

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you for those of you that are joining the call today. Just as a friendly reminder, please remember to mute yourself when you are not speaking, just as a courtesy to the speakers and other people that are on the call. We should be getting started here shortly. And just as a reminder, this call is being recorded.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi, everybody. We'll be started just in a few minutes – one second. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Hello, everyone. This is Fadi. Good evening, good afternoon, good morning wherever you are in the world. Thank you for joining us on this first Transition Facilitation call. As you recall, we had the chance to meet informally in Buenos Aires, and at the end of that meeting, there was unanimous agreement that it's not a bad idea for us to have a monthly meeting to just be on the same page, on the same agenda.

This is not a meeting to discuss any substantive issues related to the transition. This is a meeting simply to facilitate our various activities and ensure that we each see the swim lane that others are in and understand the full transition from a program standpoint or at the program level.

And therefore this is intended to be largely an update call, a call to clarify any questions between the various activities that will hopefully lead us to a successful transition.

---

*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.*

---

The agenda for this call was sent to all of us by Theresa as a suggested agenda for today. At the end of today's call let's make sure this agenda works. If it didn't work let's make sure we change it accordingly so that when we hold this call next month it reflects everyone's desires.

But we will, after these quick remarks, we will move into a timeline discussion. I think in a moment we will put on the Adobe room the more detailed timeline. The timeline as agreed with you in Buenos Aires was built based on input that we received from all of you and individually. This is essentially an amalgamation of all the input we received from you, and we are displaying it for you in a moment here to discuss.

We have with us also NTIA. I think Larry Stricking is with us on the call and Larry will just comment quickly on the responses of the community to his letter about the timeline for implementation.

Then I think if we could get and make this a regular thing every week, a quick update from the CCWG accountability group and I believe Leon is representing those chairs today here, so Leon will give us a quick update mostly telling us whether the timeline has shown on the – a document will display in the moment. It's still what it is and if there are any comments or changes from his side that we should know. Similarly, hopefully we can get the same from the ICG on this call.

So that's the plan for these calls and we'll leave time for any questions or any discussion points that we would like to have. One of the things we also agreed in Buenos Aires is that how this particular meeting, this now monthly meeting, is shared with the community, how we explain what it is, how we disclose its contents, etc. It's something we should

---

discuss and decide here today. This way we are all aligned. And it's up to all of you, all of us, how we wish to do that.

In case you do decide to share the full recording of this meeting, we are recording it at the moment. Should we at the end of this call decide we don't want to move forward with full disclosure, we will destroy this recording, but we're doing it in case all of you are ready and feel this is the best service to the community that we share this call publicly.

Finally, just to remind everyone who's on the call, this call includes the leaders of the SOs and ACs. It includes the chairs of the various working groups that have been assembled for the transition. It includes the staff that is working with all of you to facilitate your work and it includes the board liaisons to the ICG, the CCWG plus our chairman; Steve Crocker.

In addition, we have NTIA with us, given that they have also a critical role, an essential role, in how we get this transition done. So this is a good place to review timeline, to review high level actions and activities, and to ensure good coordination between us so that we are successful.

Before we get into the timeline, on the Adobe screen now, you can see the slide that I had used in the opening at Buenos Aires, which was as a result of our very first meeting in Buenos Aires where I share this with you. That slide stands, and I think yesterday after the congressional hearing which Larry Strickling and I were witnesses at, this timeline was shared and discussed publicly, and I think we're generally now, despite the fact dot-com has not become law yet because it hasn't passed the Senate, but if we assume it does become law, then this middle phase (phase 2) stands as this slide is.

---

If it does not become law then there may be some slight variations, and I'll ask Larry to say anything if he wishes on the 30-day portion of that middle arrow. But in general, that generally should be the model.

We will get into a second slide that has far more detail than this particular high level slide, but that high level slide generally remains right at the moment.

The only thing that we didn't add to the slide is related to the end line, the end of phase three, but I'll leave that later when Larry discusses the community response to his letter as to when is the end of phase three.

Are there any comments or questions? I need to hear from you if there is any – I'm going to [inaudible] that we're going to make this meeting recording public and available and disclosed to the community. I'd like to hear if people would like to have not to have the recording of that meeting public, when we describe to people this meeting is a facilitation meeting and here's the recording, so that we can move quickly through the agenda.

I'll open the floor. Are there any hands up?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Alissa Cooper has her hand up.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Miss Cooper, please.

---

ALISSA COOPER: Hi, thank you. I guess I have a related question, because [Grace] is taking notes, I see I was wondering if the minutes or the notes that she takes what we would be able to do with those. My specific question was because my co-chairs are not on the call if we will have the minutes and if we will be able to circulate them to either all of the invitees or publicly. But I was just wondering if I need to take notes so I can get heads together with my co-chairs later or if the minutes will be available. That intersects with your question about whether the recording will be available.

FADI CHEHADÉ: [Grace] is [now] taking notes and we will not be doing minutes, but the recording, as the announcer, said the call is being recorded. If no one disagrees that that recording should be made available to the public, then of course your co-chairs could listen to it and there should be no issue there. Right, Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. That's fine with me. I will take my own private notes just for ease.

FADI CHEHADÉ: And since you are speaking, do you have any objection to the recording being made public?

ALISSA COOPER: No. Sounds fine to me.

---

FADI CHEHADÉ: Okay. Are you okay with how I define the purpose of this call? Are you fine with that?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

FADI CHEHADÉ: All right. Anyone have an objection to the purpose of the call is defined and to releasing the recording to the public every month of this call? Are there any hands up?

Okay, so I'm assuming that this is a go. Thank you for that feedback. That's important. We will attempt to also do a transcript, but for now we will have the recording, and if we can do the transcript, we'll do that as well.

Why don't we go to the timeline? If [inaudible] detailed timeline.

ALISSA COOPER: Let's upload that. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADÉ: This is the same slide you've seen before, but of course updated now. So, Theresa, walk us through that a little bit and let's high level make sure that people appreciate all the lines and what's there.

---

THERESA SWINEHART: Sure. I'm happy to. And then after this call, we're happy to get additional input. And similar to the recording, if everybody would like to get this out into the public space, that's up to the group itself on what they want to do with this next.

On the timeline, this has been updated based on discussions with the different leaderships from the organizations during the Buenos Aires meeting, but of course if there's any adjustments, we're happy to reflect this.

Going to this, we have a couple of the processes. And please note that this is the [notional] timelines in a working document. The first would be the CWG, the stewardship project plan. As you'll note, the submission and the congratulations to the whole team on that of the submission over to the ICG was done at the Buenos Aires meeting, so that projection looks like it's on track. And now it's under review of course in the ICG.

Alissa, I don't know, you may have some comments or things with regards to any relevant factors around that.

The second line, which is a lighter gold – and I don't know if we can zoom in further for those of you on the Adobe room – reflect the timeline that had been provided in discussions with the chairs of the ICG on where the ICG is and the timeline and the review, including their public comment period with the anticipation of having something finalized close to the end of October around the Dublin meeting.

The CCWG, which is the blue line, likewise looks like the timeline and obviously the Paris meeting coming up next week will be essential with

---

regards to both the [preparations] of that work and the providing all the materials to go into the second round of public comment, noting that there's an interdependency there to the naming community proposal on specific elements that need to be addressed in that context of that proposal that goes out.

Again, the anticipation is that will be, based on what we've seen from the community input, ready to be delivered to the board around the end of October, around the Dublin meeting.

That one, the CCWG has a dependency, as does some of the ICG with regards to some bylaw preparations. So if we jump down to the ICANN review process, you'll see the notation of where ICANN can provide input into the public process and public comment periods of the respective groups. And of course board members are actively following the discussions in their individual capacity and providing input into those discussions.

Based on the DOTCOM Act, and based on what we've also heard from NTIA, there's a bylaw preparation area that needs to occur upon receipt of the proposal, but getting that information over to NTIA as part of what they need in looking at the final proposal and they need to receive that, if you jump down to the blue line, as part of their inner-agency process.

So there's been discussions that have started both with the CCWG to partner with the respective community working group, and of course the external legal counsel, to start the thinking around those bylaws so



---

that we can progress in a timely fashion as things get finalized and everything can be ready in a package.

And I'm not going to speak of course to the US government process. I'll let Larry talk to that. But that's the overview of the timeline.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Can you show the whole page again?

THERESA SWINEHART: We're happy to send this around, and of course once you decide it's ready in the context of reflecting any updates from what your observations are based on what's occurred since the Buenos Aires meeting. It's up to this group if they want to put this out into the public or how they want to handle that.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Just before I ask, we go to the next agenda item for Larry to just comment on the letters he received from you. Then we will go to you, Leon, and we will focus on your line and have you just give us a quick update/confirmation if this reflects your view. Similarly, of course, with you, of course, Alissa.

But before I go do that, I want to – with the full picture in front of you, and I know this is difficult to read, but we'll send it to all of you. Assuming you also want us to publish it, we'll publish it.

---

What is important to view here is some of the [inaudible]. Right now as this stands, it still shows that the CCWG, which is the second line, the orange line – pardon me, that’s the ICG. And the CCWG which is the blue line. Both of them will deliver their final proposals to ICANN who in turn will deliver them sometime in the late October, early November timeframe. Could happen in Dublin, but let’s say Dublin plus a couple of weeks or three weeks. That’s currently where it shows.

And if that occurs, this picture, if you [inaudible], this picture continues to show that if that occurs, the US government [inaudible] period will lead us somewhere to a finish of that process by the end of February, early March. That’s what this says today, but there are so many steps that lead us there.

With that, I’m going to ask Larry Strickling if he is ready to give us his view on the responses he received from the community to his letter. Larry?

LARRY STRICKLING: Thank you, Fadi. Can people hear me okay?

FADI CHEHADÉ: Very well. Thank you, Larry.

LARRY STRICKLING: First, I want to thank Alissa and Leon and the leadership of the ICG and the CCWG for getting us the letters and it was helpful to have the letters

---

before the hearing yesterday. What this speaks to is the question of executing an extension of the contract past September 30<sup>th</sup>.

This issue came up in the hearing yesterday. For those of you who followed it, you know that I said that based on our first review of the information in the letter, it was apparent that we were going to need to extend the contract at least through next July based on the information we had received. And quite honestly, I think to make sure we built in a margin of error here, because as Fadi pointed out, the DOTCOM Act hasn't been enacted yet. We're not sure exactly what the environment will be for the review of this after it's delivered to us.

We are going to be discussing with ICANN an extension likely to go out as far as the end of September next year. What this means is that we would take what is currently a two-year option for extension and break it up into two one-year options, which would mean that we get to the end of next September and everything's done, implementation is complete, then the contract [inaudible] at that point in time. If it's not, then the option we'll have at that point is to extend it another year. Obviously we're trying to target a date that fits best with what you all are projecting the schedule and the amount of time it will take to get the implementation complete, assuming we can get it approved in the timeframe that we've laid out – the four to five month timeframe, which again assumes that the DOTCOM Act is enacted by Congress sometime this year.

Since the contract expires on September 30<sup>th</sup>, we have to have all of this done in the form of a contract modification before that period. We are under an obligation to notify Congress 45 days before we make any

---

changes to the contract, so we are going to be moving fairly promptly to start the administrative process of executing contract modification.

I want to emphasize that that's the only modification we're going to make at this point in time. The amount of bureaucratic efforts that's involved even in doing something as simple as modifying the option period typically takes 90 days in the federal government, but we don't even have that 90 days, so we're going to have to do this on a faster time [string], and as a result, we're all focused on just making the one modification that's necessary to allow us to extend the contract for some period between nine months and twelve months and we'll get back to people when we finalize on that.

That's where we stand on the contract extension. All of this was made public yesterday during in the course of the hearing with Congress. It's been reported widely in the domestic press here in the US that tracks this thing.

So that's the update on the contract.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Thank you, Larry. Thank you very much. Let me just make sure I repeat some of the key things I heard and I want to make sure we are in synch on. If you look at the screen right now, the screen shows this green line which is the implementation [operation] [inaudible] line kind of ending at the earliest at the beginning of July and potentially going as far as September. That's the same line that will determine when the contract will end. I believe that is in line with what you just said, that you will extend the contract, but that contract will be extended either to go up

---

to July or potentially up to September, which means a year extension as opposed to a two-year extension.

The second thing I heard you say – [Hillary], if you could go back to the detailed line here. If you could blow that up, I want to show that line.

This blue line here is the steps to extending the IANA contract. I think that's a minor details, but I think I just heard you say 45 days. This line which now shows it goes from July 1<sup>st</sup> to August 30<sup>th</sup> should be fixed to end on August 15 because of the 45-day mark.

So sometime between the beginning of July to mid-August, we need to have extended our contract either by nine or ten or twelve months as opposed to currently two years.

And the third thing I heard you say is because the modifications to the contract are, let's say, not the easiest thing to get done, you would like the modification of the contract to be limited and restricted to the change of the extension timeline from 24 months to somewhere between nine and twelve months and nothing else. Are these the three things I just heard you say so that I confirm we heard you correctly, all of us?

LARRY STRICKLING:

Yes, except that it's not that I like for the modification for only to be on the extension. I think I was clear in saying that is the only thing we're going to modify. So we're not entertaining any other additions to the modification at this point in time.

---

FADI CHEHADÉ: Okay. Thank you, Larry. Before we move to Leon giving us some insight on this specific timeline related to CCWG, are there any questions or any hands up at the moment, or if someone is not in Adobe wishes to speak? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Jari has been able to join now.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Oh, good. Jari is with us as well as Bruce. Thank you both for taking the time. Okay. Why don't we focus on the CCWG line and allow Leon to look at some of the detail? This is the orange line. We're now in July 2015, so please scroll a little bit and make it – no, that's fine, stop there, so he can see the end of that line and make sure he is comfortable [with the details].

Leon, would you like to give us some insight? And if people have questions for Leon, please chime in or raise your hand. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Fadi. [inaudible] timeline is on track with what we have on screen. As you know, next week we will be holding our face-to-face meeting in Paris and our aim is of course to build our second proposal, which hopefully will be the final proposal, and after that, we will be launching our second public comment period which will last about 40 days, as indicated here in our timeline.

---

And after receiving the feedback of that public comment period, we will be of course refining our Work Stream 1 proposal, so that we can deliver to the chartering organizations for review and hopefully approval – I mean, delivering by the beginning of October and have them approve it before Dublin so we can deliver our proposal to the board at our Dublin meeting as clearly stated here.

So far, the timeline remains [inaudible] from our side and we will continue to update you regularly if anything changes. And of course I'm open for questions or comments.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Thank you, Leon. I have a first question for you. Have you [said] with the other chairs or yourself what possible risks to the timeline are there and are there additional areas where we could support you or do things so that we can mitigate some of these risks for you?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Fadi. We haven't discussed in detail of course the risks that we might face with regards to the timeline. We are mindful of at least a couple of risks. This could be of course [inaudible] consensus in the group. We have had very thorough discussions as to which kind of organizational or corporate model we would be suggesting to [inaudible] ICANN, and this of course has been something that at times feels like we're getting a lot of traction into one model, but then things change.

---

I think that our main threats with regards to the timeline is being able to reach consensus on a certain corporate model for adoption, and the other risk that we might face is of course the new issues emerging from public comments.

There have been some new emerging issues from public comments which we are addressing at this moment, and hopefully this won't be a motive to extend our timeline, but so far we need to be mindful that there are these issues and that these are also a risk for the [inaudible].

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Okay. Thank you, Leon, very much. Any hands up or any questions to Leon about the CCWG? No. All right, we're good then. May I – if I could add a question, Leon, myself. You are facing obviously a very important meeting in Paris and there are going to be a lot of hands as well as efforts. It always amazes me how much is going to descend to help you and make sure we advance the ball in Paris.

At the moment, what is your expectation and hope as chair to achieve in Paris? What would you say that would be a good outcome for you in Paris?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Fadi. Our expectation and our happy ending for the Paris meeting, if I may say so, would be to achieve consensus with regards to at least the corporate model that we would be proposing or incorporating into our proposal and this would of course allow us to put



---

in or set up final proposal which carries out the consensus of the large group, and then just publishing for public comment.

So the final [inaudible] for us at Paris would be to have consensus on our proposal so that we can go to our next public comment with a proposal that's already been past the CCWG consensus. That would be the optimal scenario for us.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Thank you, Leon. Okay. If there are no other questions, can we ask please for Alissa to do the same for the ICG [inaudible] also here in front of us? Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER:

Sure. Thank you, Fadi and everyone. I think looking at this timeline that we have in front of us, the ICG is on track with the parts that are under our control. We had a very productive call yesterday to assess the proposal that we received from the CWG and had an in-depth discussion of the proposal. We have a few action items emanating from that discussion, but we are on track to continue with our assessment of the combined proposal which will take place on our mailing list between now and July 15, and then we'll have a call on July 15 to hopefully complete that assessment and then get ready to prepare the combined proposal for public comment

One thing I will say looking at this timeline, we haven't included in the ICG firm dates for when we will go to public comment nor the exact lengths of the public comment period so the details that we will need to

---

work out. We might want to reflect that as [inaudible] end dates of [TBC] because they still are [TBC] at the moment, although I expect to have them – I don't know if we'll have the dates nailed down until just prior, but we will have a decision I think on the lengths of the public comment period shortly.

But otherwise everything else is in the pipeline after that. The rest of the timeline remains as is as we will await the receipt of the public comments.

Just one other comment on the timeline and then I will have one topic to raise, but we'll stop for questions. I'm not sure that the dotted lines and arrows that go back and forth, especially this first set – the red ones and the orange ones – I'm not exactly clear on what those are representing. They might be representing additional work for the community is my thought which is definitely the case. We may have additional work for the communities this month. We may certainly have it after the public comment period. We might have a [inaudible] in the interim where if we receive comments and we need the communities to address them, then we may pitch those to the communities. But in any event, that's a detail that we can work out with [Hillary].

I'll stop there. I did have one question for the group but I'm happy to take questions on everything I've said thus far.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Thank you, Alissa. [Hillary] is here, so she's hearing you and it would be good if you guys could communicate on that detail. Could you also, if you could, please address the same question we asked Leon about risks

---

you see? You also very carefully raised the point that there are some parts of this not under your control directly as ICG. Could you just point these out so we're clear on what you meant by that?

ALISSA COOPER:

Sure. At each step in this process, we have identified the amount of time that we hope it takes, but I think [inaudible] accept it's possible that it could take longer.

So for the next step, which is the combined proposal assessment, [inaudible] ICG are aiming to have it done next week on our call, but if there's a lot of details to work through, if we can't come to consensus, if there's just more material than we can manage in doing the assessment next week, then it might take longer and that might push back our timeline to be able to go to public comment by the end of the month.

We have, as ICG members, I think been very committed to following along in the community processes the whole time. We've had two parts of the proposal for a very long time to evaluate and we've already evaluated their compatibility with each other. We've done I think as much work as we could do to try to accelerate the process, but you never know what can happen when some people go in for [inaudible] review. So that's what I would say is the first success.

If we have questions for the communities that arise out of that assessment process, we have to take those back to those communities. If those apply changes in the proposal or imply any other work that could require the communities to go back and seek further consensus in their own groups, then that could potentially take longer than the two-

---

week period that we had planned from next week until the public comment launched. So that's another kind of possibility that again we've been trying to review everything along the way to avoid that, but you never know.

Then I would say the same thing about once we receive public comments they may raise new issues related to the proposal. They may raise questions that we want to take back to the communities for clarification or potentially for amendment of the combined proposal. So that's another spot in this September timeframe where we've allocated some time for community work, but not very much. So if it's anything too substantial, then I think there's a risk there that the timeline will flip a little bit.

Lastly, I would say – this is something that came up on the ICG call yesterday – is that we have committed, as you can see on the timeline, to seeking confirmation from the CWG that once the CCWG has concluded its Work Stream 1 work and sent its proposal to the charting organizations for approval, once that step has been taken, we have committed to seeking confirmation from the CWG that the output from the CCWG meets this requirement. We need to hear from them that it does.

And if for some reason it does not, then we will be in a position where the transition proposal can't necessarily be considered complete because the requirements of one of the operational communities won't have been met. So that's another area where there's potential for slippage in the timeline.

---

Then I guess I have to say – I know that I said that was the last one, but there's one more, which is that if we received public comments to the extent that we think that we need to work with the communities and have the communities potentially amend the proposal, and those are extensive enough that we think we need a second public comment period, then that would certainly extend the timeline significantly.

So all of those have the potential to rear their heads at different points in the timeline and potentially create some slippage.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Excellent. This is very helpful to all of us, certainly here to the team. Any questions to Alissa? I know you have a question, Alissa, if we could hold it until any other business, which is the next section. But I just want to see if there are any questions anyone has to Alissa about the ICG work.

LARRY STRICKLING:

Fadi, this is Larry. I want to talk to both ICG and CCWG about public comments if this is a good time to do that.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Certainly, please.

LARRY STRICKLING:

Typically, in our process in the United States before an agency takes any action, it's expected that it'll run a public comment process of its own. We question the wisdom of doing that in a situation where these

---

proposals have been put through a tremendous amount of public comment already, and there's more coming up.

One of the things we're considering doing – and I'm interested in reactions from the leadership of both groups in response to this idea – is that is a point at which you put your proposals out for public comment that we would take some action at our end to basically publicize that public comment process and urge commenters to submit comments into your process.

I doubt that we'll be reaching out to anybody who's not already fully engaged in this, but at that point, if we are questioned why we didn't follow the typical process of getting public comment, we'd like to be able to say, well, we in fact urge people to provide comments at a better time, which is while the proposal is still being shaped instead of just giving us comment at the end of the day when there's really nothing more to do except giving it [inaudible].

To that end, though, it will be very important that in seeking public comment, the ICG and the CCWG put into the comment questions – and I think this is happening anyway, so I'm hopefully not saying anything new. It'll be important to build the public record on how these proposal satisfy our criteria, because we'll have to rely on that when we do our certification to Congress at the end of our review after we get the proposal. So just keep that in mind. And if you weren't already planning to seek comment on that – and I'm virtually certain you were already – that'll be an important thing to make sure is included.

---

FADI CHEHADÉ:                    Anyone wishes to comment? Certainly Alissa, or Leon, or anyone else about the proposed approach of Larry? And I will ask [Hillary] to capture that as soon as Larry and his team have clarity when they will do that to capture it on this timeline as well, so we can see when the US government will [inaudible]. Any questions? Larry?

LARRY STRICKLING:            Well, let me be clear. I mean, we aren't setting up a separate public comment process. All we're going to do is once your process, the ICG and CCWG open up their comment periods, we will put out an appropriate notice that basically directs the community to submit comments into that already existing comment cycle. We're not trying to layer onto this any additional comment cycles. And we're not suggesting people send all their comments to us. We're just saying people ought to engage in the process that's already set up and we're going to try to find a mechanism to accomplish that.

FADI CHEHADÉ:                    Excellent. Any questions for Larry on this?

ALISSA COOPER:                I was just going to say that I think that's a great idea, and from my perspective, would welcome more publicity from the US government side or from any other vantage point. I think that fits in well. The ICG has a communications plan that we are developing in conjunction with the launch of the public comment period to make sure that we are reaching as far and wide as we possibly can to solicit comments on the

---

combined proposal and certainly reaching beyond the traditional audiences and people who are accustomed to attending ICANN meetings and so forth. I think that would be a really good addition to the overall plan to do outreach and publicize the ability for the public to comment.

And to your second point, Larry, we are absolutely planning to ask the public for input about how the proposal meets the NTIA criteria and we are working through the details of that right now.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Thank you, Alissa. Leon typed in the chat room that he is also support of Larry. He thinks it's a great idea. Okay, we are going to close on the timeline with one comment and then we'll open this for any other business. If I could ask you, [Hillary], to focus on the bylaw preparation line.

This second red line there that says bylaw preparation at the moment is just a straight line simply showing that bylaw preparation will be going on, and it shows very clearly when the bylaws should be adopted on the bottom right, so that Larry can then move forward with the certification.

However, we don't have today detail on how the bylaw preparations will occur. The good news is that the CCWG has published an initial draft of steps towards that. The board has engaged directly with them and is discussing with them some amendments to that to make it work with the board process.



---

So today this red line is kind of blank. I think by the time we meet in a month, this red line will have a lot more detail. So everyone is clear how the bylaws will proceed to hopefully a successful finish when Larry needs to certify and adopt it. But again, that line is just there today as a placeholder. We only know an end point.

With this, I'm going to open this for any other business or questions and answers, and please let us know either in the chatroom or when you speak whether you want this particular chart, given that the ICG and the CCWG just confirmed as well as the US government that what's there right now reflects where things are, except for the change we will do to your line on August 15<sup>th</sup> for the contract of IANA that if you want this chart published along with the recording of this call for the public.

So I open it and I start with Alissa because she had a question already for the AOB. Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. This question came up during the ICG call yesterday, and it relates to the plan for the cooperative agreement with the root zone maintainer. I understand that that is, to some extent, outside the scope of everything that we have been discussing here, but we have been reviewing the names proposal in light of the NTIA criteria. One of those criteria relates to the security and stability of the DNS, so the question came up as to essentially what the plan is as far as implementing the requirements that has been stated in the CWG proposal about the need for there to be a mechanism to ensure that the PTI can have the change

---

request for the root zone implemented by the root zone maintainer on an ongoing basis in a timely manner.

It would seem to be that there's some requirement there for that mechanism to be in place coincident with the transition, but there's not a lot of public information as far as anyone on the ICG knew about what the plan is for agreements to be signed or modified or transferred or whatever may happen with the root zone maintainer.

So I was just curious if anyone on this call has more information about that. We at the ICG plan to write it up as a topic in our assessment of the proposal against the NTIA criteria, but if there's further information about that, it would be useful to share. Thank you.

LARRY STRICKLING:

I'm sorry, I was talking, but I'm on mute. I was just going to respond to Alissa's question with the fact that we have asked ICANN and VeriSign to get together and look at what would be involved in eliminating the US from its role in terms of authorizing the changes to the root zone file and we're awaiting that plan from the parties.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. Is there a timeline associated with that?

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Alissa, the US government has asked us to cooperate with VeriSign on this. We are working with them on that and expect to give the US government an initial draft of that in the next week or ten days.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yari has his hand up. Yari?

YARI ARKKO: Yeah. I just wanted to ask further from Larry or anyone else. The timeline for that part of it is one thing and it's great that it's in progress and being done, but I guess the question from our perspective is are we expected – the ICT, for instance – integrate that part or is that completely outside of [inaudible]?

LARRY STRICKLING: We are not expecting ICG to integrate that into your plan.

YARI ARKKO: Okay, thank you.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Is there any other business or any other questions before I close this call and just make sure we have consensus on what to do with the slides? Are there hands up? Oh, Yari, please go ahead again. Sorry.

YARI ARKKO: Apologies for speaking again. I have another issue, and it isn't necessarily something we need to deal with here, but I just wanted to highlight that that's been an ongoing discussion and that's the matter of the trademarks and domains. There's been some discussions and

---

various entities have made statements and such and the CWG made it very clear that whatever they had in the proposal [inaudible] is not part of the proposal [inaudible] and it's not [inaudible] any faster. That's great.

However, I think the situation is that we have one of the three communities, the RIRs who have specific requirements regarding this in their formal proposal, and then we as the IETF didn't really have a position of that. We were not setting new requirements of that, but we were later asked if we're okay with the particular [inaudible] they wanted to push [inaudible]. And then CWG is kind of pushing this into the implementation phase.

It's an interesting case in the sense that this means that – normally we have an specification phase and an implementation phase. Now we have something in the implementation phase, if done in the wrong way, or again [inaudible] of some other entity, then that might actually end up affecting this specific case. It's not that we necessarily have to do anything about that right now, but I keep this in mind that we have a situation where some of the proposals actually speak to this topic and have specific requirements and that those specific requirements I guess needs to be handled after [inaudible] in the implementation phases in all three communities somehow later.

That's fine, but I hope that's understood by everybody.

---

FADI CHEHADÉ:                      Okay. Would anyone like to comment on this? I don't think it's a question. You were just raising a point, Jari, and we appreciate it. Anyone wishes to comment?

STEVE CROCKER:                      Two pieces of comments. First of all, there's a lot of discussion about trademark and relatively less focus on the domain name IANA.org. From an operational point of view, my attention is completely focused on the operational control of IANA.org as a domain name and the issues of legal control of the trademark is completely secondary because I think it has far less impact no matter what happens and there's plenty of time to sort things out. Whereas if operational control of IANA.org is screwed up, then the impact is felt rather quickly and directly.

The second thing that I'd want to say is that I see I guess four parties involved in this discussion of which ICANN and its IANA function is just one, and the other three are the three operational communities. The easy case is when we're all in agreement, and the next easiest case which is not easy at all, but it's still easier than the other cases is when the three operational communities decide in unison to do something else.

Things get much harder if the three operational communities not only are in disagreement with ICANN, or one or more of them is, but also in disagreement with each other.

We don't actually at ICANN have much to say about any of that, except that, as I alluded to before, as long as we're the operator for the IANA.org domain, then it's essential that that be operationally stable.

---

But we don't have any claim on the intellectual property involved. There are no legal issues from where we're standing, and anything that's comfortable to the community is comfortable with us with, again, just emphasizing the [inaudible] that while we're the operator for IANA.org, we need operational stability of that name.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Very well. Thank you, Steve. Again, I'm going to ask Jari if we could to table this because we're out of time and we should really, if possible, not use this call to address issues. The issues should be addressed in the ICG and the CCWG and the various places where the community is all present, but thank you, though, for asking the question or at least putting the issue on the table. This call should be purely just for us to coordinate things.

Now, as we close this call, I saw several comments in the chat that are okay with us releasing the recording and this chart. And we will do that every month as we move forward. Is there any objection to that at this stage we should hear from anyone?

ALISSA COOPER:

Would it be possible, because we discussed a couple of edits to the chart during the call, not only the extra 15 days for NTIA but also the dates for the ICG public comment period being changed to [TPC] and then I'm still unclear on the dotted arrows. Could [Hillary] perhaps send the updated version around, and also so that people who are not on the call can see it and just give us 24 hours or something before publishing to make sure that it looks right to everyone?

---

FADI CHEHADÉ: Absolutely. I think this is a grand idea. We will do that. [Hillary] is here and she took notes. She will send them to all of the people who were on the call and who were supposed to be on the call. And if she doesn't hear back within a day or so, we'll attach it to the recording and make sure everybody can see it. Thank you. That's a good idea.

Any other objections to this that we should hear?

Sorry, I'm told Leon wrote something about a hearing in November. Could you read me the comment?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sure. I'll read the [inaudible] comment. He says, "It's a procedural minor question with regards to [inaudible] by mid-November. So far every call from our meeting in BA."

FADI CHEHADÉ: I see. [inaudible] maybe chime in on that, but just to be clear this is not a congressional hearing. This was simply that Larry mentioned that after he receives the proposal, and assuming he receives them in October, there is a chance – there is no certainty here – that he will invite many of the working group leaders to come to Washington for a chance to engage them in a public way.

Larry, do you want to say anything about that now, just so people have any sentiment from you of the plan? And it was not in December, by the

---

way. Oh, in November. It was in mid-November. You're right. But anyway, please, Larry?

LARRY STRICKLING:

Sure. Again, no decision has been made. Some of this will depend on the schedule and when we finally get a proposal. We have told Congress yesterday at the hearing – so I got questions a lot about what will our process be once we get the proposal. I didn't provide too many specifics, but I did provide some, and I urge all the working groups to go back and access that part of the transcript when it's available to see what we did say.

I did talk about the need for the process to be very open and very public, very transparent. So as part of that, we are thinking about whether or not to do a public session at some point after we've had the plan for a few weeks, so that we've had a chance to digest it, to bring the architects of the plan or at least the facilitators, the leadership of the groups, to come in and be able to present their plans in a public meeting, be able to go through a certain amount of questioning from us to help us fill in the record to support this.

Assuming we really get the plan by the end of October, we had thought possibly the third week of November following the Internet meeting in Brazil would be a good time to do that. But it's all contingent on when everybody finishes their work and gets the proposal to us. And if we start getting pushed into December and the end of the year holidays, it's going to be much harder to schedule something like this.



---

But it's in the back of our minds. We're thinking about it as one way again to demonstrate how we are going to go about evaluating and reviewing the plan. I would say it's more likely than not, but it's not scheduled yet. It can't be scheduled until we have a firmer notion of when we're going to get the plan. So we'll keep people apprised. But yeah I think I had shared at least the concept with many of you in Argentina just to get reactions.

I think on the whole – in fact, I'd say unanimously – I didn't hear from anybody who thought this was something they didn't want to participate in. I think that is good input and we'll continue to work through our planning for this process once we get the proposal.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Larry, just taking your permission, since this is an item that you're thinking about and it is an item that has timeline dependencies, should we even show it in even a tentative light on the 90-day review so people at least know? Because as you can tell, people are – should we show and then shift it as the timeline shifts?

LARRY STRICKLING:

No, because at this point, it's simply an idea. It's nothing that we have settled on doing, and I think it would create some unfortunate expectations if we started showing it on a timeline and then decided not to do it. Until we've decided to do it, we shouldn't be showing it on a timeline.

---

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Understood. Appreciate it. That's good to know so we know what to – okay, we are over our time. We're going to meet again in a month. Are there any changes to this agenda given that this was our first meeting and we were trying to see if this works? Was this a good use of everybody's time? Is the timeline as you see it okay? Any comments that would make this a better call? You could speak or type in the Adobe room, so we can be helpful and supportive. Okay.

I want to add one item to this agenda and that's an item to make sure the chairs speak to me and the staff and the board about any additional support they need. This would be a good place for them to say, "We'd like this kind of support. We need more of this. We need that." Because then we're all here and hands on deck. This is a place to manage resources. Theresa is here. All of us are here to understand how we can serve you better and facilitate this process better. So let's make it a standing part of the agenda. This way if there is something, it comes out of here.

Okay. Leon said the agenda works. We add an item of bylaws [inaudible] coordination. As we clean up that red line, it will become – just like you did an update today, and Larry in a way gave us an update on his section and certainly Alissa did on hers. Starting next month, our board members – Bruce, or Steve, or Kuo-Wei – one of them will give an update on their redlines as well. So we will add that.

And then of course with time, as the implementation green line starts becoming active and we're starting implement some things, then we will have the implementation teams at ICANN whether it's David

---

Conrad, or Sam, or Theresa also speak to that. But we're not there yet with those [inaudible]. Thank you, Leon.

Alissa says – okay, that's a [detail] for her. Thank you, Alissa for that. We'll capture this.

I want to thank all of you for your time, for your service, and for everything we're doing to move this forward. I hope you can write me privately if you think this could have gone better, if you were [inaudible] speak here on this call. Please, we're doing this to serve you. We're doing this to facilitate this. This is by no means a call to manage anything or to direct anything or to solve anything. It's just to make sure we're coordinated and facilitated. Thank you all very, very much. Have a wonderful summer and the rest of you going to Paris, all the best in Paris. Enjoy the croissants and hopefully the consensus. Take care. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**