

DIANA MIDDLETON: Hi, [Trang], [Luco], and Valerie. This is Diana. I just made you three hosts in the room. Is that how you want it, or do you want to only have a couple?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi, Diana. That's fine. I heard a little bit of an echo. Is that the audio on our end? I think it is. Can you mute your laptop, please, Valerie? I'm getting feedback and echo.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Better? Yep.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. Oh, it's uploading.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Boy, it's taking a while. Can I take a look at the deck real quick? Do you have a copy of this?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. That is strange that [inaudible].

[JOSH]: Thank you for joining this call. We will get started here shortly. Just as a friendly reminder, if you would like to mute or unmute yourself, you can

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.

do that by selecting Star 6. Again, that's Star 6 to mute or unmute. You can also the mute function of your phones, as well. Thank you very much and we will get started here shortly.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Hi, everybody. This is Theresa. We'll be starting shortly.

[JOSH]: Thank you for joining this call. As a friendly reminder to everybody on the phone, if you can please mute your phone at this time. You can do that by selecting Star 6 or using your mute key on your phone. That would be greatly appreciated by all the presenters and speakers. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE: Hello. This is Fadi.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Hi, Fadi. We're just convening everybody on the call. I see that we have a few dial-ins that don't have names associated with them. Josh, is there a way to figure that out?

[JOSH]: Yeah. I'm working through that. As soon as they start speaking, I can figure out who is what extension.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Wonderful. Thanks. Excellent. Leon, thank you for joining us, as well.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Theresa.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Let's see. Why don't we just give it on more minute? I just want to see if we have anybody. I know most of the ICG crew is out at the IETF meeting and it's quite an early hour for everybody there. So whoever is at the IETF and has joined, thank you so much.

Okay. All right. Why don't we go ahead and get started? If that sounds reasonable to everybody. Leon, do you know if we're waiting for anybody from your group, Mathieu or Thomas?

LEON SANCHEZ: No. I don't think so. I think that Thomas and Mathieu will not be able to attend the call.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Okay. And Lise, are we waiting for Jonathan, do you know?

LISA FUHR: No. He sent his apologies.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Okay. Fantastic. Thank you. And then I don't know if we have a [Elisa], Patrik, or Mohamed on for the ICG or not. Doesn't sound like it. [Do we have] Byron on? Okay. Excellent. Steve, do we have you or Bruce on? Don't hear you yet. Okay. And then I know that we had heard from Fiona, that she and Larry may be late for this call, so we should just go ahead and get started. Good.

Okay. So with that, this is our monthly program facilitation meeting call to go over the timeline and where everything is with regards to all the different moving parts and also to talk about the implementation area. So Fadi, if I could turn it over to you for some introductions, and then we can start scooting through the timeline, which we revised and, of course, want everybody's input on as part of a work in progress from that. But Fadi, could I turn it over to you?

FADI CHEHADE: Sure. Thank you, Theresa; and thank you, everyone, for taking a little bit of time to review the timeline. Again, as you all remember, this is not a call for us to address any substance or substantive issues outside of ensuring that we are all moving towards a common timeline and a common understanding of the implications of the various dates that every part of our community is publishing in order to complete the transition.

I do think that, at this stage, the key dates that continue to resonate with everyone are November 15, which is in 12 days from now, when the CCWG intends to release its first set of recommendations with an analysis also of the changes that have occurred since the last proposal.

This is a very, very important document and date. And my understanding, at this point, is that this date is firm and that the group will bring us there.

My sense is on the risks of this day, and I let Leon and others chime in later when they present their updates, has to do with, frankly, the potential introduction of brand new accountability elements that are kind of beyond the framework of what we discussed in Dublin, and what the community saw in Dublin. And those things could potentially cause us delays to November 15, which I believe, when we look at the full timeline, we will agree. I hope that this could have potentially difficult implications on the transition.

Now once that November 15 initial report is released followed by the November 30 full report with documentation, there is a clock that is then started and ticking with a bunch of timelines and deadlines related to public comment periods and analysis and so on and so forth. And without getting into those details at this moment, this all leads us to January 7 at the moment, or so, which is the date we expect to have the final proposal delivered to the SOs and ACs as the chartering organizations. So that's a second very key date that we have.

And then, after that, we have some dates that are still in flux related to how fast the chartering organizations could then process this particular final proposal, and how long it will take them. Do they need to meet in person? Do some of them need to meet in person versus others? All of that is still in flux.

But I think right now, in the immediate term, the dates that matter are November 15 and January 7. After that, there will be some management.

Also today, both the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives released their 2016 calendar of – Congressional Calendar, which shows when they will be in session and when they will not be in session. We are analyzing these calendars and our team will be meeting with Congressional staffers this week, and I will be in Washington, D.C. in ten days to meet with the Congressional Senators and Chairman in the House, who are relevant to our transition, to also get a sense from them as to when they intend to hold hearings next year.

Right now, it seems that there will be two sets of hearings. One early. By early, I mean either in early December or early January, and then there will be a second set later in March or April that should finalize, hopefully, things for us. But again, this is way out, but I'm just giving you a view as to kind of what would happen once the Board wraps things up and the chartering organizations [are done].

I must say that, overall, Dublin helped us get this timeline organized. Huge kudos to our Chairs, the ICG Chairs, the CWG Chairs, the CCWG Chairs. Incredible work happened in Dublin. Frankly, hats off to all of you for keeping the process on track and for helping us have what I think will be a good meeting today where we're watching now, for the first time, kind of us getting into the final mile between now and hopefully the NTIA certification that our proposal works.

So with this background and kind of high-level thing, let's just hand it to you, Theresa, so you can walk us through the timeline that is now in the Adobe room.

THERESA SWINEHEART:

Okay. That sounds perfect. So with the help of Hillary, we thought that given where we are after the Dublin meeting, it would be good to refresh the timeline a little bit and look toward the projection of September 2016, and outline this. Now of course, please give us any feedback on this and any adjustments to it.

I don't know if it's possible to zoom in to this a little bit, looking up at the upper left hand corner. Is that? Perfect. Okay. A little bit more. What we've done here is we've outlined the global community processes and specifically possible – oh, there we go. I don't know if everybody can see that – by looking at the dates for the CCWG on the 15th of November, then the 30th of November.

In relation to the ICG, our understanding is that as soon as they get the green light from the CCWG, and specifically the naming community, that everything is captured in the accountability proposal, then they'll be ready to submit it to the Board. So hence, you'll see that alignment in sort of the mid-January timeframe.

One thing that we have been discussing, also, with the SOs and ACs is whether the chartering organizations need to have a face-to-face meeting, and our understanding is we'll have further information on that once they have an opportunity to see the proposal and a call around the 23rd or 24th of November to finalize whether a tentative

meeting is needed on the 12th or 13th of January for the chartering organizations.

So with that, you can see where the timeline is and the receipt of the proposals to the Board. On the green section there – I don't know if everybody can see that – you'll note that where we have the review process, the bylaw preparations, and also the anticipated timeframe on the public comment period to the bylaws, and then in the purple area, you'll see the U.S. Government process that we had outlined earlier that we've discussed in the context of NTIA's review itself.

After we hear back from the participants on the call, ICG, CWG, and CCWG, with regards to any of their thoughts about where the process is, Trang was going to go through where we are on the implementation and the work around that, as we had done on the prior call.

So with that, are there any questions on the revised timeline? And again, we're happy to circulate that and get comments and feedback on any adjustments that you might have, or get those reflected here. But with that, if maybe I could turn it over to the CCWG to see whether you had any comments and updates you want to share with the group, and then I would turn it over to the CWG and then the ICG representation.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Theresa. On the CCWG track, we've been doing a lot of progress, as you might have heard. We've been tasking the working parties to iron out the details that were outstanding from our Dublin meeting. And this week, I think we will be receiving the proposals from each of the working parties to [inaudible] timing issues, so we can

set up our third proposal and, of course, publish it for public comment on the 15th, and then, as scheduled, we will be releasing the full report on November 13. Well, of course, with the heads-up what we will publish on November 15.

So far, we can say that we are still on track to meet this timeline, and we hope that we will achieve actually delivering to the whole community as is scheduled on the timeline that you just presented on the Adobe Connect room.

And in regard to a possible face-to-face meeting, there seems to be little support for that amongst different SOs and ACs, but we somehow know that there might be, in fact, a couple of SOs and ACs that might need to actually meet face-to-face. And, of course, we are worried that if that is going to happen, we need to begin planning as soon as possible. And maybe some questions arise from a possible face-to-face meeting like where would it happen? Does it need to happen all SOs and ACs at the same place, or can this be done on a face-to-face meeting based on having SOs and ACs meeting at different places? I don't know.

So I think that this kind of information could also be useful so that SOs and ACs that are actually planning to have a face-to-face meeting to review and hopefully approve the proposal would have this in mind so they can begin planning anything that they actually need to plan.

So I'm, of course, open to questions. If you have any questions with regard to the CCWG meeting or timeline, I have [to answer].

FADI CHEHADE: Theresa, may I just ask Leon and make a statement?

THERESA SWINEHEART: Of course.

FADI CHEHADE: Yeah, so Leon, I think some of the folks on this call were not with us the other day maybe when the CCWG met with the SO/AC leaders and with us to discuss a little bit timelines. And I just want to emphasize that many in the SO/AC community, including Byron, who I think is with us today, noted that the determination of these things will need to be after they see what comes out on the 15th, so this is important.

And Byron, please correct me if I'm wrong, but I think you said something to the effect of – I mean, if what comes out on the 15th is largely in line with where we saw things in Dublin, then it's one thing. If it's, of course, a completely different – or at least hugely new introduced ideas, then it's a different thing in terms of the ability of then the SOs and ACs to move rapidly towards closure and response. So I think that's an important point.

The second important point on the face-to-face meeting that what's more important rather than right now to agree will some of our SOs and ACs require face-to-face or not, although thanks for reporting to us that most of the feedback you're getting is maybe not necessary, which is fine. I mean, that's their call.

We also discussed on the call last week that we should try to all target towards the 15th of January for the delivery of the report from the

chartering organizations to the board for the CCWG to have received the chartering organizations' response so that we can have the Board look at that proposal on the 15th.

And the Board, if you recall, Steve Crocker said if he gets it on the 15th, he is gearing up his Board so that we're talking about a day or two, not a week or two or a month or two, after the 15th of January for him to turn it around and deliver it to the NTIA. So I think these are important dates.

Now if an intersessional was necessary, we would – pardon me, I shouldn't use that word. If a face-to-face meeting is necessary for some of the SOs and ACs, then that would need to happen, obviously, either late in December or sometime in early January before the 15th of January. That's what I hope we all agree on. Leon, does this reflect in general or is there some comments or correction? Which I'm happy to hear from you based on the call we had the other day.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks, Fadi. It does reflect the actual status. And in regards to your concern on new issues being introduced, we have had some discussion in the list, or in the different mailing lists from the working parties, on topics that hadn't been actually explored before. And, of course, we are listening to the concerns and to the comments from the different people that are raising these issues.

But we have been very clear that we should focus on what we have at this moment on what we agreed to refine from our Dublin meeting, and that at this stage, it would be, if not impossible, at least very difficult to try and introduce new concepts at [the late hour]. So we wouldn't be

actually going into looking to those new issues that are being brought and that are not essential to the transition.

So on that side, I think that you can also be sure that we will avoid introducing new concepts as long as they don't – I mean, they're not related to the transition. Then thus far, we haven't seen anything new that actually relates to the transition, so there shouldn't be any changes in our document at this stage.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Fantastic. Thanks, Leon. Any other questions for Leon or discussions around the CCWG work? No? Okay. With that, is there anybody from the ICG on the phone who might want to talk to the timeline of the ICG or any of the elements there?

LEON SANCHEZ: Theresa, I see Byron's hand is up.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Thank you for helping me there. Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Hi. Thank you very much. Leon, I just wanted to ask you a quick question of clarification. You said a couple of times there you don't expect or see any changes as it pertains to the transition. That's seemed like pretty specific wording. Are there other changes that you think are material

that aren't necessarily specifically related to the transition or not? It's just as you stated. There is nothing material that we should be aware of.

LEON SANCHEZ:

You're right, Byron. There is nothing material that you should be worried about. So far, as I said, new issues that are being raised in the different mailing lists are not related to the transition, so there wouldn't be a need to actually modify our report or our proposal based on these new issues that are being raised. So nothing to worry about so far, I think, and you can be at ease.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHEART:

All right. Thank you, Byron. Anything else on that topic? Okay. So we have my understanding is nobody from the ICG on the call here. If that's the case, then Lise, could I move over to the CWG to the naming community?

LISA FUHR:

Sure, Theresa. Well, apart from following the accountability work and progress, our group is looking at the implementation because of the timing issue, we really need to follow or give some responses on the budget in relation to the actual implementation. So we have a design team that works closely with Xavier on looking at the budget and hopefully to finalize this in mid-January, as I understand it.

Furthermore, we are working also on the IPR issues where the other communities have sent in their requirements for the IPR issue. So we still have to finalize our input to this. And not the least, we are following the SLE progress closely, too, and we have a call on Thursday regarding this.

We have also started [inaudible] the bylaws in relation to the PTI and to our work. And that's hopefully finalized within a couple of weeks. We have Sidley helping us doing this and we hope to have something to review for the group within the week or two.

So we are preparing for the implementation. Nevertheless, it has not been signed off yet, but because of the timing, we need to move on on this. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHEART:

Great. Thank you, Lise. Any questions for Lise on this? Okay. Any other comments? Otherwise, I was going to turn it over to Akram and Trang with regards to the implementation area. No? Okay. Trang, can I turn this over to you now?

TRANG NGUYEN:

Yes. Thank you, Theresa. So to put this slide that we have shown you here in the Adobe Connect room in context, allow me a quick minute to remind you that on last month's call, we shared with you an implementation timeline that assumes the proposals will be delivered in December of this year. Under that scenario, we would have had four

months for implementation, which is the minimum required amount of time for implementation.

Based on the current timeline, which was shown earlier, we've updated the implementation timeline to reflect this change. So as you can see on this, if you're connected to the Adobe Connect room, what we're showing is that all of the implementation phases have now shifted to the right by half a month to accommodate for the proposals being delivered or finalized in January of 2016.

So what this shows is that we would have approximately three-and-a-half months for implementation as opposed to four months. We expect that the impact of this to the overall implementation to be minimal, and what we we're trying to do is we're trying to start work sooner to make up for the shortened implementation timeframe, so PTI structure and CSE are a couple of areas that we've identified where we intend on starting to work sooner to hopefully make up for some of that time, but our assessment right now is that if the proposals are delivered in January, that we would have minimal impact to the implementation phase.

So that's basically what I wanted to share, Theresa, in terms of implementation. I'd be happy to take any questions.

THERESA SWINEHEART:

Does anybody have any questions or any additions to this? No? Sorry. It was my bad. Okay. Well I guess with that, this may be a shorter call than we usually have. Is there anyone else that anybody wants to raise on the call with regards to the timeline or where we are in the process or

anything else with regards to the implementation or any issues that are coming up?

FADI CHEHADÉ: Yeah. If there are no other comments, I'll just [inaudible] Theresa, but let me first see if there any comments from our colleagues.

THERESA SWINEHEART: It looks like Byron has his hand up again.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. Could you put the slide back to the timeline? I think one slide back.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Sure.

BYRON HOLLAND: No, sorry, the detailed implementation time. Yes, that one. Thank you very much. I just wanted to maybe get from Trang or whoever else... Not being familiar with exactly what will be happening in terms of root zone maintainer, in terms of changes to accommodate the SLEs or the agreement there, testing, etc. Can you talk to us a little bit about how you're going to provide the community comfort, especially those of us who are operators, that this process is well in hand, how it's going to work, that you're going to be relatively transparent about the changes made and the outcomes achieved by the end of this process. Do you

have a plan to bring the operator community not onside so much as to just provide us comfort that this has been done effectively?

Obviously, you cut to the heart of our daily bread here on this.

TRANG NGUYEN: Sure, Byron. Thank you. And I see Akram has his hand up. So I think, Akram, did you want to address Byron? Question?

AKRAM ATALLAH: Yeah. Can you hear me?

TRANG NGUYEN: Yes, we can hear you.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Very well. Yeah.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Good. Thank you, Trang, and thank you, Byron, for the question. Byron, what you're doing here is what I'll call a two-step process. The first step is for us to take out the approval role out of the system, so NTIA's approval role in the system. We're taking that out of the code. Then we're putting a system that's going to run in parallel without the approval, and the maintainer will receive the two systems and will compare them.

And we will post that comparison for 90 days, and if there are any differences that are not justifiable as in a difference, for example, where the maintainer sees that the approval was delayed because NTIA posted [inaudible] a day later and they actually received the approval from the other system a day earlier, these are things that we believe are explainable. Then we will fix the issue and we start the plot again until we get 90 days of results that are posted that show that the two systems are working in parallel and working consistently and you're getting the same results.

And all of this output would be transparent. And therefore, you'll be able to see what's happening on both the systems and if there is any difference. And we intend to basically get – once we get the 90 days approved, we might approach NTIA and see if they want to switch to the [inaudible] system and have it run for a while before September, before the end of September, or if we [inaudible] end of September and then switch to that system.

So the idea is that we will have a stability and security on the system for a while before we actually say it is viable and it's something that we can switch it. And this is why we're doing minimal changes to the system in order for us not to take on too much risk during the transition. And as an operator, I hope you appreciate this is the least amount of changes that we can do. I hope that answers your question, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Yeah. Thank you, Akram. That's very helpful. I'm certainly happy to hear the level of transparency that you're committing to so that you can give

the operator community comfort in this significant change. I certainly agree with your final comment. Absolutely. Good to hear.

AKRAM ATALLAH:

Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

If I could just offer a couple of comments before we move on. Sorry to extend your call, but if we could go back up to the overall timeline, high-level timeline. Great. Thank you. Just from my community's perspective, and I assume each one of the respective communities will have some variation on this theme. It is a tight timeline and while certainly possible, I just want to highlight within the ccNSO some of the challenges just to make sure that what is presented on the effectively [gaunt] chart looks like it's in hand, but there are certainly some critical milestones and constraint points that demand that it all goes perfectly well in my community to get to the answer. And I'm going to assume everybody else's, too.

A couple of things. We're having to call two special council meetings to address this – one since our last call that I have put in place for this Friday to go over the timelines and to make sure effectively we have buy-in for what, in a sense, is a nonstandard process. I'm sure all of you can appreciate in my community and I'm sure others there are, and I say this with respect. There are process weenies who as soon as we go outside the process, we'll question the outcomes and the validity strictly on process.

So as a community, we have to stick handle that challenge because it's almost guaranteed that that will happen. I'm confident we will get past that, but it is something that I think we all need to acknowledge as we embark upon something of a non-standard process. There's also the concurrency, essentially, of what's happening between the summary report and the detail report with the 15 and 20-day timeline.

Coming into my community will be hard pressed to come to conclusion before the end of that 21-day time – or, sorry, December 21 after the 35-day timeline. Which for North American community puts us smack in the middle of Christmas holiday week, and bringing the council together to deal with that becomes its own challenge.

And ensuring a level of participation that gives validity to the process is certainly something that I'm very sensitive to, to make sure we have a positive outcome at the end of all of this. And also, just as a note around the ccNSO community, as soon as the council takes a vote – and I know there may be some question about how much the community needs to vote on this versus adopt it and what that might look like, and if there's any actual difference there.

There's a seven-day period where the community can come back and essentially object to that vote, and then we have to go through a process, etc. Which if we're talking about December 21, having a special council meeting somewhere between the 21st and the 24th, and assuming it's positive vote, that still means that community could object leading up to effectively New Year's Eve-ish.

So I just want to not put a wet blanket on this, but just to acknowledge the fact that that's just within one community. There are some critical path moments here and there are some moments that are not assured, although we're certainly going to do our best to get over those hurdles.

I just wanted to be candid about them and let us all know some of the issues that we're going to have to get over and through to come to this tight – to successfully complete this very tight timeline. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHEART:

Thanks, Byron. A question, I guess, to you and others. Is there anything else that we can do to help in light of that? That's a very open-ended question, but as you know, there's a lot of moving parts. And as we're looking at keeping everybody informed on the different moving parts, is there any in addition on this call that would be helpful to help what you need to do with the community?

BYRON HOLLAND:

I mean, to [tread] off your [top] and I know this is going to be happening in some way, shape, or form. But certainly, individual community webinars with the CCWG leaders and ICANN staff is required, making sure that those are plentiful and good for maximum participation in each of the communities. I think that's going to be absolutely critical, and the more lead time, the better.

If we think about the time of year that this is happening in, it's difficult. Obviously, not for everybody, but for a lot of people. So the more lead time we have to these events, the more clarity there is around these

key dates and times, the better, but certainly just starting with a plentiful number of webinars tailored to each community with as much lead time notice as possible. Just right out of the gate, I would offer that. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Okay. That's actually—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry.

THERESA SWINEHEART: I was going to add in changing the holiday season, as Fadi was suggesting, but Fadi, I'll turn that over to you to socialize.

BYRON HOLLAND: Could you just postpone the week of Christmas for about two weeks? That might solve some of the challenges.

FADI CHEHADE: It is the 12 days of Christmas. We don't have to celebrate from the beginning. Of course, those of us who belong to Eastern churches like myself, we celebrate Christmas in January. It's time for everybody to get the calendar right. Anyways...

So look, I'm very glad Byron said what he said. Because frankly, even though all these nice little charts that we draw look like they're

perfectly colored and perfectly make sense. The reality is in between here, there are some – there's going to be some grinding teeth going on within the communities and, frankly, some pragmatic leadership from everybody so that we can move this process forward. This is not a slam dunk by any means.

I think we are united after Dublin in commitment to get the transition done. We are united in understanding that continued slippage way past the end of this year in delivering the proposal to NTIA, frankly, just makes things far more difficult for them to happen. So I think we all know that and Byron, yourself, as much as you have clarified to us the risks, you've been one of the clearest communicators on the risk of continued delays.

So I know you are just being superbly pragmatic and clear that this is not a slam dunk, that the delays that all we participated in to get the best possible outcome from the CCWG, the reality is that they put us in a tight position here during a very busy time. So yes. To all the above, yes. And I think the answer you gave yourself that webinars, meetings, as much as possible, the date prior to the holidays is going to be very helpful to get us to the right day.

Of course, Leon's statement earlier that they're being very, very careful with adding new elements to the proposal as it exits their team on the 15th is also going to be very helpful, as you know, to the other day, Byron. The more we have new elements being added at the last minute, the more difficult it will be to get everybody back on the same page after Dublin. So I think this will help, as well.

I think that the clarity of our package that will be sent to the community on the 15th and on the 30th will help a lot. If this is well-written and well-prepared by staff and the CCWG, I think it will go a long way. So there's a number of factors that will make this easier, Theresa, as I'm sure you know.

It still doesn't make it – I mean, there are a lot of people to get on the same page, which is precisely why I think the ccNSO and the GAC, which are very broad, diverse bodies, as well, with machinery and processes that are more traditional. We will need to make sure that they have the sufficient time to review those things and, in fact, if required – and only hopefully if required – face-to-face meetings need to be organized.

Byron, you will tell us after – we agreed if you recall that the SO/AC chairs and the CCWG chairs will all meet on, I think, the 23rd or the 24th of this month by telephone. So we can assess a little bit after we see the proposal from the CCWG on the 15th, and after you all have had your council meetings, internal meetings, assess a little bit the timeline more closely after that date. So I look forward to that call, also, in two weeks or so.

Is NTIA with us on the call at the moment? Is there anyone from NTIA?

THERESA SWINEHEART: I haven't seen anybody join.

FADI CHEHADE: Okay. They said they will join late. They had a conflict, but let me, just at the high level, confirm the following. We are engaged, as I said before,

to understand the NTIA process. In terms of... If you recall, there are two parts to that process. One is the DOTCOM Act and the appropriations rider. That's one side. And the other side are the hearings themselves that will occur in Congress. So let me just give you a couple of comments on these in the absence of Fiona and Larry.

On the first one, as you recall, the DOTCOM Act passed the House but was held up in the Senate. Now, the House has just completed its work for the budget of next year. It is being finalized in the Senate within about a few days. I think December 11 is when the Senate is committed to close up the budget.

Now why this is relevant, the budget versus the DOTCOM Act? Because the current strategy that ICANN is implementing in D.C. is to see if we can convince the lawmakers to adopt the DOTCOM Act as part of the budget package that the Senate will approve on the 11th and let go of that rider that has been hanging over NTIA in terms of its ability to participate in the transition.

So this is maybe more detailed than you all would like, but there are some delicate things we're negotiating in conjunction with NTIA that we are negotiating with Congress to make sure that we can get the DOTCOM Act as kind of a replacement for the appropriations rider.

All of that is in motion as we speak, and both myself and my teams are quite engaged in D.C., and I'm heading there, as I told you, to basically attend to that process. And by early December, we should know where that process is.

Now why is this important to us? If the DOTCOM Act passes in December, it means the process by which Larry will conduct his review has now an anchor in the law. There will be a law that will define a little bit what he can do and how fast he can move, and how much time will he give Congress for their deliberations. And that will change the schedule in front of you in some ways, and will define it more clearly.

If the DOTCOM Act does not pass, and the rider remains, there are some risks, but they're manageable, for Larry to continue working with us on the transition. As you recall, the rider does not allow Larry to spend any money or expend any activity towards the transition until September 30, 2016.

Now there are some legal details about this that I'm not going to bore you with in terms of what does this mean and how does it limit our ability, but the [inaudible] I can tell you is if the rider stays, then our assessment at the moment along with Larry's is that we could probably move forward with the transition the day after September 30. Let the contract lapse, that is. But there are risks associated with it.

Now the second part of what's happening in D.C. are the hearings, and we have three sets of hearings that you need to be aware of, and if you have seen me and Larry in Congress over the last year and a half, you'll appreciate these. There are hearings in the Senate that will largely be conducted by Senator Thune's Commerce Committee, and I'm meeting Senator Thune on the 17th to talk to him about that.

There are hearings that will occur in the House in the Commerce Committee of the House, and there are likely – hopefully not, but there

are likely – hearings that will occur also into Judiciary Committee in the House. Those are the Judiciary Committee doesn't have direct purview over the NTIA or the matters we're doing, but they have obviously a very, very strong focus on intellectual property and, therefore, are going to be very closely scrutinizing what we're doing in that area. And this is a very important element of the hearings that we should not forget.

Now there is no guarantee that all three will do hearings. It is likely they will, and it is likely that they will do it in a distributed way, so some of them will do it in potentially December, and we offered them December 8 as a day. It's the only day I'm available, so we're already giving them some dates.

January could be another date. According to the Congressional calendar, it would happen in the second or third week of January. Or it could be in March. We don't think there will be much in February at this stage but we don't know. All of this is being clarified as we speak with Congress, and sometime by the time I meet with you, or those of you meeting me again on the 23rd or 24th of November to review timelines, I should be able to give you a very – well, not very, but at least a clear view of where these things stand.

Any questions on the Washington scene or comments on that? Does this make some sense, I hope, to all of you as this is a complex kind of next phase of activities ICANN and all of us will be engaged in, in Washington to get this machine moving forward.

Theresa, did I miss anything in terms of the Washington engagement? Is that fine?

THERESA SWINEHEART: No. I think that covered everything.

FADI CHEHADE: Okay. Good. All right. So very well. I think, then, the entire... All the headlights and the lime lights are focused on you, Leon. November 15. So right now—

LEON SANCHEZ: No pressure.

FADI CHEHADE: No pressure, but your group now holds the key to make the rest of this nice colored slide we're all looking at have a good shot at getting done. So good luck to you and to your group, and to your leadership so that we can get this wrapped up and moving forward. But if there are no other questions, I think, Theresa, we can wrap this up now.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Okay. That sounds great. Thanks, everybody. And we look forward to talking in a month on the call again.

FADI CHEHADE: By the way, just before you go, when is our next call? When is the next call of this group? Anybody has the date? Is it in December?

THERESA SWINEHEART: December 1 is what we have on the calendar.

FADI CHEHADE: December 1. Okay.

THERESA SWINEHEART: It looks like that.

FADI CHEHADE: Yeah. I think that's a good time because by November 30, we will have released CCWG that finished its work, and the SO/AC communities in general will have had a chance to talk. So yes, December 1 sounds like a good time for us to reconnect and make some, hopefully, some refinements on this timeline. Very well. Thank you, everyone. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Thanks everybody.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, everyone.

FADI CHEHADE: Thank you.

TPFM #5

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye-bye.

FADI CHEHADE: Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]