your AC line

Matthew Shears (CDT):has there been an updated principles doc that reflects the latest proposed changes on the list?

Greg Shatan (IPC/CSG/GNSO):Good morning/afternoon/evening, all!

Staffan Jonson:Good afternoon all

Mary Uduma:I will participate till 1400hours only as I am on a journey.

Allan MacGillivray (.ca):Good morning/afternoon everyone

Graeme Bunton - RrSG:Good morning all.

erick iriarte:good morning to all

Grace Abuhamad:You have scroll control on the document

Stephanie Duchesneau:@ matthew - i had proposed a redline to the principles document, but i do not believe that subsequent discussions on separability and stacey's suggestion regarding redress have been incorporated into a draft

Bernard Turcotte - staff support:I believe Martin Boy is looking at those

Bernard Turcotte - staff support:Boyle

Matthew Shears (CDT):@ stephanie - thanks

Lise Fuhr:@Stephanie Duchesneau I will send out a revised document with the comments included.

Stephanie Duchesneau:thank you lise

Robert Guerra:question - is there a need to have OFAC licenses mentioned in the ccTLD section. right now that is held by NTIA/commerce.

Grace Abuhamad:Now that's Chuck's presentation is over, I've given you all scroll control

Robert Guerra:thanks chuck!

Robert Guerra:music?

Donna Austin, RySG:Allan, not sure .int is necessarily a GAC issue. If we do not think it is relevant to this discussion I suggest we leave it to others to sort out.

Greg Shatan (IPC/CSG/GNSO):Need to identify the IPR in question. Most USG contracts have the USG owning the IPR.

Wale Bakare:That's seems a very important aspect - NTIA (replacement with a new entity) and Verisign

Elise Lindeberg - GAC:.int has already Dona - .int has already been sent to the GAC as relevant to look into, and forwarder to me and Wanawit. It's relevant for the GAC to have safeguards for the continuation of the .int policy and practise - it's exclusively for intergovernmental organisations

Robert Guerra:a couple of links of interest regarding OFAC -

Robert Guerra:<http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/sanctions/Pages/licensing.aspx>

Robert Guerra:http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Office_of_Foreign_Assets_Control

Donna Austin, RySG:Elise, perhaps this is a conversation to have offline, but I'd be interested to understand the context in which .int has been sent to the GAC.

Robert Guerra:there are OFAC equivalents for other countries ..

Avri Doria:the # oversight strawman still need another strawman added. the one with no fixed oversight mechanism

Grace Abuhamad:@Avri do you have link to Google Doc so that you can edit?

Avri Doria:i don't know. so i have it?

Grace Abuhamad:Yes, let me re-post in chat

Grace Abuhamad:Strawman 1 Pros/Cons: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1IVs0kGklkPvm9c-pjMtlDnc5paYJxtVN6zjhViWvyHQ/edit?usp=sharing>
Strawman 2 Pros/Cons: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1gIQ81lqZ-bdh2PmQ5DRfzqdWla-WZ3b9j-l4pi5kc4/edit?usp=sharing>
Strawman 3 Pros/Cons: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1KD864oZXnxLDeLyMRgoCGhxYwFd2cKgRmkauBCXNk_s/edit?usp=sharing Matrix: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1kO8dtSdkTnH79FSUsxA8KmPv1O2IfYwYFm2k_CloNmW/edit?usp=sharing

Grace Abuhamad:4 documents. Matrix is at the end

Avri Doria:but that does not include strawman 4 - the minimalist option.

Elise Lindeberg - GAC:Dona - it hasn't been "sent to the GAC" - sorry for that. It has caught the attention of the GAC chairs and Wanawit and me as something that the GAC have interest in

Grace Abuhamad:@Avri -- right. I meant to suggest that you could add that option :)

Avri Doria:so we can add a column?

Grace Abuhamad:yes

Matthew Shears (CDT):I think it would be useful to add new strawmen rather than overly edit the existing ones that way we can see the range of options

Wale Bakare:Out for a brief, back at few minutes past 1500hours

Avri Doria:it is not letting me add a column for the minimalist trust option.

Stephanie Duchesneau:perhaps we could convert this to a sheet and not a word document - it is much easier to insert new options

Robert Guerra:Agree with Matthew+Avri that we might want a 4th proposal that picks elements (or not) from the other 3.

Avri Doria:that is what I have been unsuccessful asking for. a 4th column.

Matthew Shears (CDT):we should not be surprised if there are additional proposals submitted in the next few days that may or may not draw on elements of the existing strawmen

Avri Doria:oh, these are docs in drive, not drive docs. so no simultaneous editing.

Avri Doria:bummer. why use drive in that case. the wiki is just as versatile as word in drive.

Chuck Gomes (RySG, Verisign):@ Allan: I agree that we need to try to start zeroing in a possible consensus direction but until we get to that point we need to be careful about restricting contributions.

Donna Austin, RySG:I agree Chuck, we should not feel constrained by a timeline.

Avri Doria:i don't know i have making point since the beginning that i have not seen included.

Matthew Shears (CDT):+ 1 Chuck

Grace Abuhamad:@avri, maybe you converted them incorrectly. Do you want me to create the same document in Google Docs directly? I thought doing a Google docs conversion would be sufficient

Avri Doria:i can deal with the document any way it is served up.

Avri Doria:i was just noting that a word doc in drive was self defeating.

Chuck Gomes (RySG, Verisign):@ Lise: Do we need a rapporteur/coordinator for Subgroup 5 now?

Grace Abuhamad:All times are in local time

Grace Abuhamad:I will send out an agenda in UTC for the group

Robert Guerra:allan - great idea.

Donna Austin, RySG:agree with Greg on facilitator

Staffan Jonson:Allan: even though I like the idea, I wouldn't hold my breath that we're ready for that just then. I hope we are, but what if we aren't

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:Greg is completely correct- any facilitator would need to know the topic inside out and unfortunately no professional facilitator that I know of does.

Avri Doria:not only subject matter, but they all come in with their own idea of what the collaborative culture should be like.

Lise Fuhr:@Chuck yes and no - things need to move fast and we need someone to be ready to coordinate

Avri Doria:a bad facilitation can take us down the wrong road and leave us stranded in a culdesac

Mark Carvell, UK Government:Agree with Allan to have a clear objective stated of a single proposal. More important for achieving that is the Chair and Secretariat- not sure facilitator would add much in keeping the process for the day on track.

Allan MacGillivray (.ca):I agree with Greg, that no facilitator is better than a bad facilitator.

Graeme Bunton - RrSG:the PPSIA WG used someone from the ICANN community (in this case Thomas Rickert) to help facilitate a f2f meeting in LA. We generally found that to be useful.

Staffan Jonson:But I also agree with Mark and Allan: "Agree with Allan to have a clear objective stated of a single proposal. "

Matthew Shears (CDT):difficult to get a facilitator up to speed...

Avri Doria:have another meeting

Allan MacGillivray (.ca):Greg - great idea!

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:+1 Greg - let's make sure we use all available time

Stacey King, GNSO:Apologies all. I need to drop off to get the kids to school! Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:I need to leave next meeting looms

Amr Elsadr:Apologies about being late. I had another ICANN call I needed to be on.

Avri Doria:Continuing 3 now is not a great idea.

Grace Abuhamad:@Amr -- so many calls at ICANN!

Avri Doria:this meeting was already double boooked.

Amr Elsadr:@Grace: Yes. Life is good!! ;-)

Greg Shatan (IPC/CSG/GNSO):I have revised the Strawman Matrix to add a column for Strawman 4..

Avri Doria:so befoe we even have time to create o4, we are going to go further discussing 103.

Grace Abuhamad:@Greg do you want me to load Google Docs?

Avri Doria:...1-3

Greg Shatan (IPC/CSG/GNSO):@Grace: yes.

Avri Doria:hey, if discussing 3 option is the way to get consensus go for it.

Avri Doria:i sitll oject to going into an RP#, but what the heck.

Robert Guerra:can you please share the URL here as well. thank you

Matthew Shears (CDT):discussion should not preclude other options going into next week

Grace Abuhamad:https://docs.google.com/document/d/1kO8dtSdkTnH79FSUsxA8KmPv1O2IfYwYFm2k_CloNMw/edit

Robert Guerra:thank you grace

Avri Doria:i am joining another call now.

Mark Carvell, UK Government:I think it would be helpful for the community, observers and the wider audience (includign UN and its agencies) for the meeting Chair to issue a statement about progress of the CWG's work - a kind of short interim report which would allay fears that there might not be substantial progress being achieved.

Grace Abuhamad:@Mark that's a good idea. Something to address with the Chairs

Matthew Shears (CDT):agree strawman 4 is a separate option rather than a composite

Guru Acharya:@Greg: What is the purpose of a new entity for oversight in Strawman 3. Cant the oversight mechanism reside inside ICANN as an internal committee? This would avoid need for funding/jurisdiction for the oversight body. The governing documents (SLA etc) can be between ICANN and the new IANA entity.

Guru Acharya:sorry. i didnt mean governing documents. i meant documentation to replace ntia contract

Amr Elsadr:@Guru: I believe this is what is being suggested in strawman 1.

Guru Acharya:in strawman 1 there is no new IANA entity.

Guru Acharya:in strawman 3, we are creating a new entity for iana

Guru Acharya:the names community is different from iana

Guru Acharya:structurally separate

Matthew Shears (CDT):its a bout degrees of separabilty and/or separation

Amr Elsadr:@Guru: Yes. That is correct. In SM1, there is no new IANA entity, but the oversight committee is within ICANN. This can be "mixed and matched" with other models, I suppose.

Matthew Shears (CDT):no model assumes ICANN has IANA function in perpetuity - the key issue of separability exists in each model

Guru Acharya:we need a new legal entity for oversight only if the names community is structurally integrated with iana. In case of a new iana entity, a new eneity for oversight seems refundant.

Guru Acharya:i agreed with mitons mail yesterday about the need for periodic bidding for iana

Amr Elsadr:I don't personally see the "enhanced seprability" features of SM1 and SM2 to actually allow for seprability that is independent of ICANN.

Matthew Shears (CDT):@ amr - that needs clarifying as separability that is independnet of ICANN is an important consideration

Donna Austin, RySG:Greg, to what extent, if any, do you see any of these strawmen covering the 'clerical' functions currently performed by NTIA?

Chuck Gomes (RySG, Verisign):Regarding funding: What is the difference between funding by ICANN and funding by registries? Over 95% of ICANN's revenue comes from gTLD registrants via registries and registrars and another 1-2% from ccTLD registries.

Amr Elsadr:@Matt: I agree. In SM1, IANA is a division within ICANN. In SM2, it is a wholly owned subsidiary. That means a decision to separate at a later date under those two models would involve ICANN agreeing to it.

Alan Greenberg:Chuck, my recollection was that the discussion was around the scenario where IANA is no longer associated with ICANN - how is it funded then.

Chuck Gomes (RySG, Verisign):@ Alan: I get that but I think my question still stands.

Matthew Shears (CDT):@ guru - agree - is the option for periodic bidding there or is it only foreseen in the strawmen based only upon failure to perform?

Guru Acharya:i didnt mean governing documents. i meant documentation to replace ntia contract

Allan MacGillivray (.ca):@Chuck - do you think that the registry community could actually come to an agreement on funding?

Chuck Gomes (RySG, Verisign):@ Allan: I would like to hope so; it probably depends on the details.

Alan Greenberg:But perhaps gTLD operators would be less willing to fund the ccTLD part of IANA's responsibilities.

Chuck Gomes (RySG, Verisign):@ Allan: I don't think that registries in either SO would agree to continue paying fees at current levels to ICANN and also paying fees to support a separate IANA on top of that.

Bernard Turcotte - staff support:And let us remember that some ccTLDs for a variety of reasons cannot pay a US based company anything

Donna Austin, RySG:generally the security and stability issues fall to the ICANN Board, I don't understand how that role will change under any of these arrangements.

Guru Acharya:@matthew: i think sm2 and sm3 look at a limited term for the contract. but i dont think they mention how the new contractor will be selected.

Bernard Turcotte - staff support:Another relevant point with respect to ccTLDs and charging is that as a rule ccTLDs will object to having to sign any type of agreement.

Guru Acharya:@greg: A MS body is also needed in case a decision about a new IANA operator is being taken by the oversight body - because we will be dealing with a number of policy issues.

Alan Greenberg:Sorry, dropped off

Amr Elsadr:@Guru: I think you're right for SM2, but in SM3 I (personally) understand that the oversight body would determine if a contract is renewed or a new contractor is sought.

Grace Abuhamad:Do we know who is building out strawman 4? Lot's of work going on in the document!

Allan MacGillivray (.ca):@Bernie - good point, which is why I have concerns about registries coming to an overall agreement on funding.

Bernard Turcotte - staff support:TYaking this to the next level IF ccTLDs are to be represented in an EXTERNAL oversight entity they would probably have the same concern of have to sign up as members etc.

Guru Acharya:how is a SLA to be enforced in strawman 1 - legally speaking - since both parties are within ICANN?

Bernard Turcotte - staff support:The current NTIA arrangement clearly states that there can be no charges for the IANA services

Amr Elsadr:I think I need somebody to explain the problem with funding to me. Funding is already via registries (g's and some cc's). Couldn't the portion of funds needed for IANA operations be redirected from ICANN to the new IANA inc.? That would probably increase some overhead costs, but I don't imagine it would be much.

Matthew Shears (CDT):agree we need some amended contract to go forward which implies that there is a contracting entity and that the contract is term limited

Alan Greenberg:@Amr. If ICANN and IANA no longer have any relationship, how/why such funding would be arranged could be problematic.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:very problematic

Amr Elsadr:@Alan: Which part? Redirecting the funds away from ICANN, or towards the new IANA inc? Both?

Allan MacGillivray (.ca):@Amr - ccTLD financial contributions to ICANN are, for the most part, voluntary. Many ccTLDs may be unwilling to commit to fund a new body. A new body would need certainty on funding to proceed. If only the gTLDs were willing to commit to funding, would they be willing to let the ccTLD community be represented on the board?

Amr Elsadr:On the ICANN side, I suppose it would require renegotiating some aspects of the registry agreement.

Wale Bakare:>>That would probably increase some overhead costs<< How would the separation of IANA from ICANN create a probable overhead?

Grace Abuhamad:@Donna I think this is also part of RFP4

Amr Elsadr:@Allan: I think you pointed to the exact issue I am having difficulty understanding. Why would CC's who voluntarily donate to ICANN not wish to do so with a new IANA?

Matthew Shears (CDT):the anonymous penguin is probably avri

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:For the record, I am ocl999 on the Google Doc & only added 1 comment

Amr Elsadr:@Wale: That is only an assumption on my part. I'm guessing overheads may include information infrastructure, costs of oversight body meetings, and others I can't really think of.

Donna Austin, RySG:Amr, the cc's would be more likely to contribute funding to the organisation that provides the IANA function, and for strawman 3, the consequence is likely that ccTLD contributions to ICANN will be redirected.

Allan MacGillivray (.ca):@Amr - could a new entity be created solely on the 'hope' for future payments? This is where I have doubts.

Amr Elsadr:@Donna: That's my assumption as well.

Grace Abuhamad:@Greg -- ok will do

Amr Elsadr:@Allan: Obviously, the ccTLDs would need to endorse the proposal this group puts forward including funding mechanisms they are involved in.

Wale Bakare:@Amr, thanks. How are the functions currently being carried out? Who funds the operation of the functions, which staff carrying out the functions?

Guru Acharya:@Donna - I agree that ccTLDs will have no incentive to provide funds to ICANN in case of a new IANA entity.

Bernard Turcotte - staff support:@Amr and Donna - Donna is probably correct but what Allan is looking at is that the money that is coming into ICANN now is outside of a contract requirement

Amr Elsadr:@Wale: There is dedicated IANA staff now, but IANA shares the same BoDs with ICANN. Funding is via registries.

Matthew Shears (CDT):I agree with Olivier's concerns on coordination

Matthew Shears (CDT):and compatibility

Allan MacGillivray (.ca):@Wale - the ICANN operational plans puts the direct cost of IANA at about \$2.7 million.

Amr Elsadr:@Bernard @Allan: Thanks to both of you. I'm beginning to see the problem.

Amr Elsadr:@Allan: I recall it being closer to \$10 million.

Alan Greenberg:@Amr, an ICANN which cares about the S&S of the Internet will of course want to see IANA continue functioning. But in parallel, and ICANN that has had IANA unceremoniously ripped from their control may not be all that cooperative.

Grace Abuhamad:Confirmed #4 is Avri

Lise Fuhr:Thank you Greg - have a nice day, evening, morning etc.

Grace Abuhamad:Avri = Pengu

Wale Bakare:@Amr, i think the concerns left the CWG-RFP3 to optioned the proposal on Strawmen

Chuck Gomes (RySG, Verisign):Thanks Greg & Lise

Staffan Jonson:Thank You. Bye

Carolina Aguerre:Thank you all!

Matthew Shears (CDT):thanks for a good call - see you next week

Donna Austin, RySG:Thanks Greg

Graeme Bunton - RrSG:Thanks all.

Lise Fuhr:Goodbye

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:bye then... now to prep for my next call. this makes 2 nights midnight tonpostbdawn. sigh

Wale Bakare: @Amr, i think the concerns left the CWG-RFP3 to optioning the proposal on Strawmen

Wale Bakare:Thanks, bye

Tomohiro Fujisaki:Thank you, Bye!!

Allan MacGillivray (.ca):@Amr - I just checked the FY15 plan - it is showing \$2.6 million