

---

THERESA SWINEHEART: Good morning everybody. This is Theresa. We're going to give it a few more minutes. We've got a few folks dialing in that had some difficulty. Then we'll get started. It looks though we've got everybody who was planning on dialing in able to dial in. Why don't we get started. First, Mike has started the recording, and as you know we post this for the community to have. First of all, welcome everybody, and I know that there's various time zones involved here, so thank you for everybody who's on the late side and the early side.

Looking at the chat room and looking at the participants in the Adobe room, I just want to check whether we have anybody from the ICG, either Elisa, Patrik or Mohamed on the phone? Okay. It looks like not, but I see Jonathan Robinson is on, and the Chairs of the CCWG, so that's fantastic. Just to confirm, was Fadi able to join? I think he may have had a change that canceled things? Okay, let's get started. Can everybody hear me okay?

First of all, welcome everybody. As you know, yesterday the CCWG was able to post its final set of recommendations for public comment, but I'll let Mathieu, Thomas and Leon talk to that specifically. Let me go over briefly the timeline that we have set out here. I hope everybody can see it okay in the Adobe room. What it shows is the timeline for the global community process. You'll see the CCWG and the posting of the comments there for November 30<sup>th</sup>, so congratulations everyone on that, and the 21-day comment period, which will then end on the 31<sup>st</sup> of December.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

This is now out for public comment, and also for the SOs and ACs to be taking a look at. That schedule looks very much on track. We have also the anticipation in the middle of January for the submission of the accountability report up for the Work Stream 1 Recommendations to the Board, together with the ICG Final Report to the Board. That will be the blue box that's in the January timeframe for the submission to the ICANN Board and then the transmission over to NTIA.

As you can see with the green area, we then have the ICANN review process as well as the beginnings of the preparations for the drafting of the Bylaws, and the time frame there is also that we get those out for public comment for a 30 to 40-day public period, and then get those provided over to NTIA as part of their certification process. Then on the purple line at the bottom you'll see that once it's transmitted to NTIA there's a 60 to 90-day inter-agency review process, which is expected to last that period of time, as well as the 30 legislative days with the US Congress and that review process there.

Part of this, which Trang will also be talking to, is then around the implementation, which as you'll see is for the ICANN review process the solid, clean lines for [Start bright 00:25:05]. For those windows we really need to be watching the timelines for the submission, obviously the timeline for the transmission to NTIA, their review, the certification, and then the finalizing of the implementation process, which Trang will talk to.

Are there any questions with regards to the timeline and any points to be raised here? We're happy to make adjustments, if anyone sees that adjustments are needed and not reflecting what the community process

---

---

has, but this is based on discussions with the respective community leadership members. Any questions to be raised on the timeline at all? Okay, with that, let me turn it over to the CCWG Chairs to talk about the update on their proposal, if I could do that. Would that be Mathieu?

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thank you Theresa. This is Thomas Rickert speaking, the GNSO-appointed Co Chair to the CCWG. My fellow Co Chairs, Leon Sanchez and Mathieu Weill have told me to give this quick update, and I gladly accepted. I'm not sure whether we have the CCWG timeline available for the Adobe room as well, because that has a little bit more detail than what we see here. Either way, I think that you are familiar with the overall intention to get our recommendations to the ICANN Board by the 22<sup>nd</sup> of January, and Theresa already mentioned that we have our third report out. I really recommend you find it and read it.

It's an excellent read. It's basically taking our update document that we spoke about earlier to the next level. Huge parts of this third report resembled a lot the update document that we shared a few days back. You might recall that we've shared the update with the community to ensure that the community gets hold of the document that enshrines, in an easy to read manner, plain language, no acronyms type of writing, the recommendations that we have been working on, so that they can familiarize themselves with the likely output of the CCWG.

The third report now is a little bit longer. The body of the report has 56 pages and there is a set of appendices, including minority statements to show the diverging views in our group, but also dedicated to appendices,

---

the detailing of the information on the 12 recommendations that our group came up with. So please do take a look at those. The recommendations can be understood from the update document, as well as from the main report, but all the glorious details – the description of the processes, let's say, for invoking the community powers, or how the empowered community can work; the escalation path as well as how, as the case may be, rights can be enforced – that's all detailed in the appendices.

So what we've done is this: we have issued the third report for public comment, and saying "public comment" I should be more precise in saying that at this stage it is essential for us to get feedback from the chartering organizations, because the Charter that we're working under is the set of rules that we have to play by in order to get our recommendations adopted, and we need five out of six chartering organizations to approve our recommendations.

That's not to say that we're going to ignore or neglect the views that come from other parts of the community, but our focus is to ensure from a process point of view that the chartering organizations take a look at the recommendations and share with us, by the 21<sup>st</sup> of December, whether they're able to support the recommendations or not. Because there is a specificity in our Charter that says that if there is one or multiple recommendations that chartering organizations cannot endorse, we would need to issue a supplementary report and get that out to the chartering organizations again for their approval.

If we take into account this additional feedback [group 00:30:12] that is exactly the time that we'd then need to get our recommendations finally

---

approved by the chartering organizations by the target date of the 22<sup>nd</sup> of January. Please make sure that you are ready to share with us your endorsement, or the lack thereof, as the case may be. We do hope that you can support all the recommendations by the 21<sup>st</sup> of December.

Also, we'd like to let you know that we've scheduled two webinars to take place tomorrow, and I'm sure that the dates can be shared in the chat section, but we're going to have one round midday UTC and one evening time UTC, where we are going to update the participants of these webinars in multiple languages on the differences between the second and the third report. Remember, we have been working on our recommendations for almost a year now, and I'd say that 80+ per cent of our recommendations have been known for more than six months now.

A lot of the essence of what we're recommending has already been included in our first report. Refinements of that, some alterations, have been included in our second report, so that we don't have to repeat what we did from scratch, but we'll focus pretty much on the differences, so that the community can more easily understand what the essence of the third report actually is. We've also put visualizations of the different recommendations into the report, in order to facilitate understanding of what we're doing.

I think that's pretty much it for now. Depending on your demand, we are more than happy to schedule individual phone calls or meetings with your respective groups to answer the questions that you might have, to expedite the process of being able to comment on, or ideally support, our recommendations. Also, we can hold additional webinars later during the comment period. We already have people asking, "Why are

---

you doing this so early?” because the third report was only published yesterday.

The answer is that we want to make our recommendations as accessible as possible to the community, which is why we chose to hold the webinars early – so that people don’t have to work through the proposal in its entirety to understand where we are, but to explain this to them in an interactive format allows them to ask questions so that they can then dive into the sections of the report that are of particular interest to them. Before I close, let me say that this has been an outstanding collaborative effort between our group, the wider community, and our excellent support staff.

They’ve been working tirelessly, they’ve burnt the midnight oil in order to make this happen. We are on track with a very ambitious timeline, and we’d really hope that you will support everybody who has put countless hours into this by making sure that we can meet the next milestones in the overall transition timing. Theresa, I should pause here, and I’m happy to answer all the questions there might be.

THERESA SWINEHEART:

Thomas, thank you, and thank you Mathieu and Leon for all of the work you did in pulling this together. I know it was a huge team effort, but it really is a remarkable document. I printed it out last night, and it’s really a remarkable piece, so congratulations on that. As you note, it’s going to be important that the SOs and ACs have a chance to review this. Since we have representation from quite a few here, are there any questions for Mathieu, Thomas or Leon about the timeline or the document?

---

I know that there's been some discussions with the SO and AC Leadership also about whether a face-to-face will be needed at any point in time. I know that decision has to be made fairly soon, but I just wanted to open up this discussion, Thomas, and you've offered to take any questions specifically with regards to the signing off and the inputs for this piece that was posted on the 30<sup>th</sup>. Any questions from Jonathan, or Byron, or anybody have questions on this? Byron, please go ahead.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you Thomas for that quick overview. I just wanted to pick up on one of the points you made, to make sure I'm clear, and that's around the December 21<sup>st</sup> date. I think your comment was to the effect that you expect or certainly hope that the chartering organizations would be able to provide you a concrete thumbs-up or thumbs-down response to the proposal. Now, since that's the last date of comment period, the timing will be a little bit tricky in trying to bring that to conclusion in a sense before the very final comments have been seen. Is that your expectation, or at least your hope? If so, do you have any concerns around the almost inevitable commentary about process?

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thank you very much Byron. You are correct in asking this question, and you're not the first person to ask it. I know that the ccNSO has planned to decide on this on the 23<sup>rd</sup>, if I'm not mistaken, so you are obviously building a little bit of time into your planning. I guess my best answer to you is this: we have put out our recommendations, and the question to the chartering organizations is whether they can endorse those or not.

---

Should we receive comment from the community suggesting that we need to make material changes to our recommendations, we will proactively go back to the chartering organizations and ask them whether their feedback, i.e. their support or lack of support, will be revisited on the basis of the public comment. So far, we would assume or hope that the community endorses our recommendations. Remember that these have been evolving over months and months, and there were only a few outstanding important questions, aspects, that we've been further refining and working on. So we do hope that the community will support those.

But in the unlikely event that the community pushes back on one or more recommendations, rest assured that we will not let you twist in the wind with having endorsed or not endorsed recommendations that at that point need to be revisited. We would then proactively go back to the chartering organizations.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: Most welcome, Byron.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Any other questions to Thomas about the timeline or any of the elements around this? Great, well, congratulations again. We've put into the chat room the two webinars that will be early this week. I think that's excellent that they're on the earlier side, obviously, for the



---

communities to have that opportunity and to get the update, and then Thomas, your generous offer to each of the SOs and ACs, I know that's going to take some additional time for the community to be looking at this, but we're in the final leg of all of it, and again, this report looks really comprehensive and looking forward to all the feedback on this. So congratulations on that.

I don't know that we have any representation from the Chairs on the ICG, but I see some Members of the ICG on the call. Is there an update there that anybody from the ICG would like to provide to this call here, with regards to the work that's underway? Okay. Good. Any other updates on timelines from the SO and AC Leadership with regards to their process on reviewing this and finalizing the accountability report, or any questions around the ICG report that somebody may be able to answer? No? Okay.

Great, then let me turn it over to Trang, if I may. As you know, Trang and Akram are leading on the implementation timeline, and we'll go over that. As you know, on the timeline charts, in the Adobe room, this is going to be a really important part as we start preparing for and then implementing the different areas in order to [unclear 00:41:00] timeframe. With that, Trang, I'll turn it over to you and Akram.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Thank you Theresa. Good morning, afternoon, evening everyone. We do have a few slides on implementation that we'd like to go through and provide you with an update on the work we've been doing lately. I'll go quickly through this first slide that I have here. This is a slide you've

seen in the past. This is our overall timeline slide for the implementation phase. The one thing I wanted to highlight on this slide and reiterate is that if the current timeline that Thomas spoke about earlier today holds, and a proposal is delivered to the ICANN Board at the end of January, that will give us about three and a half months for the implementation phase, and we believe this is still enough time to get everything done, but it doesn't leave any buffer room to address any unanticipated issues.

So it is a very tight schedule we'll be working with, but we believe that we can still get everything done if the current schedule holds. That's the main point that I wanted to highlight on this slide. For these next two slides we've prepared an update of the work we've been doing along the three tracks. I'm sorry, Byron, did you have a question on the timeline I just went over? Perhaps it was an old hand. I'll go on. We'll take any questions at the end. As I mentioned, we've prepared for you a slide that will give an update on activities that we've been working on along the three tracks.

This slide is showing the work that we're doing on the RZMS and RZMA track. That work is essentially the work around making the [co-changes 00:43:11] to the RZMS to remove the RZA role, as well as the discussions with Verisign around the RZMA or the Root Zone management Agreement. We are anticipating that the work on both the RZMS and RZMA will be finalized by the end of January, so that parallel testing can begin in February, and so that we will have the draft RZMA also posted for public review. Again, I'm going to go through these slides really quickly and I'll take any questions at the end.

---

---

On this next track here we have an update for you along the IANA stewardship transition or essentially all the elements that are in the ICG proposal. There are eight projects for this track and we are currently showing the status for all eight projects are on track at this time. I'll quickly go through each of these projects to highlight some of the work that we've done for you. For the names SLE project, that's the project whereby we're going to have to implement all of the SLEs that have been defined by the names community.

For this, we have engaged the resource to parse the data that we are currently collecting, the RZMS, and we're still anticipating that by mid-December we'll have a good idea of the level of effort required for this work, as well as the type and format of the data that we'll be able to provide to the CWG so that they can review the data and then set performance targets that will eventually go into the ICANN PTI contract. For the IR SLA document, we have been in discussions with the IRs regarding version three of this document.

In general we have agreement on the operational terms of the agreement, and we're in discussions with the IRs on the legal terms. ICANN Legal provided feedback on the documents last week, and in general we expect that much of the discussion and the work moving forward will be more of an editing rather than a negotiation exercise. So we are hoping to conclude or finalize that document by the end of January.

With regards to the MOU supplemental agreement with the IETF and the IAB, we're doing a final review of this document in light of the ICG and CCWG proposals, to ensure that no additional changes or updates are

necessary. This document was drafted very early on in the process. I believe it was May or March of this year, and a lot has happened since, so we just wanted to do one final review of the document, just to make sure that it's still in alignment with everything in its current state. We also anticipate that the document will be finalized no later than the end of January of 2016.

For the IANA IPR project, as you can see, we don't have a status for that as of yet on these slides, because we are still waiting for implementation requirements. We are [attracting 00:46:44] the discussions of the IPR Design Team, and we're awaiting implementation requirements from the community, and as per the request of the CWG IPR Design Team, we are also looking into the cost and the amount of time required for setting up a new trust, so as to inform the community's continuing work on this topic.

With regards to the formation of the PTI entity, we're currently working on an implementation plan that we will start to share with the community in mid-December. The plan is intended to be aligned with the scenario that the CWG Design Team O has been working on with Xavier Calvez, our CFO, for the ICANN FY17 budgeting and planning process. That Design Team has been working on a set of scenarios and assumptions that we're going to do an ICANN FY17 budgeting process, and the PTI implementation plan that we're going to be putting together, we try to stay in line with all of the discussions and the work that that Design Team has been doing.

For the RZMS Standing Committee, CSC and escalation mechanisms, we are working on implementation plans, and we'll share them with the

---

---

community in January, February and March, respectively. Izumi, I see you have your hand up. If it's all right with you, I have one more slide, and so if you'll allow me I'd like to go through that one slide really quickly and then we'll take questions?

On this last slide that we have here for you, this is the enhancing ICANN accountability track. We anticipate completion of the proposed revisions to the Bylaws, including proposed incorporation into the existing Bylaws by mid to end-February of 2016. This is consistent with what's illustrated in the overall timeline slide that Theresa showed us earlier on. Currently, Sidley has produced a draft of the Bylaws for the CWG, and we are currently reviewing that draft and hope to provide feedback on it very soon.

As for the other three projects that you see on this slide here – IRP enhancements, reconsideration request enhancements and community powers – we're currently reviewing the CCWG proposal that was posted yesterday to identify the implementation requirements and [again 00:49:41] timelines. We expect to have a draft of a high-level project plan built out for these three projects, based on the CCWG proposal, by mid-December.

That's an implementation update for you, and hopefully that will give you an idea of what we've been working on, what we're currently working on, and some of the things that we'll be producing in terms of deliverables in the next couple of weeks and months, as we head into the New Year. Theresa, I can take any questions now. I see that Izumi has her hand up. Maybe we can start with Izumi's question?

IZUMI AIZU:

Hello. Thank you for this update. It wasn't a question about the update, but I just wanted to add some information and update around the IPR, if that's okay? But I can bring this up at the end after we go through the questions, if that's better for the process. Assuming that it's all right to give an update, I just want to share that we recently had the call among the three operational community leaders, and we actually discussed about the possible timelines of the IPR.

We felt that while it's not completely discussed with our respective communities yet, a suggestion was made to target around February, before the submission to the NTIA, so that we all agree on the IPR principles and the framework of the operational community. That's where we're trying to target, and this is to be further discussed and collaborated among the three communities. I just wanted to share that piece of information. Thanks.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Thank you Izumi. Glad to hear that. Byron, do you have your hand up?

BYRON HOLLAND:

Yes, thank you. My question is really around the names SLEs, and just to get a clearer understanding from staff's point of view, or from your point of view – and I see that Akram is also on; perhaps from his point of view – whether you're confident that we're going to have absolutely clear and concise documentation, zero ambiguity, around the budgeting process of IANA, as well as the escalation path? Mid-December is very quickly

---

---

upon us, and I just want to get your sense of your confidence level in that?

Particularly as time is moving on, and some of the CWG Members are moving on, just fast-forward out in time, will we have documentation that will be absolutely crystal clear on those elements?

TRANG NGUYEN:

Akram, did you want to respond to that question from Byron, or did you want me to? Okay, Byron, let me try to respond to your question, and then perhaps Akram would like to chime in. There are two threads of work going on around the names SLEs, Byron. One thread of work is actually making changes to the RZMS in order to be able to collect the exact SLEs that have been defined by the names community. That work is expected to be completed by the end of March.

Through conversations with Members of the CWG, they have indicated that that would not give them enough time, which they believe to be six months of data collection of the SLE metrics, in order for them to define performance targets. So what we have discussed with Members of the CWG is to start on a secondary thread, which is to look at the existing data that the RZMS collect, which we both understand do not completely map to the SLEs that the CWG has defined. But go ahead and take a look at what we currently collect.

See if we can pull it, if you will, parse the data, pull the data, and provide whatever we can provide to the CWG Members, so that they can start reviewing that hopefully earlier, starting January, to see if that data could help them with defining performance targets. We have a very

---

detailed project plan filled out for this, and we're tracking this project very closely because you are right – this is a [long poll 00:56:17] in the [unclear] for us right now, in terms of all of the projects that we currently have to implement in order for the transition to happen.

There are many elements and dependencies, especially when we're talking about changes to the RZMS, and then on top of that, the parallel testing process that has to occur as well. I hope that answers your question.

BYRON HOLLAND:

That's helpful on the data side, and understanding those connection points. What about the escalation path specifically? Will we have significant clarity on what that looks like and how it works, and the escalation path between customer and IANA.

TRANG NGUYEN:

If I'm understanding you correctly, I believe you're referring to the escalation mechanisms which are detailed in the CWG plan, the IANA customer complaints process, and the problem resolution procedures, I believe it's called? Those are detailed pretty clearly in the CWG proposal. We are currently reviewing them against the existing procedures to see how they map to them, but we believe that at least the IANA complaint process is pretty much in line with the current and existing IANA complaint resolution process, so that's a good sign.

Then I think the other new process is called the remedial action procedures. That's a new process, but again, like I mentioned, the CWG



---

proposal is pretty detailed in terms of that new process. I think we do have clarity on the escalation processes that have been detailed in the CWG proposal. We are currently reviewing them, and if we have additional questions we'll certainly be reaching out to the CWG.

BYRON HOLLAND: But otherwise you expect those, what's articulated in the work of the CWG – to end up in the final document of procedures then? Is that correct? Is that what I'm hearing you say?

TRANG NGUYEN: Yes. Thank you Byron. Any other questions or comments?

THERESA SWINEHEART: Great.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Theresa, if it's okay with you, maybe I could jump in a little bit to focus on a few things?

THERESA SWINEHEART: Perfect. I was just going to turn to you Fadi. Thank you for joining.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Apologies for my delay. I was going through airport security, which is about a third of my life. Anyway, let me just ask a couple of clarifying questions. We had agreed that today's call as an important time for us

to assess, now that the proposal is out from the CCWG, whether everyone stands ready to engage their communities. If you recall last time – and I’m not sure if Thomas repeated his comment today, or Mathieu – that we were seeking some level of coordination within each SO and AC on the comment side, so that we can focus the comments towards some concentrated input that we can look at together as a community.

It’s not for me to ask for this, but I’m hoping that some of that is already happening within each of the communities. Right now, the comment period ends on December 21<sup>st</sup>, at which point our staff plans to finish their work and deliver to you the final version, including all the comments and the input from the comments, so that the chartering organizations can look at it and close things. I wanted to focus for a minute, if I could, on whether there’s any further assessment on the need for a face-to-face meeting for the GAC.

Because it seemed last time that the focus was on the GAC, and I know Thomas, you clearly noted that you will be having a couple of calls during the December timeframe – one pre-WSIS, around the 10<sup>th</sup>, and one post-WSIS, around the 20<sup>th</sup> – and then you planned to let us know by today if you have a sense of whether a face-to-face for the GAC would be needed in early January. We remain of course at your disposal to organize that. Clearly if anything is needed for the GAC, we need to energize some logistics very quickly in the next few days and get that ready. And of course, better be prepared than not if we need one.

---

So I'm going to first ask Thomas to give me some sense as to where his mind is and where the GAC's mind is on whether there will be a need for a face-to-face.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Well, I know that we are at a time where we should decide this. The good thing is that I'm more positive that we may not need one, given the development that we've had – but this is just my personal feeling. I cannot tell you at this stage that we won't need one. That will take a few more days, I guess, to discuss this in the GAC. Yes, it's a little difficult for me to give you something concrete, but I'm more positive that we may be able to come to consensus feedback during the public comment period. That will be enough for us. But I cannot go any further in saying...

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Okay, but you made a very important point. I want to just repeat it and make sure I heard you right. You were saying that some of the progress we achieved in the last CCWG call gives you more confidence that you'll be able to address the Operating Principles change, as well as the consensus on the CCWG proposal, without the need to cause a special face-to-face meeting for the GAC? That you're more comfortable, but you're not sure yet, is what you're saying?

THOMAS RICKERT:

Yes, and let me ask you a question. In the case that we may need a face-to-face meeting to sort out some details about elements of this

---

proposal, we would of course do this in January, but in the end we could also do it in a lightweight way. I don't know whether it needs to be a formal GAC Meeting, or just an extended teleconference call. Because I can't exclude this now. I think it may not be necessary, but we can't exclude this now. Do we need to, just for format, start organizing something, or do you need to start organizing something? Because I will be able to tell you definitely towards the end of the public comment period, which will be towards the 21<sup>st</sup> of December. So what do we do?

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Look, Thomas, the answer to your question is two parts. One is it depends on two things. It depends on whether we keep this as a GAC-only face-to-face. If you recall, Alan said, "If the GAC will meet, we might meet." The problem is it becomes more than, say, 100-150 people, and we get into the realms of 200-300 people – then it's almost too late to organize something properly.

It's just difficult, and it will end up costing us three times – although cost should not be our main concern right now, given that we just need to get this done – but even logistically, being able to pull this off, typically groups of hundreds like that are, as you know, booked sometimes years in advance, months in advance. So it's complicated. So if it stays as GAC-only then it removes a lot of the complexity I'm worried about logistically.

Secondly, let's assume the GAC decides around the 10<sup>th</sup> at their call, or the 20<sup>th</sup> at their second call, or immediately thereafter that they must have a meeting, would they be more flexible with ICANN as to all the

---

typical things we do at a meeting? Do we need translation in all the UN languages plus Portuguese? Do we need every facility that we provide to happen in the normal way? We just need to ask you for flexibility so that we do our best, but some of these things may not all be possible at that point.

So long as you're flexible, and the rest of the community is aware that, frankly, past this point it becomes very hard to pull a face-to-face, other than for you - and even for you, it will be tricky – then I think we're okay, from an ICANN pure logistical standpoint. Of course, if after the 10<sup>th</sup> your community makes it clear they need the meeting, then please make sure we know. If, after the 20<sup>th</sup>, your second call... The earlier you know, basically, please let us know.

Right now, since it's GAC-only, we're back to holding that week of the 12<sup>th</sup> of January. This was the time just for planning purposes, if the meeting must take place, that is the week we're thinking of – the week of the 12<sup>th</sup>. We have scouted, but it now may be passed the deadline, so we'd need to re-scout. We had scouted sites in Europe for the week of January 12<sup>th</sup>. I'm just being candid with you, so you know all the facts and you can get back to us as soon as you can with more data.

In terms of is there information from the other SOs and ACs that I need to know about, and my staff need to know about, different or in addition to what was said in the SO and AC call a few days ago? Is there anything new that we should know? All of you now have the CWG final proposal, so of course it's only out for less than 24 hours, so I don't expect people to have read it yet, but in general, are we okay?

THERESA SWINEHEART: Alan, I see your hand is up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Our position has not changed a lot. I have had some requests from a number of ALAC Members that we hold a face-to-face, regardless of whether the GAC does or not. I can't claim that as a majority or a large enough number that I would change my position. Our position still very much is if there is going to be a face-to-face, we will meet.

It's for a complex number of reasons, but a large one is the very late date at which the translations are going to be available, and therefore we're likely to be formulating our requests at the same time, as people are just getting, or maybe haven't even gotten the translations in their language. So it's a relatively complex process for us. We have many people for whom English is not an available language, who are trying to participate in the process.

Just one comment however – you said you're looking at the week of the 12<sup>th</sup> of January. It's the first time I've actually heard a date, and knowing exactly what those dates were would be really useful. I'll also comment that we've had a number of people point out that some sites in Europe are moderately easy for visas. Others have requirements like three months in advance to request a visa, so location is very much an issue for us. In terms of the size, it's not a huge number of people. We're looking at the ALAC, plus the one Member for the CCWG that is not an ALAC Member. So we're looking at 16 people, at most. Thank you.

---

THERESA SWINEHEART: Great. Alan, the timeframe, when you think you may have a yes or a no on that? You anticipate it to be closer towards the middle of December?

ALAN GREENBERG: We're already saying at this point, if the GAC is meeting then we will meet. We are requesting that we will meet. If the GAC chooses not to meet, we are really cognizant of the fact that arranging a meeting just for us would be really problematic and a significant effort, and we'll do our best to somehow work around it. We're trying to ease the logistics in that from that context. If there are arrangements for a meeting being made, then we've already made the decision and there's no indication we're going to change it. In terms of translation, by the way, facilities, we would strongly request Spanish, but other than that there's not an issue.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Okay, thank you for that Alan. This is helpful. If the GAC met in the week of January 12<sup>th</sup>, would that be too late for you, or is that too late for you?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, that would be fine, but the sooner we can have a target date, the sooner we can try and make sure that we can free up people, even if we later cancel. Thank you.

---

FADI CHEHADÉ: Okay, thank you for that Alan. Okay, are you set with this approach also, Thomas? Does this work for you, what I shared with you?

ALAN GREENBERG: He said yes in the chat.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Thank you for that. Just before I leave you, let me just make sure, since [unclear 01:12:43] is not with us on the phone, that you all appreciate what is going on in the US Government space. Right now we are very much engaged in a process where Congress is finalizing the omnibus bill – the final bill that determines the activities that the US Government [sanctions 01:13:05] by Congress next year. That bill should be through Congress on December 11<sup>th</sup>.

Why this matters to us is that in that particular bill there is a discussion between the House and the Senate, and the Appropriators, on whether the .com Act, which defines the period that Larry Strickling will have to give Congress to review our proposal, the .com Act may or may not pass and become part of the law on December 11<sup>th</sup>. Of course, as part of that dialogue, there is a discussion on removing the [rider 01:13:47] from the rest of the bill.

The [rider], as you recall, was introduced by a Texas Congressman, who wanted to make sure that NTIA cannot spend any money on the transition, and if that [rider] is reinserted into the bill, it means that one more time, Larry Strickling, for the next 12 months, is unable to spend any money on the transition. That is a problem. Without going into



---

details, we believe that in the next 12 months, if Larry's hands are tied this way, it will be a problem for the transition.

So this is quite serious. There's so much we can do, and for transparency you should know that ICANN is spending quite a bit of money and effort in Washington right now to influence that process. We have multiple consulting firms that are supporting us in that effort; to clarify why this would be problematic. We're doing everything we can to get that process under control.

Sorry, I was trying to go on mute, but I think that you heard me in terms of the process, and we're doing everything we can. We'll of course update the community after December 11<sup>th</sup>, and whatever the US Congress decides, the US Congress decides, and there's so much we can do. We're just trying as much as we can to convey to the Congress the value of one course versus the other, but we are of course going to be subject to whatever decisions they make. All right?

So just an update for you before the next time, that this is very much top of my [request 01:15:42] at this stage. With this, I think we're okay on timeline. Anything else, Theresa, I could be helpful with?

THERESA SWINEHEART:

I think we're good. Anybody on the call have any questions or additional remarks, or comments?

---

FADI CHEHADÉ: Mathieu just texted me that he and Thomas and Leon will be skiing for the next 60 days, so they're not going to be available, but other than that, there is no other online comment.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Well deserved. Well, we have our work cut out, so let's forward to the feedback on the 21-day comment period for the CCWG, and looking forward. Fadi, anybody else, any closing remarks?

ALAN GREENBERG: There's a comment from Thomas Schneider in the chat asking if the slides are available.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Yes, we can get those out. We'll get those out to everyone. Wonderful. Good, then we'll close up the call, and we look forward to talking with everybody in a month.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks everyone.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Take care. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**