
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: This meeting is now being recorded.

MATHIEU WEILL: Good. Now it's recorded. So there was movement towards a designator model with some concerns raised on the conditionality with the CWG requirements, I should stress. And very recently, because it's only a few hours ago, we've received notice by Steve Crocker that the Board with pushback on that option, and that and it still was a big concern for the Board. So it's definitely not over.

And one of the latest news was an option of setting an advance notice for a governance review of ICANN in the future after transition, and that's something that the proponents of this, which include several stakeholders, will be worked out, fleshed out, and assessed. Although there are some concerns about the political acceptability of a two-stage process and the ability to actually trust that the second phase outcome would stand a chance of being approved, if need be. So it's a complex situation but I think it's important to state that group is considering a lot of options, working forward, and very modernized.

In terms of timeline, obviously the timeline you have on your screen is not realistic anymore, and that's why we're here. Our recent assessment showed that the fastest we could do, if there is no need for further public comment, so which would imply that a solution is very close to the second report that we have published, the fastest we could do would be to deliver final reports for the chartering organization by

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.

November the 20th. And that's, once again, I stress without any new public comment.

If we need another public comment, then we're speaking about a delivery timeline to the chartering organizations by the end of January or beginning of February. And I think that is very important.

And to conclude this update, I think it's fair to say that, in our group, we are very aware of the impact of these delays on the overall transition, our group cares about the transition, our group cares about the bottom-up multi-stakeholder consensus driven process, and although our motivation has been strongly affected by some of the recent statements, including those from the Board and the ones and the approach that are stressing redlines and some in our group are proceeding this as top-down interventions.

Despite this, the mobilization of the group is very high, and that's worth noting. One of the questions that is raised through these discussions is whether our group should be mandated to work within the constraints laid out by the Board or whether our group's primary commitment should be to a bottom-up multi-stakeholder collaboration of a solution and the Board would come after that only if the global public interest is threatened.

So in terms of the way forward, we actually have three team messages for the [inaudible] work. Number one is that each SO/AC working group could include sessions on the CCWG in their upcoming agendas. The co-chairs, the various stakeholders involved in our group are definitely available to brief about our progress and where we are, and that

applies, obviously, to the ICANN constituencies as well as the other communities.

[In brief the IAB], if there's a requirement to, if there's a request to, we can brief anyone. And please reach out to us if you have questions.

Secondly, we recommend that everyone in Dublin include discussions around the various approach for our way forward, and address this question when they engage with the other part of the community, including the Board. We are very much looking for feedback and input from each part of the community on how to best address the challenge of timeline and the challenge of finding consensus on ICANN's enhancements to accountability.

And finally, we would really appreciate in that we put that in writing after the Los Angeles meeting if the Board could reaffirm its resolution that it approved earlier in the process, that it will act as one stakeholder in the process and that the final approval by the Board would be only if the global public interest was threatened and that the Board could reinforce its engagement to support the bottom-up process in the next few weeks so that we can show the world that the process of the transition was actually multi-stakeholder and bottom-up. And we welcome all the [inaudible] contributions for that.

And that's it for my updates, and obviously, happy to answer any questions.

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you. Thank you very much, Mathieu. And we'll come back to and open period for everyone to participate in Q&A. Based on what you just laid out, we obviously, as you noted, will not be delivering the WS1 proposal to the ICANN Board in October as this slide in front of you, all [of you show]. As a result yesterday, we did a high-level analysis, and if I could ask staff to put up that analysis.

It basically shows kind of the impact on the timeline because we will not have the CCWG proposal in Dublin. And what we did do is we studied how the timeline will stack if we receive the CCWG proposal sometime in November versus sometime in December versus sometime in January versus sometime in March, which is what these four swing lanes show.

I think, Diana, we lost the slide, if you could put it back, please. Thank you. So the yellow or orange bars are simply showing that the arrival of the CCWG merging that with the ICG and delivery of that to Board and NTIA.

So if those timelines stand, the phase two is the NTIA review and its obligation, which NTIA had laid out to be a certain number of months based on their plan within Washington, D.C. to get the next [inaudible] review and evaluation completed and the certification by NTIA that allows us to move forward with the implementation.

I think the new news here is what you see as phase three. This was the phase fat NTIA certification to complete and execute the implementation of the proposals. Right now, the team and we will give you there's one more slide after this where we break down phase three a little bit, so you can see the detail.

But as you know, I had announced on this call, we assigned Akram Atallah to be Theresa's partner on the implementation side. In many ways, Theresa manages our activities to support the community through phase one. In phase two, both Akram and Theresa are working because there's quite a bit of planning that Akram is doing already. In fact, even now in phase one. And then the execution in phase three is in the hands of Akram and his team.

That team has now confirmed to us that if the proposal from the ICG stands as it looks today, which we expect PTI and all the pieces in it, and if the proposal from the CCWG meets Larry's requirement of "Simple as opposed to complex," then they would need a solid four months to get things done after phase two. That's what phase three shows it. It's a four-month period.

So if the delivery of our full proposal to the Board/NTIA because that will happen pretty quickly after the Board receives it is in November, then this shows that we can deliver and complete phase three and still have a month of buffer time before September 30th. If it's delivered to the Board and NTIA in December, then we can still get it done, but pretty much with no buffer.

If it starts slipping into January, it will be beyond the September 30 timeline and will most likely necessitate a renewal of the contract. And certainly, if it's delivered in Marrakech, it would. So this is not a slide showing any "judgment" on the work. This is a timeline sensitivity analysis that says if we deliver the proposal in this timeframe, this is what we'd expect.

This is not a political assessment. This is not an assessment of any windows of opportunity in the American political system. This is purely implementation and understanding what it will take to get things done. We had good meetings with NTIA, for example, to understand what things from phase three can be started in phase two, or even phase one, and what things we can do without tripping any contractual lines.

That work has occurred and led us to the next slide, please, which I'm going to ask Akram was trying to cover, and that's the details of the implementation that are starting to emerge from the team Akram is leading to give us this four-month timeframe that you just saw on the prior slide.

Let's just take a few minutes to look at that so everyone appreciates the various pieces being implemented. And I'm going to ask either Akram was trying to walk us through this side.

AKRAM ATALLAH:

Thank you, Fadi. I'm trying to walk us through the slides, but I wanted to just mention very quickly that we tried to break off what we can do into administrative preparations and then once the proposals are done, we could start on planning and doing some actual work that's ahead of delivery.

And then once the proposal is approved by NTIA and the Congress, that's when the implementation starts. We will continue to work with all the parties to make sure that we can do as much work ahead of time as possible, but there are some constraints on what we can do ahead of the approval.

Also, one important point in our planning, our assumptions, we put the date of December 30th and worked backwards on everything that we could do there so that we make sure that we hit the September 30th, and one of the things that obviously comes up very quickly is that as the approval could move to the right, we need to try to do as much as possible before the approval. So that's clear for us in order to maximize our chances of hitting September 30th.

So with that, I would leave it [inaudible] Trang to walk through the different [inaudible]. Thanks.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you, Akram. Can you hear me?

AKRAM ATALLAH: Yes.

TRANG NGUYEN: Perfect. Thank you. Thank you, Akram. Yes, as Akram mentioned, you can see below the month our implementation phases. The administrative prep phase essentially corresponds to the phase one that was on the previous timeline slide that Fadi shows. The planning phase essentially is phase two on the previous slide, and then our implementation phase, which is the four-month period that Fadi had mentioned, is phase three on the previous slide.

So as you can see here, the longer or the further out that the proposals are delivered, that makes our administrative prep phase a bit longer,

but it cuts down our implementation phase at the tail end. And as Akram mentioned, there's only so much that we can do during the administrative prep phase and the planning phase. We're constrained by what we can do during those two phases. Now we're going to try to do as much as we can. But that is just going to be things that we won't be able to do until the proposals are approved by the USG.

So just to give you a little bit more clarity on what these phases mean. The administrative prep phase essentially is when we do things like identifying the various projects that we need to work on, assigning internal owners that's going to be leading these projects, then creating project plans and start to scope out these projects.

So there's only so much of that we can do prior to the finalization of the proposals and understanding what it is that we're going to implement. So that's the administrative prep phase. The planning phase, as Akram mentioned, is a phase where we hope we're going to be able to do as much as we can. It's when we now have clearly on what it is that we're going to be implementing.

We anticipate that we'll be engaging with the community on some of the implementation items during this planning phase, and again, working also with the NTIA in order to try to do as much as we can during this phase without crossing the implementation line. And then, obviously, the implementation is after the approval, the proposals, implementing whatever we need to implement prior to the transition.

Also very important to note on here is that would include sign up from NTIA or approval from NTIA on any of these implementation item in

order for the NTIA and IANA contract to expire at the end of September next year.

So let me kind of describe the rest of this timeline. The color coding that you see reflects how we're sort of organizing our implementation work. The lines are in blue, is what we call implementation track one, and it includes items relating to the RDMS changes to remove the NTIA's role and also parallel testing, and then contract with the root zone maintainer. So all of that work is included in track one.

In track two, which is the orange line, is essentially everything relating to the PTI entity and it includes things like the SLAs that are in the CWG proposal for the naming community, the [inaudible] SLAs, the formation of the PTI structure, which includes the PTI Board, the PTI budget, any infrastructure that we need to create, and any governance documents, as well.

CSC is the Customer Standing Committee, and so that's essentially all the work around operationalizing the CSC. RDMS Standing Committee, that's also the work relating to operationalizing the RDMS Standing Committee to provide the Board with advice relating to any structural or operational changes to the root zone.

Escalation mechanisms are all of the [complaint] and escalation mechanisms are in the naming proposals. We believe that these are based on the current escalation mechanisms and there may be minimal work required, but we still need to look into what changes have been made and then implementing those changes.

Document relationship refers to agreements and MOUs with entities like the IETF and the NRO. I know, Jari, you have a question in the chatroom with regards to the IETF. I don't have it specifically called out there, but it's included in the document relationship line item. We can look into more specifically calling that out when we update this timeline.

And then IPR, obviously, refers to the IANA.org domain name and the IANA trademark. The teal colors at the bottom reflect implementation track three, which has to do with accountability items. The last line that you see there, ICANN governance documents, that essentially is referring to the bylaws.

Per NTIA certification process, as part of that certification, I think NTIA will need to certify that the bylaws have been adopted and so we will need to have the bylaws adopted, drafted and adopted, by mid-March, which is the time that we anticipate NTIA certifications of the proposals. Again, these are approximate dates.

And then the ICANN governance and accountability line is sort of a placeholder right now for all of the implementation items that we will need to do as per the CCWG proposal. There are some items that you don't see reflected on here, such as the IFR and also the Separation Cross-Community Working Group.

Those things will be reflected in the bylaws but the operationalizing of those things we think can occur after transition, so that's why they're reflected in this timeline.

FADI CHEHADE:

Okay. Thank you, Trang. If I could ask we go back to the prior slide, and then open it up for questions. So just as a summary slide, what Trang just walked us through are the things that she's leading now under Akram within the phases. And she showed this little bit of her plan of how we're going to get to the end of the September 30th timeline and the concerns that are currently clear if the delivery of the proposal to NTIA is past December. At the moment, it looks like December will be the latest.

And again, I'm not rendering judgment on where the CCWG is. I'm simply saying from a pure project management standpoint, if we do not have that report delivered by December at the latest, we are going to be very pressed to actually get things done in time for the contract expire on the 30th of September, 2016.

So with this, why don't we just open up for questions and see what folks would like to drill on? And I see three hands up at the moment. Steve Crocker, why don't you go first?

STEVE CROCKER:

Sorry. I had to come off of mute there. Thank you, Fadi. One of the things that I know is working, waiting for attention in the future is the review by NTIA of the proposal and one of the things that we've been all cautioned about is making sure that the proposal is complete, doesn't have big holes on it.

I'm thinking that it would be a big service to all of us if it were possible to get that kind of review done prior to the announced delivery or announced completion of the proposal so that avoiding any future

surprises. Might it be possible to arrange that sooner rather than later, at least on an informal basis?

FADI CHEHADE: NTIA is on the call, so I'm going to ask if they could comment.

LARRY STRICKLING: Hi, Steve. Again, what is the specific request?

STEVE CROCKER: So Larry, thank you very much. The specific request is this. We understand that the proposal will be delivered to you and this really applies to both proposals, the ICG staff proposal and the CCWG's proposal, so I'll raise it in both settings that one of the things that you would do is look to see if it's in fact a complete proposal. And if it isn't, then you will have trouble accepting it and passing it along.

So I'm asking if it's possible to have your review of the emerging proposal happen in tandem so that if there are any things that you would constitute that you would say are whole, that they're identified earlier rather than later.

LARRY STRICKLING: I understand the concern, but I'm not in the business of giving partial credit. I have spoken twice now that the plans that are out there are not adequately complete for us. We've got a lot of adults in this discussion and they need to go back and fix it. But I don't see us getting involved in

partial review of some parts of the proposal before we have what the community believes is the best proposal it can bring forward that has the support of the community and will survive the various levels of scrutiny it will get, not just from us, but from lots of other stakeholders who are interested in this issue.

I guess I can't impress enough on people. You've got to get the work done.

STEVE CROCKER:

Well, thank you. In any case, speaking less to Larry and more to ourselves, I think it's incumbent on us as a community to take a look at our proposal from that perspective and make sure that we all agree that it's complete. And if we think that it's not complete, then we should attend to that before we can look at a proposal.

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you, Steve. Thank you, Larry. I'm going to call on Alan next. Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. There is one item that's not on the timeline that you showed the next slide, the one we went back from. And there's a current disagreement between the members of the CWG and the ICG or at least one member of the ICG, and we don't know to what extent that represents the whole ICG or not, related to the NTIA VeriSign cooperative agreement.

The original announcement in 2014 said that would be addressed in a separate but parallel process. And to date, there has been no announcement as to just how that would be resolved. There's a number of theoretical ways it could be addressed.

We are being told again by one member of the ICG, which may be representative of the ICG, that we should be building a full plan as to how we would want to see the cooperative agreement replaced, which may or may not be what the NTIA has in mind. That's going to be a lot of work. It hasn't been done to date. There have been no discussions between any of the parties to date, and at this point, it is either something which really has to be done within the timeline that's displaying on the screen right now, or is a [make] work project.

And there's a CWG meeting later on today in a few hours, which may partially resolve this, but at this point, this seems to be an impasse.

LARRY STRICKLING:

I think if anybody's got any spare capacity, I would urge them to join in the CCWG discussions and get that plan finished. We have basically said that, obviously, we won't continue in the role we play today and we will have to adjust the cooperative agreement with VeriSign, which covers more than just this to reflect that. And we made an announcement, I think a month or two ago, about the work that ICANN and VeriSign are doing with respect to how to test the system for root zone updates that don't involve the United States government, and they're proceeding with that testing. I don't know what more people feel they need to do

about this, but I guess there's a bigger problem to solve here, and like I say, if people have got extra capacity, jump into that and help fix that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Larry, thank you. Let me be quite clear. The question is whether the agreement is going to be modified to make sure that the root zone is updated on a regular basis without you being there. In other words, VeriSign has to, essentially, listen to IANA. Or the whole agreement will be scrapped and replaced by an agreement between VeriSign and someone else. And the difference between those two is the point in question.

LARRY STRICKLING:

Well, I think that those are two different issues. Yes, our agreement will have to be modified, and out of that, I can't speak for VeriSign and ICANN, but I assume that they will need to put paper around their arrangement.

ALAN GREENBERG:

What I'm hearing from you is that you're not expecting us to be doing any work at this point on that.

LARRY STRICKLING:

Right. I think you guys have got plenty of other work to do.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will pass that message on, and Jonathan on this call will pass that message on today. Thank you.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Fadi, if I may.

FADI CHEHADE: Yeah, Akram. You go and it seems like Steve Crocker wanted to just interject something in the discussion, but go ahead first.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Yes, thank you. So as Fadi mentioned, we have been working with VeriSign and NTIA, and we made a proposal to actually simulate what the system would look like post transition. So we're doing a parallel system that will take out the approval piece of the root zone management system and basically we are working on a contractual relationship with VeriSign to be our supplier on putting together the root zone file and assigning it and setting it up for the solution.

So we're doing this task and I [assure] the community that the contract will allow them to look at this relationship post-transition and modify, ask whatever they want to do. But the most important thing we're working on right now is the minimum change to the root zone management system to make sure that the security and stability is maintained, and then we can make any improvement changes that we want post transition. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE: Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much. I was just listening very carefully to what each person was saying, and I realize that there may be a slight difference in in some underlying assumptions or understanding.

So Alan, the arrangement between NTIA and VeriSign is a multifaceted document. So when I heard Larry say, "We're going to modify that document," I think that actually translates into remove the relationship between NTIA and VeriSign with respect to root zone maintenance, but the rest of the document which applies to various other things remains the same. And all of you can correct me if I've got this complete wrong.

And then separately, it was also saying... And VeriSign and ICANN are working out this arrangement and the ICG and the CWG do not need to attend to that. And then parenthetically, if you have extra time, go and help the folks in the CCWG. So those are the three different pieces of what I heard and I hope I haven't added any confusion.

ALAN GREENBERG: From my point of view, that is what we I believed was the case. We are being told again that we should be planning out what some future agreements between ICANN and VeriSign should be.

STEVE CROCKER: No, exactly the opposite.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE: Okay. Any other comments on this from Akram or Larry, or can we go to Mathieu, who has his hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record. We will, of course, have been told at that point that it's no longer bottom-up and we shouldn't be doing this top-down. I'm just noting for the record what the answer will be.

FADI CHEHADE: Thank you, Alan. Okay. Mathieu?

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you, Fadi. First of all, echoing Larry's words. If you have any extra capacity and you're willing to serve in a bottom-up process, please join the Accountability Working Group. We need every hand on deck. My comment was I mentioned earlier two dates, which were November 20th or early end of January. I want to stress that in comparison with the slide that's currently on the screen, the dates I was mentioning were dates of delivery of the final report of the CCWG to the chartering organization, and so you need to factor in an extra delay before you reach the delivery to the ICANN Board, which is the consideration by the SOs and ACs of this report.

And obviously, it cannot be less than 30 days, then it's already very challenging because it's not a time where there are sessions, and we know some SOs and ACs are very reluctant to do important decisions like this between physical meetings. So I want to stress our creative and out of the box. We need to think in terms of process and project management here if we want to meet the timeline because we're already basically beyond. And so that's probably not something that the CCWG can come up with, but something this group should be considering, I believe. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE:

Mathieu, if I may comment on what you just said before giving the floor to Larry. Thanks for clarifying that before we can get to the delivery to ICANN Board and NTIA, there's clearly the required important steps of the chartering organizations taking on what you finished.

And so if we recall what you covered earlier. If I could ask someone put us on hold to figure out who that line is. Okay, thank you.

So I was just saying that if in fact you do stick to your most, I guess, positive report that if you do not go through a second comment period, you might finish your work in November. And then if we add that 30-day period you mentioned, which I think is reasonable for the chartering organizations to review it, then our second [swing] lane on this slide may still be possible. Because at that point, we could finish things in 30 days.

So clearly, if we align these two things, it means that if we are able to work with, as Larry said in LA, with the simplest possible proposal based

on the latest proposal you had put out and received comments on, then we may have a shot at getting this done without slipping past September 30th. Am I reading this right? Am I reading this based on what you said earlier, Mathieu, right?

MATHIEU WEILL: That's correct. And the challenge I was stressing was the challenge for the chartering organizations to get organized in order to get that through in 30 days between sessions.

FADI CHEHADE: Right. And again, in that best case, my sense will be, and we will discuss this in Dublin, but this is a chance also to comment on it during this call. Is that we may need an intersessional meeting at that point, because certainly, some SOs and ACs have made it very clear that without an intersessional meeting, they cannot really go through that approval process.

So based on this, even in the best case, we are likely to need an intersessional meeting in December. Jari, you're next.

LARRY STRICKLING: Fadi, could I just jump in for a second?

FADI CHEHADE: Certainly.

LARRY STRICKLING:

A couple of times you've said on the call about the need for simplicity and the idea that it's a USG requirement. I guess I just wanted to clarify that we said the plan needs to meet our criteria, it needs to meet the needs of the communities, and then within that, obviously, we would favor a plan that is simpler over a plan that is more complex, but it still needs to meet the conditions that we've set and that the community has set for this. So I just wanted to clarify that.

And also, on this particular point, in terms of Mathieu's schedule, could it be help – let me ask this. Does the community feel that they're going to be able to spend as much time as they need to in Dublin to work through issues? Or is the schedule constraints limiting how much the CCWG feels it can get done?

Because you do have this golden opportunity of having everybody together for several days in Ireland, and it would be a shame if artificial schedule constraints prevented the group from getting together and busting through these issues, if they could.

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you, Larry. And in fact, we do have a meeting in exactly another hour for many of the community leaders, many of whom are on this call, and many others, the SG leaders, the RALO leaders, many of the GAC vice-chairs, the CCWG leaders, the CWG leaders, all of us [inaudible] together precisely to answer the question you asked, which is look, we have Dublin in front of us, this is the timeline we're looking at. How can we all work together to maximize the time in Dublin towards success?

So we will look at this question immediately after this call an hour from now.

LARRY STRICKLING:

That would be very helpful because I didn't talk to your schedule but, obviously, we are quite concerned about getting a plan much past the end of the year. I think if it's a good, solid, well-thought-through plan, that is complete, answers the questions, we can process it if we get it roughly at the beginning of the year. And I'm not saying we can't do it, something that comes in later than that, but I think we've been assuming we'd get something in November. I think we can absorb some slippage here, but I am worried about it going much past the first of the year.

FADI CHEHADE:

Okay. Thank you, Larry. Thank you for that clarity, also, on the timeline. We have a couple of minutes left, and I want to make sure we hear Jari and Jonathan Robinson, and then agree on next steps. Go ahead, Jari, please.

JARI ARKKO:

Hello, everybody. So I want to [inaudible] on Mathieu and Larry and others saying that [inaudible] where the effort is needed. CCWG at the moment. And I just wanted to say also the perhaps obvious thing that a lot is riding on this, no matter which part is the one that finished last, if [inaudible] something else, too. That part is going to get a lot of focus

and a lot of the perception on things like multi-stakeholder model and how the [Internet] is managed is going to ride on that.

So it's not this particular thing, but overall [success] of our model is riding on this and, of course, the other community. So everybody take that into account, assumption that you already have.

But the other thing I wanted to say relates to how we discuss and [inaudible] being discussed about the details of what's legal and what will be [inaudible] what requirements we actually need to support for the [inaudible]. I'm not the person who's spending all my time in CCWG [inaudible] occasionally checking with the mailing list traffic is, and have seen some of the discussions, and I would like to offer an observation that there's some great [inaudible] of the human discussion or the human level discussions, as well, that people are unhappy on both sides, and it's a little bit more tension than needed.

And defusing that somehow would actually be beneficial so I'm thinking of things like stepping back a little bit and of putting the leaders [inaudible] but someone else who can [inaudible]. So going back to the basics of we have received these comments and what issues do they actually signify, and trying to find out a way around those issues and finding a good, solid, complete proposal.

And currently, it's a little bit of back and forth between the CCWG and [inaudible] myself. Anything you can do to reduce tensions would also be useful. Fadi?

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you, Jari. Thank you for these wise words that we all need. So much appreciated. And yes, we will take that to heart in the days ahead. I want to just... I don't know why I need to say this, but I'm going to say this. The CCWG chairs and the CCWG [inaudible] have been frankly putting incredible, incredible efforts to get this done and on track. I was just four hours ago with them on a long night call for me, but for many others, as well, in the middle of the night.

There is a nonstop effort. They have ten calls this week, one of their members was saying. So I don't think it's a lack of effort. The effort is incredible, it's not the lack of will. The will is amazing, and the cohesiveness and the hard work is there.

I do think you are right, Jari, though that we need to step back with chairs and discuss with them how we can be helpful in a different way to avoid the ships passing in the night at this stage. And as Larry said, we have a very fantastic opportunity coming up in Dublin, and if we could use that time to advance the work, we would be all well served.

And I think this timeline, frankly, is very worrisome. Because as it stands, even in the best case possible, we may barely make it and Larry just gave us also the clarity that past the second swim lane, he didn't say it's impossible, but he said it gets hard. The expectation is that we should get things done around that second [swim] lane.

So thank you, Jari, again, and Jonathan, why don't you finish with your comments today and then we can on next steps.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Fadi. It's right at the back of the call and so I'll be as brief as possible. I'm struck that this is primarily meant to be a project management call and we just need to be careful what we drift into some of the issues for this, which is probably more for the community forum call later.

But certainly, it's very useful to see this implementation work and I think Trang is plugged into everything that's going on, but I just want to make sure she was aware that the CWG is working on an implementation schedule, and we should make sure she shares with that.

Notwithstanding, Larry, it's a good point about getting whatever we possibly done in Dublin. I think it will be useful to calendar the December meeting. If that is a prospect, we should at least pencil that in so we know when that is and consult to plan space and schedules for that.

And then I was struck by something that Akram said when he was talking about the different subject of the root zone maintainer, and essentially the minimum work done to maintain security and stability and perhaps that in addition to the sort of human level points that Jari made at a practical level, we could remind ourselves that we really need to do the minimum, sort of produce a minimum viable product, if you like, to meet the various requirements and I think there's a danger for all of us that we kitchen sink this.

And so that's perhaps something we can pick up in the later call, where we don't throw everything in and try and, as well as focusing on the

human level, focus on the minimum that we can do to get the job done.
Thanks, Fadi, and everyone on the call for hearing me out.

FADI CHEHADE:

Thank you, Jonathan. Okay. I think the purpose of this call was to make sure we're all aligned as to the timeline and we have a common understanding of what are the current pressures and the current, I think, estimate on how and when we could have this done. I would, right now, say that on a scale of red being we're in deep danger and green being we're in perfect timeline from a program management standpoint, I think right now looking at this program, it is definitely in the solid orange. It's not bordering on red stage in the sense that we are.

Because our best case, according to this call, would be tight. So we have left no buffer time at the moment and I think we have a chance between now and Dublin – not just in Dublin, but between now and Dublin, and certainly in Dublin – to come together and try and ensure that the bottom-up work that has been going on, which I still think is remarkable, is going to get us there on time, lest we have to push that contract another year.

So I think we're in sync. If there are no other comments or questions, we're going to just get back to work and see how we can stay in the green rather than switch to the redlines. And I'm seeing in the chatroom that Byron wishes to speak.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Fadi, I think Byron is trying to get—

FADI CHEHADE: Yes, no problem. Go ahead, Byron. Sorry. I didn't see your hand, but you may be on the phone line. So please go ahead and speak. Hello, Byron. We cannot. Byron? Can staff make sure Byron is unmuted if he wishes to speak? You are unmuted now, so go ahead. Byron?

[LYNN]: This is Lynn, his assistant. I'm going to have to dial him back in. Can you hold on for a sec? I think he just dropped off again. Just a sec. Won't be long.

FADI CHEHADE: Okay. Izumi, do you want to squeeze in a comment for 30 seconds or so until Byron comes. We had closed the line, but since we had to wait for him, go ahead.

IZUMI AIZU: Sure. Thanks, Fadi. Hello, everyone. So I just want to make some heads up that we'd like to suggest having a meeting among the leaders of this [re-operational] committee [inaudible] while we're still in Dublin so that we can coordinate on any issues that need some collaboration between the operational committees and so this is just some heads up and a suggestion for this opportunity.

FADI CHEHADE: Very good. We will definitely follow up on that, Izumi. I'm going to ask staff to organize a call between the leaders of the operational communities while we are in Dublin, our meeting. Okay. All right. This may be Byron back. Byron, are you back with us?

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes. Can you hear me?

FADI CHEHADE: Very well. Please go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, we can, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Sorry. It's been a logistical nightmare on the phone here. I just wanted to say at the end and pick up on Jonathan's point around this being kind of a project management call, and just reiterate some of the comments I've made previously. But I'm very concerned about the timeline, as we all are, and I think that the CCWG is considering or doing their work – and thank you to Mathieu and everybody on that group for how much work they have done thus far.

If we can keep a couple of things in mind. And one is the potential difference between accountability and corporate governance and some of the issues that have been most sticky from my vantage point have been some of the key corporate governance issues. The reallocation of

power or at least the changing dynamics of it are some of the toughest issues to deal with in any corporate governance circumstance.

But if we have the opportunity to digest the true corporate governance issues, separate and distinct from some account of the key accountability issues, which I think I heard Mathieu say already. I think that that is potentially a real shining light for the path forward that they should do everything they can to utilize and so hopefully focus on the accountability issues and maybe we can get the corporate governance issues at another time.

Would obviously have to be guaranteed, ironclad guaranteed if that were to happen, but I think that has potential. And then the other thing is when I look at the broader Internet governance ecosystem right now, I just want to say I'm far more worried about WSIS+10 and some of the outcomes, especially since we've already seen the comments flowing from that process, than I am about some of the shrill concerns raised about ICANN and the ICANN Board.

And if I look at those two things and think which am I most worried about, and arguably, which should we as a community be most worried, it's latter rather than the former. I just wanted to say that and thank Mathieu and the CCWG for all the work they've done thus far. Hopefully we're coming to where we can see the light at the end of this tunnel. Thank you, Fadi and everybody.

FADI CHEHADE:

Yeah. Thank you, Byron. Thank you, and just in conclusion a comment on what you just said. You may have been in and out because of the

connection but earlier, Mathieu did bring up that some of their community members have made proposals that are being now looked at in earnest to not precisely, but to along the lines of what you just said, and they're reviewing these proposals. The idea of making sure that there is as Steve DelBianco posted, a very clear process by which governance structure can be evolved past the transition in a normal ICANN evolution mechanism with some clarity on how the process would work, not so much what these processes will lead to, but more importantly that the process is guaranteed so the community can continue evolving ICANN structure.

So there's good work and there are good directional activities in that regard. Sorry we went over time, but I thought this was a good discussion. If any of you believe that we should have another call like this purely on the program and the timeline before Dublin or before we get to Dublin, do write me or Teresa or Akram. Just give us a heads up.

At this stage, we're not planning any other calls on the timeline. We do have a call with the community leaders in less than hour now to just go over that timeline and then decide how do we shape Dublin to make it a success for everyone. And for those of you on that call and here now, look forward to connect with again at the top of the hour.

Thank you all very much. Thank you very much. Appreciate your time.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]