THERESA SWINEHEART: Fantastic. Well, let me do this. I think we have a good quorum on the call. I'm just looking here. From ICG, from NTIA, from CWG, from CCWG, from the Board, and obviously myself from the staff side. Why don't we go ahead and get started here? Our normal procedure is to go around first with a few introductory remarks. Fadi, unfortunately, is not able to be on the call today, so I'm not a substitute in any way, but I'll try to get this kick-started for all of us.

The way we've done the calls in the past has been to go through talking about where all the different groups feel that their timeline is, and how they're getting a sense, obviously with the CCWG and the ICG being in the midst of the public comment process right now, I can appreciate that you may not have a [unclear 01:13] areas around your timelines or anything around your process, but if you have any sense from the comments or feedback you've been getting in, to-date, those might be good areas to also flag.

Maybe I could ask Alissa to kick off with some of your thoughts about where the ICG is at this point, and the direction that you think it will be going, and if you feel that you have a sense that the timeline for you is along the right course, based on what you've seen come in? I realize that it's closing tonight, UTC time.

ALISSA COOPER: Sure. Thanks Theresa. Indeed, our public comment process is closing very soon. We have received 83 comments in so far. We actually have some more that are pending, awaiting confirmation from the submitters.

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.

So I expect that we will receive in excess of 100 comments. More than 50 of those have been received over the last three or four days. I checked on Friday and we had 30 some, so I'm not in much of a position to be able to report on the content of them, because most of them have just arrived and we haven't started the process of doing a thorough analysis of them just yet.

We do have a group of volunteers from within the ICG Membership, who'll be doing a rapid analysis on all of the comments, to produce an initial suggestion of how the ICG should address them. That hopefully should be ready before the ICG meets face-to-face in Los Angeles December 18th and 19th. We have a group of about six or seven people who are going to be spending a lot of intimate time with the comments in the next week or so, and we have a matrix that our Secretariat has put together, to make it easier for everyone to understand the analysis of the comments.

So that's all the work that we have ahead of us over the next week and a half, two weeks, before we all get together [unclear 04:00]. I guess the only other note about things that have already happened is there had been some discussion in the community, since the last one of these calls, as regarding the IANA IPR, and we did in the ICG receive an update from the CWG about their position regarding the IANA IPR. Their position essentially is consistent with the other two communities, as reflected in that proposal. There's ongoing work amongst the communities coordinating around the implementation details for that.

Otherwise, I don't think I have to offer in the way of timeline going forward. I think maybe after the rest of the folks on the call chime in, I

might have more to say. But it probably makes sense to hear from everyone else about the timeline going forward, first.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Okay. That sounds great. Did anybody have any questions for Alissa regarding the ICG? Otherwise I'd suggest we move to the CCWG. No? Okay. Thanks Alissa. I can sense when all the public comments come in, and then the coalescing around that, that's a lot of extra work. It will be great to see everything that comes out of that. It's been great also to see all the public comments that have gone in, which is good. We have Thomas, either you Mathieu, or I don't know if we have Leon on?

Do you want to talk a little bit about the CCWG and your sense around feedback you're getting, and the comments, and then the timeline and any areas that you want to flag around that? I appreciate your deadline is not until a few days from now, so it's a bit of a wait and see with regards to all the kinds of comments that come in.

THOMAS RICKERT: Sure. Thank you so much Theresa, and hello everyone. We just finished a CCWG call half an hour ago, where we discussed our next steps. As you said, our public comment period is still open, so it would be premature to second-guess what our needs for our group to work or revisit our report would be. But what we can say, from last week's discussions with the ICANN Board, is that the Board has been working very intensely on reviewing our proposal, and they do have alternative suggestions for parts of our recommendations, at least. We are

currently expecting a more detailed description of what the Board's concerns are, rationale for their concerns, and a suggested way forward.

As some of you at least will have heard, we have asked the Board to kindly not only offer criticism to our findings and recommendations, but also to suggest alternatives. The Board has taken this to heart. They obviously do have alternative suggestions for some of the recommendations that we have presented to the community. But there is currently only a very high-level description of those alternatives on the table, and we are awaiting the Board's feedback almost every hour. Having said that, it puts us in a very difficult situation, because we can't say at the moment how much further work will be required on our proposal.

But I think I need to flag that potentially the work-plan that we've set up might not work, because the Board's intervention suggested that they do have concerns with some of the core pieces of our work, and therefore there might be the possibility of needing to readjust or even have an additional public comment period. In that sense, the next steps for our group are to wait for the close of the public comment period. We will need to assess the inputs that we're getting. We need to make a decision whether we're going to hold another face-to-face meeting [at 08:09] the end of this month.

The Board has suggested we have such a meeting, and our group is not against such discussion with the Board. But as you can imagine, our group is very cautious not to make such a meeting look to the outside world like negotiations in the eleventh hour, between the Board and some CCWG representatives, which would then bypass the bottom-up

process that we've been using over the last couple of months; basically from the very beginning of our work on this. Our group is willing to consider a face-to-face if it is actually a CCWG Meeting.

If it's not thoroughly focusing on the Board's input, but also on other input that we've received from the community, and only if it fits into our workload, [unclear 10:12] the submission of our final recommendations to the chartering organization. It needs to be well prepared, well documented, and we're currently not in the position to make any determination on that. But we've undertaken to make a promise that a decision on that will be made within the next seven days. You can expect more information from us to come your way very shortly.

I think one of the most important pieces at the moment for our group to move forward, while we're continuing the work that we have planned, is to actually review the input received by the Board. I think I should pause here. You might have questions, and Mathieu and myself are more than happy to answer them.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Thank you Thomas. I notice that Mathieu put into the chat room that 15 comments have been received so far for the CCWG, and I think as you note, certainly anticipate as it reaches the deadline, that more will come in and it will be a lot to incorporate. I think similarly, as Alissa had noted, with regards to the ICG, then there's a timeframe for the staff to pull everything together and get that out obviously to yourself as Chairs for the CCWG to be considering. I know that they're all figured up and

ready to start reviewing the public comments that come in next week, once those come in.

Good. Any questions for Thomas or Mathieu? Otherwise I'd ask Jonathan whether there was anything on the CWG front, in relation, that we should be considering in the context of this? Okay. Nothing for Thomas or Mathieu then. Jonathan, on the CWG I notice… He is typing in the chat. He has no audio, but no major comments to make. Okay. That really goes to the work of the operational community aspect, the IANA transition proposal and the accountability proposal. Are there any follow ups with regards to this?

Obviously when the public comments come in and ICG has a chance to process those and identify if there's anything impacting the timeline, but also any of the areas that need to be looked at, we'll get those flagged for the next call, and then the same as Thomas and Mathieu have noticed, and also for Leon with regards to the accountability process. I know certainly there's interdependency between the accountability process, as we know, in relation to the ICG proposal.

Are there any other topics we want to address? Otherwise I was going to talk a little bit about some of our initial thinking and preparations around the various elements of implementation that relate to the proposal, that as an organization we're starting to take a look at. We've asked Akram Atallah, who's on the call here, to be leading that part of the work as the proposals get finalized and as the implementation work starts.

BRUCE TONKIN: Theresa, before you jump into that, I can probably give a bit of an update from the Board's perspective on at least the CCWG work?

THERESA SWINEHEART: Sure. That would be great, Bruce. Thanks.

BRUCE TONKIN: I think firstly, on the ICG Report, have we published our public comments on that one yet, Theresa?

THERESA SWINEHEART: No. Those are going out today.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yes. That's about two pages. I don't think there's going to be anything particularly controversial in those comments on the ICG. Yes, hopefully you'll see those today.   On the CCWG, I noticed Thomas made the comment that you're waiting every hour for the Board's response, and I think at this stage the Board is spending every hour on developing that response. So we've been working more or less around the clock for the last few days - at least there's always somebody working on it.

Where we are at the moment is we've broken down the CCWG Report, basically copied the text from each section of recommendations on the CCWG Report, and then provided our comments on section-by-section so that we can be absolutely clear on our feedback. That's a pretty long matrix. I think we've broken it down into something like close to 50

EN

sections. We've got comments on each section. Generally, what we're doing with the comments is indicating if we have agreement with the text as written. So we're saying, "The Board agrees completely with the text that's in the CCWG Report."

The other category we have is, "We agree in general with the majority of the text for that section, but we have a couple of suggestions." Usually that's just one or two sentences on that particular section of text where we've made some suggestions, that hopefully the CCWG will take on board as part of the public comments. Then there are some sections where we've identified that there is still quite a different view from the Board on that particular topic, and where in those cases we're trying to provide some more substantial text to say, "This is an alternative way that we think will achieve the same goal."

You've heard a little about that when we last met with the CCWG on instead of using a sole member model, an alternative model we wanted to put forward was an arbitration model. You'll see some more text on that as well. On the arbitration model specifically, that again is probably going to end up being about two pages, so it's not going to be a long document. It basically would consist of our general proposal, as well as a copy of legal advice that we've received on that particular proposal.

The areas where the Board is… This is based on the last call we had; the probably main areas I can think of, where we're likely to provide some more substantive comments - they'd be on the budget, on the removal of Directors, on removal of the Board, and on the sole member models. Those are probably the areas where we'll have the most substantial comments, and then as I said, on every other area we've provided

comments as well. So it's pretty thorough, and hopefully that will be a basis for a more effective conversation between the Board and the CCWG, should the CCWG wish to hear from us. I guess that's a summary, Theresa.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Great Bruce. Thank you very much. Steve, I noticed you wanted to say something as well. Then I saw the hands in the Adobe room. So I'll go to Thomas after Steve, and then Jari and Alissa.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you Theresa, and thank you Bruce. I just want to follow up what Bruce has said. I understand that there's what I consider to be a relatively small difference in orientation. I understand the CCWG would like us to provide "a gap analysis" as opposed to providing alternative suggestions. From my point of view, these two are very tightly linked to each other in that the reason for providing alternative suggestions is precisely because there's the perception of a gap, or conversely if one comes at it from another direction, if one points out, "We think there's a gap here," the conversation is difficult to continue past that point, unless there is a suggestion about what to do instead.

I hope that the CCWG would take what Bruce referred to as what we're working around the clock on as fundamentally driven by a gap analysis and presented as a combo of at each point, "Here's what we think is a discrepancy between our thinking and yours," and, "Here's a suggestion about what to do about it." That's really all I wanted to comment on.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Great. Thanks Steve, and thanks Bruce, and also for all of your work on this - it has been fairly intense. Thomas, I see that your hand is up?

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks Theresa. My hand is to ask you how the project plan can be re-written in order to give us more time, while maybe not jeopardizing the overall deadlines for achieving the transition. I guess the Board comments suggest that it's at least not unlikely that we'll not be able to meet the timeline that we have indicated. Understanding exactly how much wiggle-room there is would be valuable. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Thank you Thomas. I think maybe once all the public comments have come in for both the ICG and the CCWG, that's a good opportunity to be looking at that assessment based on the feedback from the community, and obviously from the assessment of the public comments that have come in. Maybe that's something we can keep an eye on subsequent to the public comment deadlines, and then look at how one might want to make adjustments, if one needs to make adjustments around that project planning, and obviously the timeline that's been posted up here. Jari, you had your hand up?

JARI ARKKO: Yes, thank you. Nice to hear from all of you. I wanted to say that while the accountability piece is not really our business at the IETF, and we are still trying to compete the packet deal to take the transition forward,

we're all dependent on each other. In that sense, the recent discussions worried me a little bit. I haven't been part of the meetings, but I've seen some email exchanges and Minutes, and I think maybe other people have reacted a little bit; emotionally, or they're in some state of shock, initially.

I think it's important that we get back to doing the actual rationale process here, and I think that you guys are getting a lot of feedback from the community, and also the Board can take a look at each of these items and try to figure out if there is an issue. Always when we get feedback, we actually may learn something. So figure out if there's an issue, and then figure out a way forward. I think it's important that we get back to that, and I don't think we should be afraid of making changes, if needed. We should just get on with that.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Thank you Jari. That's a good observation with all of the issues that we have in the discussions around the different proposals. Alissa, I saw that you had your hand up as well. Unless there's any comments over to Jari or Thomas? Okay, Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. I wanted to pick up on something Thomas said. He made essentially the same comment I was going to make, which is that to the extent that if the timing does change for any part of the process, I think it will be really important for everyone to understand how much of a window we all have to still complete the transition by the time the

contract is set to expire. I know you said, Theresa, to wait and see when the comments come in, we can evaluate the overall project plan.

I think from the ICG perspective, having that information about how much of a delay is acceptable in terms of everything that NTIA has to get done within the US Government, and the approval process there, as well as everything that will have to get done from an implementation perspective. Having the information about how much extra time we could possibly take, beyond what is already scheduled in the project plan that we're all looking at.

We will need that information in the ICG very soon. The ICG potentially has multiple different options in terms of how we could go forward, depending on if there is expected to be a delay on the accountability side, and how long it's expected to be, and so forth. But we won't be able to make a determination about what to do. It's just in a couple of weeks time from now - if we don't have a clear feeling about whether we're potentially making a decision in that and jeopardizing the whole transition, or if we're just making a decision that results in a minimal delay.

I would say getting some firm information from NTIA, from all of the parties that need to be involved in the implementation phase, will be really important for the ICG, if it appears that there will be any delay at all. I would say also that from the ICG side, if we feel based on the comments we receive that we'll be delayed in our process, we'll certainly try to communicate that as soon as we can, which hopefully will be not really too much later than next week. That's a plea to the

EN

people on this call to be clear about if there's a delay, how much of it we can really bear.

I would also say I'm very sensitive to the fact that the ICG, on several occasions now, has set a deadline for something, and the members in the community have bent over backwards to get all their work done and meet that deadline, and then they've subsequently been told, "Now you just have to wait, because there's some other part of this process that isn't ready." We've done that a few times now, and we're potentially in the situation where we might end up doing that again with the public comments.

If we have the ICG hurry up and analyze all these public comments and process them and produce something, and then all of that effort was expended just so that we can wait for some extended period of time. I don't think that will be too well received either. So again, to the extent that there's any information that people can share today, as far as how much wiggle room we have, I think that would be much appreciated - and if not today, then next week or the week after, the ICG will probably need that information to help us figure out what to do if it turns out we're not sticking to this plan. Thanks.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Alissa, you make a really good point, you and Jari, in the context of also the very strong interdependencies, but not only amongst the community-related proposals. I've asked to put up this slide that I know we've seen before, about the phasing process right here. We have a very strong interdependency, once the proposals are finalized, for NTIA

EN

itself to have adequate time to conduct its review process. Then we have a congressional review process with 30 legislative days that need to be built in, and obviously the implementation timeline. When NTIA had put its letter out for identifying timeframes, the community came back with what they expected also in the context of implementation.

I think that as we look at the public comment and that incorporation, that we then look at pushing out if there's any shifts and timelines, the timeline for both the NTIA review process, and then obviously finalizing the implementation. What's most important in all of this is to get this right, and I know that that's what everybody's striving towards - that the implementation, and getting the proposals implemented in a good way is going to be the most important thing as opposed to very specific dates.

As we're trying to coalesce and finalize proposals as a community, making sure that we get this right - that the inter-dependencies work, that the themes that have been identified are workable, that there's community support and consensus around that, and that the proposals are strong and long-term sustainable, obviously. That's going to be critical. Getting that right obviously takes quite a bit of work. Going to your question about how much room there is, I certainly would be reluctant to answer that.

I think more important is how do we ensure that this gets done right, and trying to keep it within the window of time that allows for the implementation timeframe to occur as well. Others may have other observations. Does anyone else have thoughts on this?

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Theresa. That is helpful. One initial reaction, which is of course I fully agree about not rushing, and getting it right. The situation I'm envisaging is one where we, in the ICG, feel like we have to choose between a situation where we get it done, and a situation where we don't get it done within the current lifetime of the contract. That, I think, is the only thing that we really have to plan for that we haven't fully determined, or certainly that we haven't discussed at length in the ICG. If we come to a point where that's the decision that we feel like we're making, we need to be able to know if that's a situation we're in, based on the amount of time.

It's really hard, because clearly the clock isn't going to be ticking down on the contract when we're making that decision. The clock is going to be ticking down on all the things that have to happen after we send the proposal forward for transition to NTIA. It's the kind of really difficult decision that we'd have to be making. Not so much about should we keep tweaking this proposal until it's perfect. I hope we don't have to end up in that situation, but it's always good [unclear 31:50] case.

THERESA SWINEHEART: No, I hear what you're saying. I notice Jari also in the chat put about minimal delay in what we're doing, and also what we need in the context of the transition that there's many issues obviously that are relevant to the continued evolution of the organization, but also minimally what's needed for the transition, and looking at that in the context of both the ICG proposal and also the accountability proposal

EN

and the interdependencies that are there. I think this will be a good topic for us to revisit on the next call, and obviously as we get the public comments in, to try to keep an eye on this assessment.

It does raise, as you know, the really important area that it's also around the implementation of the elements of both the ICG proposal and the accountability proposal. Essentially, what would be the red line currently being shown on the chart that I have up, would be with regards to starting to prepare the different elements that are relevant for the implementation. For example, some of those can't be started until there's a sign-off from NTIA in the process with regards to, "We can go ahead and finalize implementation of certain areas."

But some of that work can already start; for example in the context of with the CCWG proposal and starting to look at elements of the CWG proposal that are related to bylaw provisions that need to be started to be prepared for, and starting to be thought about. What I wanted to also let everybody know on this call, that Fadi had announced on the last one, is we're already starting to do the thinking around that, and the project planning, and the preparations around that. We'll have that as a topic for calls coming up, on these calls - where the process and progress lines are coming on that.

I think as many who were on the call last time know, Akram Atallah, my colleague, is taking on the implementation thread of all of this. Akram, if I could maybe ask you to say a few words about the thinking of this? We can talk a little bit about this direction of the work.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Thank you. Thank you everyone for the call. My thoughts right now are really around sizing the job. We've started to look at all of the different proposals, trying to break down the different elements and projects that need to be implemented, and trying to size them. So we expect that probably in the next few weeks, before the end of the month, that we should have a rough high-level plan of all of the different elements, and what we think it's going to take us to implement them. We don't want to be the bottom [rack 35:10] in making the transition happen, so we want to try to do as much pre-work as we can so that we take the time that's available between now and the approval of the plan to be prepared.

In light of that, we've actually assigned [Trang Nguyen 35:35], who actually was very instrumental in the New gTLD Program, to lead the effort of program management on all of these elements.   She's recruiting a couple more people to do program management and project management to help with that, from within the organization. Hopefully we can deliver, in the next meeting, an updated timeline on where we see we are.

A key thing that we want to also clarify is working with the community on how they would like to engage with us on the implementation, and how we report on our progress as we move forward, so that we're working with the community, making sure that the implementation is what they expect it to be, so that we don't find any surprises at the end of that. Right now we are breaking the elements into three lanes - the PTI and the CCWG proposal, as well as root zone management efforts.

EN

Each one of these we are trying to identify the projects that can be done earlier, or the prep work that can be done earlier, and what's going to be left for later. We will start engaging with the community on assigning owners for each one of these from within the staff. So it's a lot of work but I think that we're up to it, and I hope the community will join us in getting this done on time.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Great. Thanks Akram. Mathieu and Alissa have their hands up. Mathieu, can I turn it over to you?

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you very much Theresa. Thanks Akram for the update. I think when we were discussing about wiggle room and ability to cope with minor delays at certain stages of the process, kick-starting implementation has been something we've been aware we had to kick off for quite a while now. So that's very welcome. I'd certainly encourage the team working on this to engage with the community rather earlier than later. I don't know when our next call is planned for, but if it's probably in a month's time, that's probably a bit late. The Working Groups are really eager to get support and see that ICANN is getting organized to deliver.

Finally - and it's a bit of a follow up on Jari and Alissa's points earlier - I think within the CCWG effort of the implications of any shift of the timeline in terms of dependencies, a trap we should certainly avoid falling into would be that all the parties in this call would turn to each other and try and see where the timeline shifted, and point fingers, or

assess where the problems came from. We're certainly all on the same boat here. We're certainly all working for the success of the transition, from different perspectives, with different expectations.

I think if there's any part of the process that's being delayed, or having some problems finding consensus, it's our collective response to step up and come and help if we want this to [proceed 40:08]. That's probably true now. It's been true in the last few months, and it's going to be true in the next few months. I think it's quite important that we all focus on finding the solutions that meet everyone's expectations, and act especially at the leadership level with a very high sense of responsibility towards the process. Thanks.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Mathieu, thank you. Alissa, I see your hand is up.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. I wanted to highlight something that Jonathan said in the chat, which is that one of the key issues or questions he said the CWG will be asking is what the role of the CWG is in implementation planning and execution. I will just build on that by saying that I've received some questions about the role of the ICG during the implementation phase, and this is something that I hope the ICG will be discussing the next time that we meet as a group. I think it's an open question, but I do think the ICG is a useful construct in that we have folks from all of the different constituencies and can continue to serve as a coordinating body to the extent that there is coordination necessary across the communities.

That's something that I hope the ICG will be discussing, and certainly to the extent that there's a need for support for the communities, or some sort of coordinating role - but something that the ICG could potentially take up, if the ICG Members are wanting to do that, or if the groups from the community feel that that would be useful. Particularly for areas where there are mutual interests across the three operational communities, there aren't too many of those, but there are some featuring with the PTI and so forth. So that might be something that the ICG considers we can have when we meet.

BRUCE TONKIN: Just to call in on that Theresa, if I may? It's Bruce. I support that idea, Alissa. I think there are probably two key steps to implementation. One of the steps is the actual bylaw text changes that need to be made, or the changes that need to be made to the bylaws. My understanding, from comments that Larry Strickling has made in earlier meetings, is that that is quite key for them in being able to sign off on the proposal, and that they need to know the exact bylaw changes that would be made. Certainly I think we're going to need to work closely between the ICANN Legal Team and the ICG, and also the CCWG, on making sure we've reached agreement on those bylaw changes.

Then the second area there is obviously the implementation of the many things. I imagine we're going to end up with quite a complex project plan for all the different changes that are going to be made. Certainly I think ICG is going to be a useful coordinating body, but also probably what will be useful is even identifying smaller Working Groups from the

community that will work more closely with the staff on those implementation details.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Thanks Bruce. I think that's a good way of defining it. Any questions to either Akram or anybody else on the call with regards to the work around the implementation? As Akram mentioned, we'll be reporting back to this call on a monthly basis as part of the Agenda, and then obviously in coordination with respective Working Groups around that. But any other questions or comments? Go ahead Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Just the point being that I think it's greatly welcomed that there's the prospect of both Akram's project management skills and the ICG potentially playing a coordinating role. Those both sound like very useful ideas. It's a matter of then making sure we're joined up on how this implementation is going to work and how it works within the communities and at a coordinated level. I'm emphasizing some of the comments I've made in the chat about how to join all of that up and understand and link up points that Bruce has made, for example, about smaller Working Groups.

I don't think it's absolutely clear to any of us yet how exactly this implementation is going to work. I'd encourage us all to keep talking about it and figuring it out. I think the roots or the genesis of the right idea seems to be here, but we haven't figured it all out yet. So it's something we will need to do some more work on, and I'm glad the conversation has started. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Thank you Jonathan. I know as we're in the process of finalizing the proposals, starting to think and shift over to this next phase is a welcome thing. But we also need to think through it. Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: I was just going to say I think even - it's just between myself and Patrick and Mohamed - once we got the proposal out for public comment, I had made the suggestion, "Shouldn't we go and think about what our role's going to be?" and they very wisely said, "We need to finalize the proposal first and let the public comments come in, and not have people be confused." I just wanted to reflect that part of the reason we haven't done this already in the ICG is because we do feel like we wanted to respect the public comment process and actually make sure that the proposal is in a shape that is ready to go forward, and the analysis of public comments is going to require a lot of effort and energy over the next several weeks in the ICG.

Although we might start discussing this, I think if you don't hear too much from us about it immediately, it's because we're busy trying to make sure that the proposal is in top shape and ready to go forward. We sequenced it that way on purpose, because we wanted to avoid confusion and make sure we don't ask people to think about too many hard problems at once. Definitely I want this to be on the ICG's agenda, but it might take us a little bit longer to sort it out in terms of what our role should be, just because we'll be busy dealing with the proposal itself.

THERESA SWINEHEART: It's completely understandable. We wanted to raise it on this call to also just flag the work that we'd doing internally to start the thinking around that, and obviously as the proposals are being finalized, this will be an area where we start having an inner-connection on it and then moving towards that conversation. But I hear completely what you're saying, Alissa. Any other hands up? Anybody else on either timelines or updates or any other issues? No? Okay. It certainly felt like a little bit of a shorter summer than probably most of us anticipated, and probably a busier summer than most of us anticipated.

But it's great to see the progress in all of the work, and obviously this phase now as we get the public comments in and move into the next part of the conversation about this. We have a call in a month again, and we'll focus it on a similar Agenda, and then, as noted, the section on the implementation and the focus there. To the point earlier, starting to look at as the public comments come in and as those get processed with regards to any timeline elements that need to be looked at in the context of obviously the bigger picture, and then the shorter windows within those, as we all work to get the proposals right, and moving forward. Thanks everybody. Appreciate it. Happy September. I look forward to the next call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]