FADI CHEHADÉ: I cannot think of a more important time to have this kind of call than today as we very much are in the very last yards of this very long journey and very important journey.

It seems to us from looking at the various dates now, and today for the first time we will show you the regular timeline that you've seen from Theresa's team all along, but we also will zoom in on that timeline and focus down to weeks and days into the February and March timeframe. Because for all practical purposes as of right now, if we cannot figure out together – even if it's will require all of us to do an extra effort – how to complete the process and deliver the proposal to NTIA by mid-March, I think we're going to see things starting to become difficult after that.

The timeline that you will see in a moment will, I think, help us all focus our minds on the importance of wrapping things up around the time our entire community is together in the Marrakech meeting. Looking past Marrakech, there are some very tight calendars that make it a little bit difficult for us to push past that. Having the Board present in Marrakech with already many scheduled times together so they can receive the proposals after the chartering organizations have looked at them, allowing them to pass a resolution and transmit this to NTIA, will be good because immediate after Marrakech it will be travel time and by the time we get the Board back together, may delay the transmission to NTIA by a few [weeks].

We know that NTIA has made it clear they need a minimum of 60-90 days so that they can have their intra-agency review, they can receive

the Bylaws, and provide their report. That's a known timeline. We also know that even without the DOTCOM Act, Congress will need time to review the proposal. Both NTIA and [me] have made it amply clear that we intend to do so to give them that time. If NTIA does not finish its review and report on the proposals leaving sufficient time for Congress to complete its review prior to the unusually long recess Congress plans to take this year – seven full weeks of recess starting in mid-July – I think it will mean without a doubt that this will delay NTIA's formal notice to ICANN and delay implementation and delay the opportunity, the window we all have together today.

I know that all of you have heard this 20 times before, and I' sorry for repeating it, but we are now in what we call delivery crunch time. Every day will make a difference before this gets either over-politicized or delayed for reasons we can't control.

One last I want to say: I think rising from all the details and all the hard work everyone has put, which is still remarkable, I just would like to remind us that the multi-stakeholder community's triumph and success will be in delivering that proposal to the United States government. Of course, we would like that proposal to go through the process, and we're confident in Larry Strickling's deft hand to walk us through that process and to help us complete it and satisfy the U.S. government that we have met their criteria. But our success will be in delivering that proposal. If we failed to do so as a community, I think we would wound our ability to stand tall behind our multi-stakeholder process.

We have an opportunity to do so. Everyone is together, and we're almost there, to complete all of this. I'll hand it back to my colleagues so

we can start looking at the detailed timelines and make sure that we have reflected what you've told us, because we're only the facilitators here, and ensure that we have a shot at working together to deliver this to the Board in Marrakech, have them transmit it then to NTIA.

Theresa, back to you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you, Fadi. I guess I'm not on mute. Sometimes I feel like I'm talking to myself. Wonderful, everybody. On the timeline here (and I think we've given everybody the scroll abilities for themselves so you can see this) this is the one that you've seen in the past calls that we've had. If you take a look at it, and I think everybody can zoom in according to their own ability to see this, what we have here is the anticipation of the CCWG publishing the supplemental report.

I had just gotten off the call that Thomas, Mathieu, and Leon had shared the CCWG call, and congratulations on wrapping up a huge amount of things on that call. I don't want to speak on their behalf, but the objective here is really to get the publication of the supplemental report early next week out to the chartering organizations. We'll drill down a little bit into the timeline on the next slide that I have.

If we look at the cadence of events, then we are looking at an objective to receive the ICG proposal, the CWG dependencies on the CCWG proposal clarified to the ICG, and the CCWG proposal hopefully at the latest by Marrakech.

You can see moving down into the green line then the interdependencies with the drafting of the Bylaws, the posting for public comments that we need to do as part of the ICANN process as the Bylaws themselves, and then providing those to NTIA in time for them to incorporate into the review and the report. Also allowing Congress to have some time to take a look at it and then moving into NTIA providing us with a formal notification to finalize the implementation. This high-level overview provides us with the cadence of events that we have and the interdependencies there.

Hillary, if I could ask somebody on the team to go over to the next slide that draws down a little bit into the February and March timeframe. Okay, wonderful. Again, if we could just get everybody scrolling right. We prepared this looking at the feedback that we've been getting from the CCWG, understanding the interdependencies of the CWG with regards to the accountability proposal recommendations and then the ICG.

If we look at submission of the supplemental draft reports to the chartering organizations by 18 February and allowing the chartering organizations to go through their process for the consideration of the Work Stream 1 recommendations, understanding – and [inaudible] got Jonathan and Lise to talk to this – CWG will assess the dependencies with regard to the accountability proposal and advice the ICG on that.

Then we are looking at needing to receive from the ICG and the CCWG the proposals by the 8th, so by the Tuesday in Marrakech, in order to allow the opportunity for the Board to have both sets of proposals and turn those around and have the opportunity then at the Board session

itself on Thursday on the 10th to be able to do the final resolution and the handover to NTIA and the transmission of that over to NTIA.

Again, as Fadi had mentioned, if we are looking at anything past that, if we go back to the earlier timeline, then we start to push all the other factors and the interdependencies out. As you'll see on this slide, it's our understanding that there may be Congressional hearings expected either in the first or second week post-Marrakech. Again, some of those might then get pushed out as would NTIA's opportunity to begin their 60-90 day [inaudible] review process.

This is a drill down of the weeks that are coming up and then leading into Marrakech with regards to the timings and the days and the limited amount of time that we have in the context of that, that we would need to factor in to allow the Board to publish its resolution and submit the proposal to NTIA by the 10th, which is their face-to-face meeting. After that, we would need to look at alternative dates for the Board to convene for a Board call and, again, that pushes the timeline out again as we talked about earlier.

Are there any questions on this? Otherwise, I'd like to turn it over to maybe Alissa from the ICG or a representation from the co-chairs followed by representation from the CWG and then the CCWG on their comments on where they are with their work and in this timeline overview. But first, are there any questions before we turn that over? Yes, Jonathan, please?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Theresa. Perhaps you saw my question in the chat there. Do you have at this stage or should we have any expectation of participating in those hearings in D.C. that you have penciled in, in the first or second week post-Marrakech? Any thoughts on that?

FADI CHEHADÉ: Theresa, I can handle this for you. Jonathan, the first set of hearings – which will be by the House, not the Senate, the House Commerce – will not include NTIA or ICANN. This will be a hearing targeted at the community. They decide whom they call from the community. We have not seen a list yet from them. Again, the hearings are not finalized, but our understanding based on the [inaudible] engagement that we have on the Hill. This is our understanding. We do not have yet any more details than I shared with you.

There will be other hearings, of course, later in the year. We expect them to happen. But at least for the immediate one that Theresa mentions in this slide, it is expected to not include. And I think there's someone from NTIA on the line, but I can at least confirm that once NTIA receives the proposal, Larry has made it clear that he will not be in hearings during the time he has the proposal in his hands and until he reaches the end of his review process. So if we give the proposal to Larry in Marrakech, that will further confirm that he will not be in those hearings in March.

Does that help you a little bit, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yes. Thanks, Fadi. You answered the first part. [inaudible] maybe that we will be involved and, if so, any indication that you can give now or at any stage in the future as to whether we should have a particular period in diaries available would be very helpful.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Yes. If you look at the House calendar, the House will be out for Easter starting on Thursday. I think it will be the 24th. I don't have the calendar with me, but I believe the House recesses on either the 24th or the 25th. So the likely hearings in March, assuming we deliver the proposal to NTIA in Marrakech, will be either the week following Marrakech or the first three days of the week starting on 22 February. After that, the House is in recess for several weeks because of Easter.

Jamie, did I cover this well? Have you been a good teacher here? Did I get this right?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yes. That's absolutely right. Just to reiterate, nothing is confirmed yet. The hearing that we expect in early mid-March would be similar to hearings they've had in the past when they've called on stakeholders. It's usually U.S. stakeholders. We don't know yet whether they will call anyone from any of the working groups, but we are trying to find out that information. [inaudible] it's not that Larry would refuse to testify. It's just that Larry wouldn't really have anything to say because the proposals at that point would be under review. We do expect the House and Senate to hold hearings shortly after approval of the proposals. If

that happens during the seven-week recess, then it would be a final check off in September. Thanks.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Jamie, is the Congressional staffer who is likely to call for hearings in March going to be himself in Marrakech with us?

JAMIE HEDLUND: There will be a number of House staffers and a handful of Senate staffers, all from the Commerce Committee, in Marrakech, yes.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Okay. Jonathan, that will be another chance also to get some insights from them while they're with us.

THERESA SWINEHART: Wonderful. [Allan], you had your hand up.

[ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY]: Yes. Thank you, Theresa. Looking at the dates from the ccNSO perspective, right now the ccNSO Council meeting which we would anticipate this to be reviewed would be on the Wednesday, 9 March. So I'm just trying to understand the timing there and why is the 48 hours needed as opposed to the Wednesday. Because in order for this to go forward, the ccNSO would have to completely revamp its program for Marrakech. So could you just give me a little background on that, please? Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Sure. I'm happy to, and I also see that Steve has his hand up. Steve, did you want to address this specific question as well? Or I'm happy to.

[FADI CHEHADÉ]: Steve, you may be on mute.

STEVE CROCKER: Yes. I was on mute. I'm sorry. I don't know how to address [Allan's] question exactly, but just looking at it from the Board's perspective, if the proposal arrives on Tuesday March 8 and we're expected to pass a resolution and forward it to NTIA on March 10, there are really two separate aspects to this. One is the substance and the other is, well, I'll call it the theater.

We will have need to have seen the substance of the proposal some time earlier so that we know what it is that we're dealing with and have time to read it and so forth. So if what arrives on the 8th is what we've already seen and it simply is a formal delivery, then we can arrange to be quite quick about the process and in step with that timing and whip it through in essence and it would be, of course, quite opportune to hand it over on the last day – I guess that's the last day of the Marrakech meeting – with a bit of formality and theater involved.

That's the point that I want to make. We need the substance and if what arrives on the 8th is materially different from anything we've seen before, then the Board will take some time to actually read it and

understand it so that its sign off is meaningful. I would imagine the ccNSO is in a comparable position.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Theresa, if I could answer [Allan]?

THERESA SWINEHART: Please, go ahead.

FADI CHEHADÉ: [Allan], of course, as you just heard from Steve, it's going to be very tight and crunch time. If the ccNSO reviews the proposal that was sent on 18 February on the 9th and is good to go with it, and assuming your meeting hopefully on the 9th is in the morning to allow the Board some time in the afternoon to look at whatever comes out of your meeting and other chartering organizations' meetings. But if the outcome of your meeting, of course, is green light and moving forward, then it would be okay to do that on the 9th.

The concern we, of course, have is if you – as you just noted, your meeting starts at 5:00 PM and by 9:00 PM you inform the community that you'd like to make any changes to the proposal at that hour, it just makes it very, very tight for turnaround. That's why I think we had put the 8th so at least to allow a day, Wednesday, as a day where all the chartering organizations would have finished and deliberated and the Board and others can. Maybe even the CCWG has meetings already, I believe, on Wednesday. That gives them a chance to wrap things up in order for the Board to then pass a resolution on Thursday.

So it's down to the wire, as you see, and if there is any way for the ccNSO, given the unusual circumstances, to reconsider that timeline, of course, it would help everyone. Because I don't think anyone else is that late in the process. I know the other chartering organizations are here, so we'd love to hear from them.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you, Fadi. Of course, just to add in and then, Alan, I'll turn it over to you, we appreciate and I know that the staff that is supporting the respective SOs and ACs and chartering organizations is also standing ready to help and support any of the groups that want to try to meet upon receipt on the 18th. What we're trying to flag here is really the latest, also highlighting Steve's point with regards to the extent to any changes or whether the documents that are provided prior by the 18th and subsequent are similar for them to get the opportunity to review that. But the SOs and ACs staff are also ready to stand and support any of the groups that want to try to meet prior to that or help support any adjustments in schedule, [inaudible] or David Olive and his team as well.

If I could turn it over to Alan Greenberg and then, James, you're next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I guess I have to express a bit of confusion. The various chartering organizations are going to do the approval on their own timeline, some perhaps before Marrakech, some at Marrakech. There's really no mechanism once one of the groups approves it for changes to be incorporated by another group and federal back into it.

We really don't have a mechanism for doing that other than reopening the CCWG discussions.

I'm working on the assumption that the approval will come from the various CCWGs perhaps with some words of caveat that go along with it that they feel obliged to put but not with the presumption that it will cause changes in the proposal. If indeed there are going to be changes in the proposal at the approval stage within the chartering organizations, I don't think we've contemplate even how we could handle that if it were to happen. So I'm not quite sure where we're heading with the presumption that there might be changes at the approval level. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thanks, Alan. That's helpful. Fadi, were you going to speak?

FADI CHEHADÉ: Yes, Alan. You're spot on in that. Frankly, given how much we've all looked at this so far, the presumption here and the hope is that this is a step for each chartering organization to say, "Yes. This is the process. This is the substance we've seen all along, and we're good to go." We hope, like you, that the chartering organizations will not be introducing changes at the last minute.

Now, if they do, you are right. The only way to address them is for the CCWG to absorb these and address them. And the CCWG right now if we are to assume that even a very small chance that there will be changes that need to be addressed, then the only day where that could

happen is really Wednesday if we are still to finish in Marrakech. To answer Allan's much earlier question, "Why did we put the 8th?" Allan from Canada, well, they're from Canada they do the work I guess. Allan who is representing Byron.

ALAN GREENBERG: Allan with two Ls.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Yes. Allan with two Ls. I think it's simply to say if we can wrap things by the 8th, then at least we have a breathing day on the 9th, which we may not need hopefully but if we do need it, then we're going to call on the great generosity of the CCWG to get together that day. And if we don't need it, then it's a day for all of us to take a step back, for the Board to have its formal meeting to hopefully review it and go forward. So that was the intent.

Really, I mean, we're now down to hours and days. If we are to, as I hear everyone here, commit to finish in Marrakech, we will need some extraordinary commitments by everyone to try and move the needle a little bit, even by a day, to give us breathing room should we need it. And hopefully we won't need it, Alan.

Does that make sense, Alan Greenberg? Does this explain why we are just leaving that day open in case?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. I [inaudible] that makes sense. I have no problem with it. But I think the reality is even if the CCWG were to meet and make a change, it would then have to go back to all the chartering organizations and the timeframe just doesn't allow that. So I'm assuming if some chartering organization has a real problem, then they will simply disagree and our charter allows it to go forward to the Board with some disagreement raised by chartering organizations. It would be unfortunate, but the process does allow that, and I think that's how we would have to proceed. Changing would push back another three or four weeks at least.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Okay.

THERESA SWINEHART: Alan, then to your point too, each of the chartering organizations has a timeline that they can work within. So again, the earlier the feedback is the better. This is really to highlight the time that if we want to try to get it done within that window in Marrakech. But the earlier we receive feedback, obviously, the better.

James, let me turn it over to you and then, Thomas, I see you're in the queue. Oh, Thomas? Okay, great. Thomas, you're good. Go ahead.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thank you very much, Theresa. I would like to briefly respond to Alan's point and maybe address all community leaders that are present on this call. It is very much up to each and every one of you to ensure that we

don't run into very last-minute issues with this. The CCWG has published the updated report in an iterative fashion. Whenever we reach consensus on an updated recommendation, we would have that sent to our lawyer for a legal check and we also sent it to our group to give them the opportunity to raise concerns, if any.

So everything that we agreed on is known to the representatives of the respective chartering organizations. So I would be very surprised and taken aback if we found out in the last minute that a chartering organization was not okay with additions or changes that we've made since we received feedback to our third report.

Remember, we have received feedback from the chartering organizations, and the chartering organizations with their feedback have specified what conditions need to be met, i.e., what tweaks need to be made to our recommendations so that they can approve it. We have not heard any concerns suggesting that approval from chartering organizations would not happen. Certainly, this needs further deliberation and inspection by the chartering organizations, but so far we don't have any indication that would make us fear that we would run into any last-minute issues.

So, please, keep your ears on the track. Talk to your members that are working on your behalf in the CCWG, and let's ensure that we don't need to open up the package again. As Theresa said earlier, we really achieved a breakthrough during the call that was had earlier today. We have reached consensus even on Recommendation 11, the Stress Test 18 issue, the Mission, the Human Rights issue, so all the very controversially discussed items have now been closed. So let's, please,

jointly make sure that we're going to have some theater as Steve mentioned it and allow for Steve to hand over a package of paper to Larry on Thursday in Marrakech. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Well done, Thomas. Well done. Great work.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thomas, thanks. James, I'm sorry. I had missed you, so please, go ahead. You're next.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks, Theresa. Can you hear me now?

THERESA SWINEHART: We can hear you now. Yes. Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL: Hello?

FADI CHEHADÉ: Yes. We can hear you, James.

THERESA SWINEHART: Yes. We can hear you.

JAMES BLADEL: Okay, great. Thomas' intervention was more timely anyway, so I'm glad he was able to jump ahead of me there. Just wanted to report that – thank you for this updated timeline. It is indeed airtight. There's very little wiggle room here. but I think that we can work this within the GNSO Council, within the schedule of the Council's review. There are existing meetings, the first of which will come out and coincide almost exactly with the tentative publication date of the report.

But we are looking at the potential for a special session in advance of Marrakech, something like February 29/March 1 timeframe, which would probably about the time everyone is getting ready to depart, as well as – and this is not the preferred option – but there is a potential that we could commandeer one of our weekend sessions for the review of this and then, of course, ensuring in parallel that we are both checking dependencies with the CCWG stewardship as well as rolling up the criteria and approval from all of the stakeholder groups and constituencies.

So the short answer is, I think that we can make this work. It's going to be very tight, and we may have to incorporate one or two special sessions in order to meet this date, but I think it's possible. Thanks.

THERESA SWINEHART: Great, James. Thanks very much. That's really very helpful and encouraging. As you say, it is getting quite tight, so we'll do whatever we can to help support any of the SOs and ACs that need to be adjusting their schedules. Again, David's team and the staff is aware of this.

They're aware of the sequencing of events and are happy to help out with any of the groups that need the additional support.

Let's see. There are no other hands up right now specifically with this. I'm wondering if I could go to the ICG chairs and co-chairs and then over to CWG on the interdependencies and then turn it back over to the CCWG to talk about any additional factors that weren't touched on yet. Alissa, would you be able to talk about this? That would be great. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. Happy to talk about ICG. I'll just warn people that it's 6:30 in the morning here and my daughter is here with me, so she's on the call as well. You might hear her.

From the ICG perspective, it's pretty straightforward. We are awaiting the publication of the CCWG proposal to the chartering organizations. As soon as that happens, we will seek confirmation from the CWG as to whether their requirements have been met plus the one condition that we're still waiting for in our proposal.

Then as soon as we hear back from the CWG, assuming that we hear back in the affirmative, then will convene a meeting of the ICG, which currently we're scheduling a few different time just to make sure that we have it on people's calendars, but we're looking at a call on March 1 and then also scheduling a meeting in Marrakech just in case. We'll only need one or the other of those, but whichever one we use to approve the proposal for forwarding to the Board. Then once that happens, we

will forward the proposal to the Board. So that's basically the remaining steps.

We have a draft version of the final proposal with disclaimers removed right now, but we haven't considered it as a group yet because we're waiting for the other steps to take place.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Alissa, thank you for braving the morning call with your daughter. I appreciate it very much. Just a quick question, if I may. You said you will be attempting a meeting before Marrakech, maybe on or about March 1. Is there a possibly or would your group consider some kind of a provisional or conditional acceptance assuming no changes to the CCWG proposal as published on the 18th? This way, it becomes only an exception that would require meeting in Marrakech, just to give everybody a clear signal that you're good to go with the 18th. Is that the intent, or is it possible?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. The idea is that we have a two calls on the calendar, or we're trying to get the two calls on the calendar just because we're not 100% certain when the proposal will be published to the chartering organizations. But whenever it is published, that's the only thing that we have to wait for because we just need confirmation from the CWG that its requirements have been met. We don't really need to wait to hear from the chartering organizations because we don't have the dependency on them.

So if everything goes to plan in the way that we see it on the slide, then we could have a call in theory on March 1, we could approve the proposal, we could send it to the Board as early as March 1. So there's no need for us to wait. The only thing that we're waiting for is the CWG. So as soon as we hear from them, we can have our call and approve. Does that clarify?

FADI CHEHADÉ: Yes. Very much. And we have the CWG here. I'm sure we'll hear from them as well to just make sure Lise and Jonathan are on board to give you that okay after the 18th. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Sure.

THERESA SWINEHART: Great. Thanks very much. Can we move actually now to the CWG? Jonathan or Lise, would you be able to talk to your timing, especially with regards to the interdependencies on this?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Theresa. Lise will come in if I am in some way incomplete or don't deal with things.

As you know and perhaps others do as well, we have been in close discussion and monitoring of all the progress of the CCWG on accountability. The two most obvious areas where there has been fairly

significant work and coordination have been to do with IRP and the budget. We are awaiting, obviously, the final text to sign off, and we'll review that as soon as it becomes available.

In fact, Lise and I haven't properly communicated this with the CWG, but we're going to do some interim work this week to try and make sure we are fully comfortable with the draft final text. So we are acutely aware of the timeframes and will do some work this week. We have a budget call tonight my time, 20:00 UTC, and we propose to have a call on the IRP-related work on Friday. We will review that with the key participants and ideally with some input perhaps from the person who has worked most closely with us from Sidley to make sure that we can in that sense certify that the dependencies are met.

So we're aware of the time scales, focused in on those two key points, and hope to coordinate with the 18th publication and be in a position such as we'll then be able to give that assurance to CCWG, ICG, and indeed those chartering organizations that expect to hear from us. I think that's it in a nutshell, Theresa.

THERESA SWINEHART: Great, Jonathan. Thank you. So you anticipate shortly after the 18th [and then with the] publication of the supplemental draft report that you would be able to provide that response back?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yes. We currently have a meeting scheduled for the 18th, although that looks to move. So I just need to think a little more about the mechanics

having had this coordination call. But we certainly were aware and are now more aware of all of the details of the timeframe, so we can work with that and do our best to meet the necessary conditions and the time scale.

THERESA SWINEHART: Great. Thanks so much for that. Any questions either to Jonathan or Lise? Or, Lise, did you want to add anything to that?

LISE FUHR: No. I think Jonathan covered it fully. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Great. Thanks. Are there any questions over to Jonathan and Lise? No? Okay. I'll take that as a no. CCWG's chairs, Thomas, Mathieu, Leon?

THOMASK RICKERT: Thanks, Theresa. As indicated earlier, we've made substantial progress finalizing our recommendations earlier today. So the plan that we're having at the moment is to finalize the report by Friday, review it over the weekend, and freeze the document for chartering organizations' review next Monday. This envisaged time plan will fit hopefully nicely with the overall planning that you introduced earlier.

THERESA SWINEHART: Great. Thank you. Anybody have any questions over to Thomas, Mathieu, or Leon based on the call that occurred earlier today? None?

Okay. Let's do this. Any other questions with regards to this timeline here or any updates or anything like that, that we should be incorporating into it? Again, this is a draft working document, but I think it provides an important overview. To James' point, we will be updating David Olive's team after this call so they're also aware of being responsive to any requests that come in from any of the chartering organizations subsequent to the posting of the accountability document on the 18th.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Theresa, it seems that we got some very supportive green lights today from the ICG, the CWG, and the CCWG due to this excellent breakthrough earlier today. Where this timeline has risks right now is with the chartering organizations, but we just heard some good news as well there.

First from James that there is a serious attempt to meet prior to Marrakech to address that in what he called a special meeting. And we will make sure our staff is super supportive to you there, James, and to the GNSO.

We also heard from Alan Greenberg that they're on board in that regard. And the ccNSO has a meeting on the 9th to address this matter. We will leave it in the good hands of Allan with two Ls to discuss with Byron whether there is a way to push this up, if not on Tuesday, preferably then at least up a little bit so it's not at the tail end of Wednesday.

As to the GAC, in 15 minutes or so there will be a meeting that I have monthly with GAC leadership, so I will bring it up with them. Although in an earlier exchange with Thomas Schneider from the GAC, he said that the plan and the target is to wrap this up with the GAC at the very latest on Wednesday, but hopefully even before in Marrakech.

So again like James just said, these are all of our best cases and all of us are working hard to meet this. So I'm not going to propose that we move the 8th on your chart to the 9th. I was almost tempted to do that. if everyone is okay, let's leave it on the 8th now and let's keep that as our target to give us that breathing day, understanding all of us that the 9th is in many ways hopefully the wrap-up day, whether the Board needs it or the CCWG needs it. And hopefully no one will need it, and we can all go to the beach on the 9th. But at least, if everyone is okay, let's make this our target timeline for the next few weeks and work as best we can with it.

Jonathan asks in the chat, "If CWG provides formal sign off on dependencies on 25 February, will that become a rate limiting factor? Or is it adequate for ICG, GNSO, and other chartering organizations that may need it?"

I see. So if I'm understanding correctly, are you asking if you don't give your okay until the 25th, are they all going to wait for that before they can move forward? GNSO, James, answers there, "If we proceed with the presumption of CWG sign off, then it will work."

Okay. I agree with that. I think if everyone can proceed with that presumption and the 25th is around the corner and everybody that I

heard say they will have meetings pre-Marrakech were not thinking that week. They were thinking the week after that, Jonathan. I heard the 1 March a couple of times.

So back to you, Theresa, on this. I just have some final comments later. Let's make sure we cover all the points that you want to cover.

THERESA SWINEHART: Great. Thanks, Fadi. Two of the other chartering organizations for the CCWG are the ASO and SSAC. Izumi, I saw that you were on the call. I don't know if you're able to comment on the ASO and update with regards to any of the sign off dependencies [inaudible] to the ccNSO or GNSO that have been flagged. And also whether we have anybody from SSAC on to talk to this as well from the chartering organizations side. Izumi, would you be in a position to talk to the ASO?

IZUMI OKUTANI: Yes. Can you hear me?

THERESA SWINEHART: Yes. Can hear you well now. Thank you.

IZUMI OKUTANI: Okay. Great. I [inaudible] we need to wait for the CWG to provide a formal final. I think we're quite likely to be able to approve on the proposal, hopefully either before the Marrakech meeting. So we're quite comfortable that we can meet this timeline.

THERESA SWINEHART: Great. Thanks so much. Thank you. Do we have anybody from SSAC on? No? I'm not hearing anybody. Okay, and I just noticed in the chat that there were some remarks from Jari. Thank you, Jari. Did you want to take the microphone on this, or shall I just read out what's in the chat?

JARI ARKKO: I can read it out as well. [inaudible]

THERESA SWINEHART: Yes. Please, contribute. Yes. Thanks.

JARI ARKKO: Yes. Okay, so [inaudible] I'm really happy to hear the positive news and the progress that's being made today and before. I think we now have a timeline that I think is very realistic and can be done. I'm still concerned though that we are at or very close to final deadline. We want this to happen during [inaudible] go beyond that, and I think that might actually mean a big reset or significant or any kind of delay.

Not that the transition itself is necessarily as important as our ecosystem is, but there's really no going back to the status quo. I don't think we can fail because failure would be causing some damage to the trust with regards to our [inaudible] the multi-stakeholder model, our organizations, and so forth.

So I think you all have concluded this. I'm just trying to put it into words that with just have to finish this. There's really no choice, and doing it in Marrakech is absolutely essential. I want to thank everybody for working hard in that. I think we can pull it off, but we still have to keep our eyes on it and make sure that actually does happen. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Wise words, Jari. Thank you. Thanks. Great.

Well, I don't see any other hands. I think this has been extremely helpful, both for helping prepare the staff to the respective SOs and ACs in the chartering organizations as well as our timeline moving forward.

I think as you heard from Steve, obviously, the expectation is to be receiving something that looks like what we're seeing in the discussions now that has been vetted with the community. If what's received going into Marrakech is different than what we've been looking at up to date, then the Board obviously would need additional time to be reviewing the changes and what has been occurring.

I think as Thomas had highlighted, we're anticipating that these recommendations have been vetted, they've been discussed, and iterations of them have been provided. And what we're seeing published on the 18th should really be capturing the dialogue among the community and the input that we've been receiving. So hopefully, no surprises leading into Marrakech around that.

I don't see any other comments here so, Fadi, I'm going to turn it over to you. I'll turn it over to you. Just to flag, this is the last facilitation call

that we have before the Marrakech meeting. If the group thinks that it would be useful to have a call immediate prior to Marrakech, please let us know. But otherwise, this would be the last call that we have, and then we would start them up again right after Marrakech. So we just wanted to flag that as far as the scheduling goes, and you can let us know offline if you think it's useful to have one before Marrakech.

Fadi, with that, let me turn it over to you.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Yes. Just some closing remarks. First of all, I couldn't have said what Jari said better. He was spot on. The impact of delay right now will be, quite frankly, devastating at many levels. We don't have room anymore. I think Jari noted issues of huge impact on trust: trust in our model, trust in our community. This is all true.

And even the unity of our ecosystem would be put under risk. The IP community, the IETF have been very clear that time is up. And we really staying together and staying in constellation as an ecosystem is very important at this time, especially as the U.S. government steps back and we become, frankly, the community that the world looks at to coordinate all these activities. So it's important we stay together.

To add to these important risks, there's also the risk that we're starting to see in the political campaigns in the United States. The transition has started to appear in the U.S. political process. Minor still and hasn't gotten traction, but the risks are increasing every week. As Larry told us on the last call, every week delay increases the risks. These are real things.

Now shifting from the risks to the opportunities, I am going to borrow the very hopeful voice of Thomas Rickert on the call today. We have achieved amazing feat in the last few months, even up to this morning with the CCWG. We have a lot to celebrate that we have accomplished, and we have an opportunity to celebrate it together and to finish the work that so many people have worked hard to do. So I'm very hopeful as I'm sure many of you are that we can wrap this up in Marrakech.

Finally, to do so, it will take the people on this call to act and own the responsibility to bring their communities around the table to get this done. This is a moment of true hard work for the people on this call who are representing or leading different parts of our community to take it upon ourselves, each one of us, to actually bring our community along to this timeline and to get this done. So let's not miss that. I'm very hopeful that we will get this done and we will hand our new CEO as well as all of you a nice little, I think, victory at the very end of the Marrakech meeting.

With that, thanks again for the commitment and thanks again for giving us your updates. This timeline now becomes, hopefully, our common commitment. Looking forward to get this done together. Thank you, Theresa. Thank you, everyone.

THERESA SWINEHART: Wonderful. Thank you all. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]