ALISSA COOPER: Okay, this is Alissa again. I think there's a few people who are still trying to connect or reconnect, but we should probably get going since we have limited time. As usual, we'll start by asking if there's anyone who is on the phone bridge but not in Adobe Connect if you could please make yourself known now.

All right. It looks like for everyone who is trying to join, you are all in Adobe Connect, so that's good. The secretary will take the roll call, as usual. You can see on the screen that we have three agenda items for today: discussion of the minutes from the last call, our e-mails to the operational communities regarding timeframes, and then our own ICG timelines. Is there anything else that people wanted to discuss or comments on the agenda? Please raise your hand in Adobe Connect.

Okay, great. With that, I think we can start with the minutes approval for the last call. We got those up on the screen. I will say these minutes have undergone some editing quite recently. I would prefer that we actually not do the call for approval today, but if there are any issues that would benefit from discussion on the call, then let's do that now. I know there's a little bit of back and forth with Milton, although I see that he's not on the call, so that might not be possible to discuss. If there's anything else that people want to discuss related to the minutes, we should do that now. Feel free to raise your hand.

Do other folks actually see the minutes uploading? I don't see them projected in Adobe Connect. Okay. I'm sure exactly what is going on with Adobe Connect. Obviously we all have the minutes in our inboxes, so we don't necessarily need the projection in order to access them. I

also don't see any hands necessarily, so I don't know if anyone has anything to discuss. There they are, okay. Now we have them projected. On my screen I can see them.

As I said, I don't think we should do the call for approval today because these have been edited very recently and we still have some outstanding issues with these. So we'll do the call for approval either on the list next week or we can do it on our June 10 call. I'm not seeing any hands go up. I think we can move on to the next agenda item.

Okay. Jennifer, actually I sent an e-mail a little bit more recently than the one that's being projected as slightly updated text. If we could get that up, that would be great. But we can start the discussion while it's getting uploaded. Sorry, that was last minute on my part.

Now we've move on to start talking about these e-mails to send to the operational communities to get an update from them about timeframes including implementation timeframes for all the communities and proposal completion for the names community.

I think where we are at this point is that folks are pretty happy for myself, and Patrik, and Mohamed to send these e-mails to IANA plan, to Chris, and to the CWG. I have made edits to try to address various comments on the list, including quoting more of the letter from Larry which was the most recent I think edit suggested by Kavouss, and also mentioning that we had asked about implementation timeframes in the RFP and we're looking really for updated or more complete information than what we got in the RFP.

You can see the text now being projected for IANA plan and there's [text] for the other two groups.

There was one issue that came up on the list, which was whether to send one of these mails also to ICANN, so we should certainly discuss that. I don't think [inaudible] that. We should discuss anything else that we need to before sending these. The floor is open for discussion.

PAUL WILSON: Hi, this is Paul. I was able to connect to Adobe.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Paul. I don't see any hands. I do think we need to resolve this question about sending one of these mails to ICANN. Anybody who has an opinion about that, feel free to raise your hand because we need to decide. We have multiple opinions that have been voiced I think on the list.

Wolf-Ulrich, go ahead. If you're speaking, we can't hear you. Okay, I was unable to hear Wolf-Ulrich. I don't know if anybody else could.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

ALISSA COOPER: No, okay. It looks like his mic is not enabled. Why don't we go to Paul and then we'll try to come back to Wolf-Ulrich? Go ahead, Paul.

PAUL WILSON: Thanks, Alissa. Just regarding the letter to ICANN, I don't see any harm with asking ICANN to identify any implementation issues that concern them. That said, I'm not sure whether – I wasn't clear on exactly what we were asking ICANN or how, but I don't have any problem with it in principle. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Paul. I think the idea is that we would send a very similar note to ICANN basically asking about approximate implementation timeframe. That would be the question. It would be almost the same letter with some minor changes.

PAUL WILSON: If I could just say I think that doesn't quite make sense in the same way as it does writing to the communities about implementation timelines for their proposals. The proposals have come from the communities, and so I think the communities would have an opinion about the implementation that they're expecting. ICANN may not, because of course what they have to do is completely dependent on what they receive from the ICG. I think maybe we're asking them for any observations or concerns, if they have them, rather than placing an expectation on ICANN that they should be able to comment on implementation under the circumstances. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Paul. Wolf-Ulrich, do you have audio?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Hello, can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, please go ahead.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: I'm sorry, Alissa. I was pushing the wrong button, so I was on mute. What I'd like to point out in my e-mail is the following. I'm supporting to send out a letter to ICANN inviting them to [inaudible] timeline discussion, but [inaudible]-wise, I see a difference in the participation that ICANN and the operational community [inaudible] in this discussion. That's what I would like to see to be mentioned in the letter to ICANN. That kind of person is helpful and can write it, but when it comes to discussion about the timeline, then it's a discussion more between the operational communities and the ICG to come to a timely decision which letter has to be sent and which content to NTIA. That's my point and that's my suggestion. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Russ Mundy, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Alissa. I think it would be wise for us to send a letter to ICANN even though there are in fact a lot of unknown specifics at this point in time. It appears to me that it would be very much in line with the previous comments at least the board has made with respect to

engaging with the community and keeping people advised about what's going on.

Even though they may not know specific details, I think it would be very appropriate to formally ask them to express whatever they think they should express with respect to implementation and timelines.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Russ. Mary? Mary, if you are speaking, we cannot hear you. Okay, hopefully we can come back to Mary. I'm not sure if she's having audio problems. Xiaodong?

MARY UDUMA: Hello, hello?

ALISSA COOPER: Is that Mary?

MARY UDUMA: Hello, can you hear me? I am here, Mary.

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead, Mary.

MARY UDUMA: I have the same position as Paul. As I said in my e-mail, I commented indirectly [inaudible] ICANN board will be sending to the operational

communities. I think we are coordinating operational communities proposal and [inaudible] recommendation. So therefore [I think] it would be premature at this time to ask the board. If the board has input about implementing what the operational communities are recommending, I think they should send it to the operational communities and [inaudible] ICG.

Well, it [inaudible] determined even if we are going to contact them. Maybe you propose a new one of what the contact we want to make with ICANN. I think the [inaudible] should be able to get or take this question to the ICANN board and then bring back information to us. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Mary.

MARY UDUMA: I hope you heard me.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we heard you. You were cutting in and out a little bit, but we got most of it I think. I have seen a couple other folks with hands up in the queue. Xiaodong and Joe, did you want to speak either of you?

XIAODONG LEE: This is Xiaodong speaking. Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

XIAODONG LEE: I think it's also [inaudible] the e-mails, but also support within the attitude to ICANN to ask their opinion about the implementation. It's better for us to know about the opinion from different communities and also if ICANN [is there]. Thank you.

JOE ALHADEFF: Alissa, this is Joe. Can you guys hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah.

JOE ALHADEFF: I'm comfortable with writing a letter to them, but I think as Paul noted, the letter may have a slightly different orientation because we're not asking exactly the same question. We do want to see if they foresee implementation issues that are coming in their way, but I don't think we're asking them to comment specifically on the implementation timelines of other because I think that wouldn't be productive, but are there internal ICANN steps we haven't thought about that will actually take them time to also do implementation necessary for the changeover?

Some of that is going to be contingent on what's the final proposals, but some of that may be internal organizational stuff that they may have to

do and it just may be useful to know in terms of the timeline if that's going to hold up [inaudible].

ALISSA COOPER: Got it. Thank you, Joe. Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, thank you, Alissa. Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we can hear you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. I'm in favor of sending a letter to ICANN. I see a point in drafting differently. I was going to suggest this, but already I think Joe has put it eloquently. I think we can try to draft something along those lines so that we can reach out to ICANN, but make it clear that ultimately the final will be coming from the operational community taking into consideration of course the input they have provided. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Manal. I don't see any more hands in the queue now. It sounds like folks are generally okay with sending a mail to ICANN as long as it's focused on some internal ICANN process that might take time in the implementation phase and inquiring about that, and that also reinforces the fact that the proposals and the implementation details all come from the communities. That's roughly what I'm hearing is that even the

people who are a little uncomfortable with asking this directly of ICANN are amenable to that kind of formulation.

What I'd like to do is since we already have the other three drafted to get those off to the communities because we are asking for an answer in just a couple of weeks' time, and I know at least one of those communities is very busy at the same time trying to wrap up this proposal. I'd really like to get these e-mails off to those communities as soon as we can. In the meantime, I will work with Patrik and Mohamed on some language that we can [put] on the list to send to ICANN and we can have maybe a little bit of list discussion about that and send that off as well. Any objections to that approach?

Okay, I'm seeing a little bit of support in the chatroom and no hands raised. I think we can go forward with hat. Thanks, everyone. Kuo-Wei, did you want to jump in? Kuo-Wei, did you have a comment? I saw your hand.

KUO-WEI WU: Yes, hi, [inaudible].

ALISSA COOPER: You are cutting in and out a little bit?

KUO-WEI WU: [inaudible] now?

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, I see you say you will write your comment. Yeah, we're having a lot of technical difficulties on this call, unfortunately. Do you want to try again to speak or are you going to write?

KUO-WEI WU: Hello, can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

KUO-WEI WU: Hello, can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: I can hear you, Kuo-Wei.

KUO-WEI WU: Oh, good. I'd just like to say thank you very much for your discussion, and also I think we are doing our best to provide a useful information to the ICG based on the [inaudible] to ICANN. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Okay, I think we should move on to our next agenda item. Our own timeline. All right. We're looking at the projection of the ICG – this is the ICG's own timeline. What I really want to do is for us to have very firmly agreed before we get the CWG names proposal about the timeline that we are going to try to hit once we actually receive it.

What we're looking at on the screen has dates across the top, but we don't really need to focus on those specific dates. We really just need to talk about how much time overall we plan for our own process and for each of the steps in that process because this timeline will essentially come into action once we receive the names proposal, whenever that is.

Joe, I see your hand up. Is that a hand to talk about this topic or to talk about the previous topic?

JOE ALHADEFF: That was a hand to have it made larger and it just happened.

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, okay. I think we all have our own control of that, too.

JOE ALHADEFF: I tried, but I couldn't get as larger on my screen until this just happened.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, good. Hopefully people can see it a little bit better now. Thanks, Joe. This timeline has been around for quite a while now. Hopefully everyone is very familiar with it. It definitely puts time pressure on us to get our assessment base done both individually on the CWG names proposal once we receive it and also on the combined proposal. It puts a little bit of time pressure on the communities if we have questions for

them or if we need to engage them about issues that we find in our assessment or comments we receive from the public.

It includes one substantial public comment period of 4-5 weeks, depending when it lands on the calendar. Then approximately three weeks for us to analyze and assess the comments and then a couple of weeks to work with the communities on changes or issues arising from the public comments. Then at the end, a couple of weeks to finalize the proposal and ship it off to the ICANN board for transmission to NTIA.

The question for us really is do we like this timeline? Is this what we want to estimate for ourselves? It does have a nice feature that if we receive the CWG names proposal in the Buenos Aires timeframe, then we will finish in the Dublin timeframe, which I think would be very – would make a good use of our meeting time and so forth because we will certainly be meeting face-to-face there.

That's the question that we need to decide. This is our big piece of the puzzle and our [inaudible] to NTIA about how long we think proposal finalization will take.

I've seen a couple of comments on the list. I know Paul had a comment that I just saw and certainly agreed with, but would like to hear from others if they support this, if we think this is a good estimate. The floor is open. I see Mary. Go ahead, Mary.

MARY UDUMA: Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we can hear you.

RUSS MUNDY: Yes.

MARY UDUMA: Okay. I just want to ask whether this timeline is [inaudible] in line with whatever we receive from the operational communities because if I look at what CCWG accountability is doing, I think the timeline, I think they've yet to harmonize that with the CCWG since the dependencies on accountability with CWG work. I don't know whether we just [inaudible]. Please correct me if I'm wrong.

Going by what happened the [last year] during the August/September window, so many people were [inaudible] and communication was – we couldn't participate so much because [inaudible] give more time to that. I think it is going to impact on our timeline.

I don't know whether you got my question. One is what CCWG accountability timeline would impact on the CWG submission. Second is the summer holiday August/September timeline whether we have adjusted properly for that. Those are my two questions. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Mary. I'll offer my own thoughts, and then anyone else [inaudible] feel free to jump in. As far as the interaction with the CCWG timeline, I think – at least as far as I know – the continuing expectation

is that we hope to receive the CWG proposal and it may be conditional on the CCWG completing some of its work.

If you look at it now, it has components that the CCWG needs to decide to take up and finish. Eventually, if those components don't end up getting finished, then we won't be able to forward on the complete proposal with the CWG component.

It's not the case that we will be blocked waiting for the CWG to complete all of its work before we can engage in all the steps that you see on the screen.

For example, the CCWG I believe is estimating right now to complete its work by the Dublin ICANN meeting as well. But obviously the CWG is estimating to hopefully send us a proposal many months before that, about four months before that. So we will essentially carry out our assessment in parallel with the completion of the CCWG work if all goes well, and then we will essentially all finish in Dublin. If that doesn't go well, if the CCWG can't complete what it needs to do in order to fulfill the conditional requirements from the CWG proposal, then obviously we will not be able to progress. That's something we definitely need to keep an eye out for.

As far as summer holidays, I completely agree. I think we're going to have to have a little bit of flexibility. That's in part why the public comment period is shown as stretching across parts of August and September. I think if we do end up with a public comment period that's mostly in August, we need to make sure that we have some time either in July or September to make sure that people who take a lot of holiday

in the summer will have at least Sundays working to be able to formulate a comment. This is not set in stone and we should certainly think about summer holidays when we put things out for public comment.

Okay, we have a big queue, so I will try to not jump in as much anymore. Kuo-Wei?

KUO-WEI WU: Yeah. [inaudible] input regarding [inaudible] implementation. Is it possible you can specify the schedule and timeline [inaudible] looking for ICANN to give you the input, please?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we will certainly do that, Kuo-Wei.

KUO-WEI WU: Did you hear it?

ALISSA COOPER: Just like we did in the other e-mails. When we write the e-mail, we will address that.

KUO-WEI WU: Okay, thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. Thanks. Russ Mundy, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay. Thank you, Alissa. One of the things that I have a bit of concern about, and I'm not sure we can take steps to lessen the problem considering we have so many unknowns, and that is the public comment period, we really don't know how many comments we'll have or how challenging it'll be to resolve those comments. Has anyone given any thought to the possibility of laying out a potential quantity of comments and the complexity of responding to the comments in a way that we would be able to base that duration on some empirical data? If we said that maybe half the comments will be easy to answer, however we're going to respond to them or whatever kind of response is needed, and a quarter of the comments will be difficult and the other quarter will be extremely difficult, and estimate how much time it would actually take to do that. We would at least have some quantitative basis that we could use as a starting point.

If the public comments that come in are vastly different than that, we then can at least have something to say, "Oh, gee, it's not what we expected. Here's what we need to do now." Is that something reasonable to spend a bit of time thinking about or not?

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Russ. That's an interesting question. From my perspective – and we talked about this a little bit last time – the reason that we need the timeline for the most part is so that we can give NTIA some idea roughly of when we think all of these different pieces are going to fall into place.

From my perspective, the things that we need to be thinking about are factors that could wildly change our overall estimates, and I think it's possible that a flood of public comments is one of those things, but I don't think that's actually really the most likely one or has a high probability.

We can look at all of these proposals have been out for public comment before. We've seen what the comments have been. We have an idea of who's commenting and the nature of the comments and also whether the comments were addressed in previous public comment periods and so forth.

Even if this amount of time that we give ourselves doubles or something because we got more complicated comments than we thought we were going to, is it going to generally affect the kinds of questions that NTIA has to answer for itself about its timing and the contract's expiry? I would say probably not. It's certainly something we can point to when we respond, but as far as getting way down in the weeds as to creating a formula for how long this will take, I think that might be more detail than we really need.

If it takes us a couple extra weeks, takes twice as long as we thought, again I think that's not necessarily a really big deal as long as we can try to stay roughly on the same timescale. But we'd certainly appreciate other people's thoughts on that, too.

Joe, go ahead.

JOE ALHADEFF: Thank you. I'm fine with that, Alissa. My concern is that basically because it is the consolidated proposal, it might cause a number of people that frankly weren't paying much attention earlier to jump in and say things that just hadn't been raised at all previously. I'm fine with the response and no problem from my perspective moving forward with what we have.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, great. Thank you. Joe, go ahead.

JOE ALHADEFF: Thanks. Alissa, two things. One was when we got to the part of the timeline of the ICG analysis of public comments, I think that should start earlier than it does because we don't have to wait for the comment period to be over to start looking at the comments. I think that should be more [continuous] with part of the comment period as well. There's no reason why we can't look at the comments on a rolling basis.

The other question I have is – and this I think is an unlikely scenario, but one I think we need to think about – if the comments result in, for some reason, a significant requirement to go back to the three operational communities for work because somehow this has changed the proposal, we may need to have a consideration of a second public comment period after that, because if the proposal has changed dramatically – and due to the open processes of proposal formation, it seems that it shouldn't happen, but if it does, we might want to consider an as-needed second comment period.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Joe. Two good points, I would say. I definitely agree about being able to analyze comments earlier, although I think as we have seen in all the public comment periods, the bulk of the comments always come in approximately 30 seconds before the deadline. But we could certainly analyze them earlier if we get them earlier.

Yeah, I agree. I think we can certainly make use of the second public comment period if we decide that we need one. Again, I'd like us to try and hit this, assuming that we don't get a lot of comments that we haven't seen before that haven't already been incorporated. We will have to continue to evaluate this process as we go through it, depending on what happens.

Next in the queue, I have Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks, Alissa. I have two points. One is with regards with the timeline, the beginning the assessment. We have in the timeline two phases of assessment among [inaudible] – CWG proposal, and the other one is in the combined [inaudible]. From my experience with the [more extensive] [inaudible] assessment, I would say this is inter-related. [inaudible] been separated [in a row] one after the other, but immediately then we start to assess CCWG [proposal], questions will come up does it fit to the others and how does it fit and what is the impact on that. We should combine this with two phases, not to make us thinking about this is one, and then we will start just [inaudible] overall thing. That's one point.

The other one here is with regards to the IGF and [inaudible] we have if necessary integrated as well. I wasn't sure what [inaudible] came from. Is it on the tests of the ICG coming from the assessment that we have [inaudible] them to come back with answers, or is it something which comes by themselves? That wasn't clear to me. That's one question.

With regards to the public comment period, I would support that we are going to diligently prepare for the public comment period as the other OCs, and specifically the CWG and the CCWG, [inaudible] public comment periods in order to help commenters to structure their answer and tell us also [inaudible] to work with incoming comments.

It would be helpful to just give them a kind of [inaudible] where they could rely on, according to our criteria we have. It's not something which they must use. There's no obligation. Everybody can answer in a way he or she is [inaudible], but it could help. As you can see from the other comments in the CWG area, it is used [wisely]. That would be helpful. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Just to respond to your question about community work being if necessary, that, to my mind is certainly based upon requests from the ICG. If we do our assessment just as we did for the individual proposals from the IETF and the RIRs and we come up with a question or something that we think needs clarification in that community, then we would go back to them and ask for that, and that's where they would need time to do that work and come up with an answer or new text for the proposal or whatever it might be. It would

certainly be from upon request from the ICG. The two other points I think are well-taken. Does that make sense? Does it clarify that?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes, thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Manal, go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thanks, Alissa. Thanks for the timeline. Actually, I see it as a perfect timeline for a best-case scenario which could hopefully happen. I was just thinking out loud. Can we maybe make a best-case scenario timeline like this one and then another timeline, for example, with two public comment periods taken into consideration whatever complexity or controversial issues that might pop up and might need to go back to the operational communities and so on, so that we can have two [scenarios] and then we're speaking about the timeline that changes from this optimum timeline and the other slightly expanded one. I'm just wondering if this makes sense.

I mean, it's very hard to [inaudible] clearly through the future and we do not know exactly how things would go as planned. Again, the suggestion is we maintain this excellent timeline and try to work another one, taking into consideration maybe a second public comment period and then [inaudible] within this change. Thank you.

I'm sorry, one more comment. Again, to accommodate for concerns that were raised, maybe Dublin could be not the deadline for submission but our final face-to-face meeting and fine-tune it. The deadline could be shortly afterwards if things shifted a little bit. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Manal. I was just looking at Jari's text chat as a response to you and wondering if you wanted to maybe follow up by audio.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. Can you hear me, guys?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, go on.

JARI ARKKO: Okay, excellent. Just repeating what I said in the chat room. It goes to infinity. We start looking at bad situations. There's multiple timelines. I'm not sure having multiple timelines as such may be the answer. People get too depressed. But we could add text to the timeline [inaudible] additional events, [inaudible] comments or need to change the proposal, or maybe [some] additional steps such as adding a second comment period or needing more time for some of the steps. As long as that's clear to everybody that this is the reasonable/optimistic timeline and if there are complicating factors, then this could change. I think everybody is assuming that, but we can make it [inaudible].

ALISSA COOPER: I see support for that from Russ Mundy. That would definitely be my preference as well. Manal, do you have a feeling about that?

MANAL ISMAIL: No, just to say that as far as we are going to have two different deadlines, I'm fine. It's not necessarily that we need to have two separate timelines and two different [inaudible] and confuse people. But again, to take into consideration what may shift our deadline a little bit. I'm fine with Jari's suggestion. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. I guess in response to your other question, I think we sort of have two options in terms of publishing this timeline. Since we have pretty good agreement on it now, we can publish it now without specific dates, I think as [inaudible] suggesting, we start at time [P] and then show that we would finish somewhere four months after time [P] and that way we avoid this question of do we finish exactly in Dublin or not, because we just start whenever we receive the names proposal. Or we could just hold this – agree that this is what we're striving for and then publish the timeline when we receive the names proposal and then it will have dates on it. That would probably be my preference, to be honest. Then we can see if we're actually trying to hit some specific finish in Dublin or shortly thereafter. That's what I would prefer is that we just hold this until we receive the CWG proposal, and then have specific dates and we'll know that we're aiming for about four months.

I have Joe next in the queue. Go ahead, Joe.

JOE ALHADEFF: Thanks. The only thing I was going to say is I think Jari's proposal makes sense. The only thing I would go with in that proposal is just to say I don't think we should try to specify how much time additional issues may take, but maybe just have a little explanatory paragraph on the bottom saying that the complexity of comments of a level of changes related to the comments may require changes in this timeline including the potential of a second comment period or something and leave it fairly generic so that we are saying that it's a conditional timeline based on the circumstances of what we received, give an example of some of the things that they may make as changes but not commit to any of the details because we don't know whether it would be a one-week, two-week comment period or what have you. I don't think we should try to boil the ocean on a detail, but perhaps have just a disclaimer paragraph on the bottom about how to think about the timeline.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, that makes sense to me. Thanks, Joe. Xiaodong?

XIAODONG LEE: I just wonder if it's necessary because there's no [inaudible] from NTIA [inaudible]. I'm just wondering before we make the final proposal, if [inaudible] some kind of communication of discussion with NTIA to check what NTIA is [suggesting] on the proposal before we [inaudible]. Hello? Hello?

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry, Xiaodong, I'm not sure that I understood. So you're saying that you think we should ask NTIA if they think this timeline is appropriate?

XIAODONG LEE: I think [inaudible] for the timeline issue. I just wonder if we need some action items in the timeline, if we need some kind of communication before we finalize the proposal. We should [inaudible] communication with the NTIA.

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, I see what you're saying. We should have a line in here somewhere that says that we send the proposal to them—

XIAODONG LEE: I think we can have some informal discussion of communication with NTIA because NTIA maybe, or maybe not, give an opinion on the proposal. I think it's [inaudible] for us to have some kind of informal discussion with NTIA to check their suggestion on the proposal.

ALISSA COOPER: Right. As Russ has pointed out in the chat, there's actually this orange bar that goes across the top of this timeline which we've mostly been ignoring in our discussion, but the point of that is that there's ongoing NTIA review of the proposal, which I think has been happening to some extent. Obviously there was some feedback given at the last ICANN

meeting. I expect that to continue. But if we want to make more of a point of doing that, or less of a point of doing it, then we certainly can.

XIAODONG LEE: Okay.

ALISSA COOPER: I don't see any other hands in the queue, and I'm just trying to factor in – I know Narelle doesn't have audio, [inaudible] NTIA interactions which I agree is a little bit tricky because they're giving feedback on an incomplete proposal, but they have been giving feedback so that's good.

Just to summarize and wrap up here, I think what I'm hearing is that generally people support us trying to hit this timeline whenever it begins when they receive a names proposal, but that we should make [inaudible] to make it clear that there's some contingencies. Things could take much longer and give some examples of what those are, and that also we should attempt to do everything we can in the process to help us achieve timeliness. So parallelizing, formulating a comment sheet for public comment, and getting as much of the complete proposal ready in advance as we can.

Finally, there's this question about interaction with NTIA, which it looks like we might want to continue discussing a little bit on the list because we're running out of time today and it looks like people have different opinions about how to get informal feedback from NTIA.

In any event, I can take an action to take the comments received today, incorporate them into this timeline document, add some text about the contingencies. I think that means that we have a good estimate that we can factor into a response to the letter from Larry and then we can publish this once we receive the CWG names proposal and we actually know what the dates should be on the top line up there.

Any objections to that way forward? Other things that people want to bring up in the last 60 seconds?

Okay. I think we will close on time for once, unusually. We have a couple action items coming out of this call. We'll have a conference call on June 10th, after which we will hopefully have some input from the communities on timing and we will discuss agenda for Buenos Aires and other topics that may arise between now and then.

Thanks, everyone. Have a good day or evening as it were, and we'll talk to you on June 10th.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]