

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
December 9, 2014
2:00 pm CT**

Thomas Rickert: Thanks so much. My name is Thomas Rickert and I am one of the co-Chairs of this Cross Community Working Group. The other co-Chair that we presently have is Mathieu Weill who will introduce himself in a moment.

We would like to take this opportunity to briefly introduce ourselves, let you know who we are going to work with over the next couple of months. Also I would like to introduce you to ICANN staff that is supporting us. And to get the ball rolling, I would like to start introducing myself.

I'm Thomas Rickert. I'm a lawyer by profession based in Bonn in Germany. And also I'm working with ECO, which is an Internet Industry Association and I'm taking care of one subgroup inside the Industry Association taking care of the interests of the domain industry and there are more than 150 members.

I'm on the GNSO Council; in my fourth year now. And I've been working in a couple of GNSO related activities. And I was also co-Chair of the Drafting Team for the Cross Community Working Group. And future details can be found in the statement of interest that's available on the ICANN Web site.

So Mathieu, can I ask you to also introduce yourself briefly?

Mathieu Weill: Sure. Thank you Thomas. Welcome everyone. We're pleased that we're having this first meeting. So my name is Mathieu Weill. I am the Chief Executive of AFNIC, the ccTLD Manager for .FR domain names. Our organization is based near Paris obviously with a strong French focus. And we're also involved in gTLDs because we are a registry service provider for several projects such as .Paris for instance.

And I'm here as a member for ccNSO. And I have - in my past I have been a - the Chair of (CENTR), the Professional Association of European ccTLDs. And so I really look forward to working on this important topic. In I think in a little more than a couple of months, as you will see in the timeline a little bit later on. Thomas, would you like to...

Thomas Rickert: Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: ...take on?

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much Mathieu. You should know that there might be more co-Chairs as we move on. But for the time being, Mathieu and myself have been confirmed co-Chairs of this group.

In terms of staff, we have Grace Abuhamad. Grace, maybe you would also like to say a few words.

Grace Abuhamad: Thanks Thomas. My name is Grace Abuhamad. I work for Theresa Swinehart in the Strategic Initiatives Department at ICANN.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Grace. Then we have Marika Konings.

Marika Konings: Thanks Thomas. This is Marika. My name is Marika Konings. I'm a Senior Policy Director and Team Leader for the GNSO. I'm based in the ICANN office in Brussels, Belgium.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Marika. Then we have Adam Peake.

Adam Peake: I think I'm probably on mute. No, I seem not to be. Sorry. Adam Peake. I recently joined the Strategic Initiatives Group. And I'm working for Theresa Swinehart. I hope the audio is okay. I'm in a rather awkward location at the moment. But looking forward with you all and it's a pleasure to be joining ICANN. I know many of you from having been a volunteer. So this is an exciting time and a great project. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Adam. Bart. Bart Boswinkel, can I ask you to introduce yourself?
Bart, you might be on mute.

Mathieu Weill: Bart seems to be typing.

Thomas Rickert: Okay. So there seems to...

Mathieu Weill: (His introduction) in the chat.

Thomas Rickert: Can you hear me? There seems to be an issue - an audio issue? Can somebody please (unintelligible).

Woman: We all hear fine Thomas. The audio is fine.

Thomas Rickert: Okay. Thank you. So Bart has introduced himself in the chat. So let's then move to Berry Cobb please.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Thomas. Berry Cobb. I work with Marika in the GNSO Policy Team. We're GNSO Policy Development. And I'll also be assisting...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...with the Project Management role. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks so much Berry. Please do note that Grace and Adam will be our primary contacts I understand. But we have a whole team of ICANN staff, which is excellent because, you know, I've been working with them as many of you have on other projects and I think we're in very capable hands with them. But, you know, should there be a need, there would also be access to additional staff to support this important initiative.

So after having introduced ourselves, this would usually be the point in time where we do a roll call. And as some of you at least will know, roll calls are done in different fashions on various ICANN committees or groups.

So sometimes people are called out by name and they have to confirm orally their presence. In other groups the names of the participants are read out so that everybody knows who's on the call. We have discussed this before the call and we would like to suggest to the group that we slightly modify this tradition and replace the roll call by taking note of the list of the participants, the colleagues that are in the Adobe Connect.

As you can see in the left part of Adobe Connect, there's a list of those that are using Adobe Connect. And we would at the beginning of every call ask those

that are not using Adobe Connect that who are only dialing in by telephone to make themselves heard and we would then add them to the list.

Also we would usually ask individuals to provide us with updates to statements of interest. So should you have any updates to statements of interest that would be the point in time for you to say that. Certainly a condition for you to notify us of changes to your statement of interest would be that you issue a statement of interest in the first place.

Staff will gladly support you with this should you not have done that already. I should also say that there is no issue with having an interest or representing the interest of certain groups, companies or what have you. It's just important for transparency reasons that everybody knows on whose behalf you're actually acting.

And having said that, we think it is a good example of a parallel activity that we could when signing up to the Adobe Connect add to our names in square brackets our affiliation. So if you could please take note of that and for the next meeting when you dial in, please add your affiliation in square brackets.

So I think that is the first item on the agenda. So we've done the welcome. I would again like to welcome all of you. I know that's it's an unpleasant hour of the day for some of you for joining this call. I think this is a very important initiative. It is much appreciated that you joined this. And I'm sure that we will - that we have a very fruitful discussion over the next time.

In terms of using the Adobe, if you want to speak up, in the upper section of the screen that you see in front of you, there are three little windows; one is showing a loudspeaker, one is showing a headset or the handset and the next one is showing a little icon of a person that is raising an arm.

So if you click on that, you can indicate in the Adobe that you want to speak. And usually we're building queues of those who want to speak. And then in the order of them having requested to speak, they will then be asked to make their statement.

So please do make use of that. If you want you can all try it out now. Lowering the hand would be exactly the same procedure, i.e., clicking on that very icon. So please don't be shy. Just test it. I'm testing it.

And if you use the scroll down or the pull down menu, you will see that there are other options to choose from. So you can applaud. You can say that you don't like something. And I think that is very good for us as co-Chairs to see what the discussion is moving to the right direction.

So if we see a lot of support that is very good. If something is - or if a proposal is made that does not get traction inside the group, then people can say that they don't like it. So thank you for toying with the Adobe Connect for a moment.

Okay. Virtually looking at Mathieu and staff whether I've forgotten to mention something for the first item on the agenda. And if that is not the case, I would like to move to the second agenda item, which is an update on membership and participation.

And we've certainly noted that there has been some exchange of communication on the mailing list with respect to that. But let me first ask. Samantha, you had your hand raised. Was that just from the test? Otherwise, please do speak up. No, the hand is lowered now. Oh, it was just a test. Okay. Thanks Samantha.

There was some communication on the mailing list regarding membership and participants. We also had a lot of communication about exactly that question when we had the phase of the Drafting Team as well as in preparation for this call.

Now I would like - I think this is very important. And I think Greg Shatan made a very important note on the mailing list saying that in the other group a lot of valuable contributions that helped form the proposal came from participants.

So please do not assume that participants, which are non-members are of lesser value to the group than our members. I think everybody is equally welcome in this exercise.

Also let's remind ourselves that we are working on a consensus proposal. So we do not plan to take - we do not plan to take any votes. We even do not plan to call for any consensus calls. But we would like to determine the level of support for a proposal by testing the waters with the group and...

Woman: Okay. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: ...sensing the atmosphere. And hopefully there will be consensus from both participants as well as members so that there is no need for any other determination of level of support for an individual proposal.

So both Mathieu and I we are firm that we do not want to make use of the one difference between the two statuses that you find in - listed in the Adobe Connect. And this only - this one difference is that in case there needs to be a formal consensus call that only members can join this consensus call.

I see the first hand is raised to make an intervention and that is from Richard Hill. So Richard, please speak up. Richard, you might be on mute. We can't hear you. Richard.

Richard Hill: My fault. I muted the microphone. Can you hear me now?

Thomas Rickert: Now we can hear you Richard. Welcome.

Richard Hill: Can you hear me now?

Thomas Rickert: Yes.

Richard Hill: Okay. I'm sorry. I apologize. Yes. Those are very good sentiments that you expressed. The problem is that the formal rules are clear and the formal rules are if you do get into a situation where you're going to need to make consensus call, then the participants are not going to be counted. And I'm not willing to participate on those conditions.

I already made that point in the other group. And I had exactly the same reaction as you from the other group saying yes, but don't worry about it because we're not really going to do that, et cetera. But I'm sorry, you know. These are rules. The rules are the rules. I don't have a problem with your rules. I think you're perfectly entitled to make those rules only I'm not going to participate under those conditions.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Richard. I don't want to seem evasive. But I would like to hear the other interventions in the queue first and then respond to your point. Thanks Richard. Tijani is next.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. Tijani speaking. Do you hear me?

Thomas Rickert: I can hear you loud and clearly.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay. Thank you. So yes, I agree with Richard. And I can tell you that it is very good what you said but what about the huge number of participants? Is it possible to manage a call with a huge number of participants and giving the floor to all members that want to take the floor?

And how you will try to build the consensus with this large number of participants? This was an issue or is on the mailing list and they think it is something that we have to consider. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you Tijani. Next in the queue is (El) of .na.

Eberhard Lisse: It's Eberhard Lisse listed as my usual initial. Can you hear me?

Thomas Rickert: Eberhard please go on.

Eberhard Lisse: Okay. Richard, it's too bad that you have to - can't participate. If you have a problem, go to your constituency, ask them to amend the charter. The charter is as it is. It's not the best charter but that's the one that we have to work with.
\\

The same goes for this argument that we had earlier in the day. The Iranian GAC representative is listed here as a liaison. If he wishes to be a member, it's not problem. Go to the GAC and kick somebody off the five members and become a member.

I really think we should accept the charter as by each constituency or by each supporting organization or by whatever it's called. Accept it. We abide by it and carry on. To say well it's a shot and I don't - (unintelligible) go away.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Eberhard. Let me say that I would prefer not to make direct reference to individuals when we're discussing these things. I've certainly noted the discussion on the mailing list. But nonetheless you will have noticed that I have introduced the topic in a very neutral session so I think we should refrain from any kind of finger pointing to make an argument.

I think all positions that are being voiced are valid points and they need to be discussed. I think this process will only be transparent as well as carry weight in the overall process in we hear all the pros and cons and if we discuss them. And we might not accept all of them. But it's important that we go through the issues that are voiced.

Let me briefly respond to the points that have been mentioned by Richard and Tijani in particular. First of all, it was made - reference was made to counting. We will not take votes. We will not count notice. That will not happen under any circumstances.

The determination of consensus levels and we have two of them being full consensus, i.e., where everybody supports a certain proposal or raw consensus where almost everybody supports the proposal. And we will still be able to manage very big groups. We've done that in the past in other - on other projects.

Usually what you would do as Chair or as co-Chairs is to ensure that you lose nobody by asking questions such as does anybody object to this. And then if you raise an objection, we do know that there is no full consensus and we

would ask people of what kind their objections are and see whether issues can be mitigated or if the gaps can be overcome to still be able to pursue the consensus position.

So there are ways of mitigating a group towards a consensus position if possible if there's sufficient room for the consensus without counting individuals.

So I think this is very well possible. I think participants carry the same weight as others do when it comes to forming a proposal. And as I said, Mathieu and myself we are set not to make use of this exception of circumstances where actually there would be a difference between membership and participant status.

Also I would like to add although this is something that we'll get back to when we talk about the work methods that no firm decisions will be taken during a call.

That shall give those that might not be able to follow the speed of our discussion or that will have to think about the issues discussed overnight. The opportunity to chime in at a later stage and make themselves heard. So no opportunity is lost even if you miss the call and only go through the transcript afterwards.

So I think we're trying to be as conclusive as can be during this process. We are bound to certain rules. But I think that we are very interested. And I think this should be the overall interest of this whole group to make this a proposal that can be carried by the whole community.

Now let's just imagine for a moment that we propose something. We do a consensus call only looking at the members that are - that have membership status and neglect the colleagues that have participant status. This I think will have an issue to be supported by the chartering organization because they will ask us whether we followed due process.

And if we have neglected a big portion substantial argument of participants, they will certainly not adopt the recommendations that we make. And the second order for that would be the Board that I think will also not support the outcome of this group unless it gets sufficient traction from both members as well as participants.

So this has been a long answer. And I see that there's a queue building up. But I hope that I could verify some of the questions that you had. Richard, to be quite honest, I'm not sure whether that's an old hand or a new hand. If it's a new hand, please speak.

Man: (Mute).

Thomas Rickert: So obviously that was an old hand. Next is Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi there. Evan Leibovitch from At Large. My question I guess also goes to the mechanics of what you were describing. I have no problem participating as a participant in this manner taking it on good faith that we're going to try and achieve consensus. But when you have so many people - just back to the original point you were making.

When you're going to try and get consensus around the group, are you going to limit it to a consensus amongst the people who are participating on any given call or is there going to be made an attempt when there is an important

consensus point to be reached to use either email or Big Pulse or whatever maybe not as a formal vote but to try and get a feel of what the group is doing since at any given time you're going to have a lot of people that can't make a phone call.

I'd hate to have a consensus call that basically shut out a number of people that would otherwise want to participate. So I just want to ask if you thought of the mechanics of getting consensus from such a big group. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Evan. That's a very good point. I try to respond to that briefly by saying that no firm decisions will be taken during an individual call. So there will always be a chance to chime in after a call. So if you miss the call, you don't miss the opportunity to chime in and make yourself heard.

I would like to suggest that we get back to the point where we discuss working methods. But next in the queue is Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I just popped my hand up briefly because the point you were raising Thomas about how will we bring in the community with us if we take a consensus call amongst members and we can't prove and showing a transparent as well as -- and I'm going to use this word a lot -- accountable manner that the communities we have seen positioned to represent are also coming with us.

I think my response to that is if we don't, then we're not doing our job. And they'll move us out and put people who do represent their views in. On the very rare situation, and it should be as rare as (unintelligible) that we need to take a vote heaven forbid or of course a consensus call.

Then their working methods will be I trust clear, accountable and the community - including the community beyond ICANN and their Board will be able to see exactly what level of agreement and community support any such vote or agreement to a consensus carries with it.

But I do want to just remind us all that the communities that we represent or are participation members from have all approved a charter. And the charter is a charter and it has rules in it for probably very good reasons because it gives predictability as well as accountability. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks so much Cheryl. Unless there are any further statements, I think we should move on to the next agenda item and that would be the review of the charter. And for that item I would like to hand over to my colleague Mathieu.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Thomas. I think this is perfectly fitting with the last comment we've had from Cheryl to go back to the charter and have a thorough look at what is our founding document in this work.

Grace, can you put up the other slides on the - a summarized version of the charter. As I said on the mailing list, I strongly encourage everyone to read this charter. And as co-Chairs, Thomas and I will really, really get back through this document as much as possible to guide us in driving this work forward.

Few points that I want to emphasize on the charter. Grace, I think we can go to the next one. I will try not to be too long. This covers our problem statement, our roles. I will come back to this (theory). There is - there are a number of indication on deliverables, timeframes and reporting. Membership is addressed. And of course the rules of engagement as well.

I was co-Chair, and Thomas as well, of the Drafting Team. Our intent was really to provide the ground rules in such - in quite a firm way and provide flexibility for the working group to define the topics it finds appropriate, its working methods and eventually of course the proposals.

So if we go to the next slide please Grace. The scope; important aspect of course. We have two tracks in the IANA Stewardship Transition. They are interrelated and interdependent. It has been acknowledge by everyone now.

What is in our scope is the accountability mechanisms regarding all of the (unintelligible) provided by ICANN. What is out of our scope is the accountability for the administration of the IANA function, which is all of this being addressed by the ICG.

It is worth noting that obviously there might be some friction in this. It's not as simple as that. And therefore we need to have excellent coordination with the ICG as well as the various subgroups of the ICG including the Community Working Group on the naming function, the CWG. The next slide please.

There are supposed to be two work streams. This was identified as a need to - because we - our goal is to deliver proposals that enhance ICANN's accountability. And there is a strong timing constraint due to the transition.

And Work Stream 1 is defined in order to focus on mechanisms that must be in place or committed to within the timeframe of the transition. Whereas Work Stream 2 is the - addresses accountability topics for which the timeline may extend beyond this transition.

I'd like to stress couple of things on the charter as well, which are not on the slide and I think I was getting back to. There are two important definitions in

the charter. One is the definition of what is meant by accountability. The definition is the one from the NETmundial multi stakeholder statement. It is - reads like this.

The accountability is the existence of mechanisms for independent checks and balances as well as for review and redress. I think it's going to be extremely important that we focus on this definition as much as possible when we refer to accountability in the future.

And a second definition, which is I think extremely important to note is that stakeholders are defined as a person, group, organization that has a direct or indirect stake or interest in the organization because it can either affect the organization or be affected by it. This includes but is not limited to ICANN SOs and ACs.

So we have a wide definition of stakeholders and a definition of accountability, which is inspired by NETmundial and this (unintelligible) the importance in our work (moving on). Next slide please Grace.

Just going quickly. There is a - there is a whole list of suggestions of items to be addressed of work areas but we have to work quickly on the work plan. That is on our agenda today. And making sure we align the timelines with the CWG and the ICG. If we can move onto the next slide. I'm sorry - two.

Those are the typical areas of work that are mentioned in the charter and are provided as indications of work we probably should address in our work. And it goes - there's a mention of stress tests. We will come back to this of course; a priority, identification with the key aspects to building consensus on priorities will be one of our challenges. And if we move to the next slide.

It comes to the group composition we've addressed already. I'd like to go back slightly on the composition to inform everyone that we have an ICANN Board Liaison. He is on the call. It's Bruce Tonkin. Thank you very much Bruce for putting your name forward as Board Liaison. The staff representative is Samantha Eisner. And she is on the call as well. Thank you Samantha.

We - the charter mentions the ATRT past participants. And I hope we can find a past participant of the RTRT, ATRT on the call to - but so far they haven't been identified. So if you were a member of ATRT1 or 2, please inform Grace so that we can list at least one more ATRT past participants. And I think for members versus participants we've already had the discussion. I'll not come back to this.

One thing that is going to be important for us. The charter has provision for expert advisors to support our work. As you know, these advisors are to be selected by the Public Experts Group. I don't think we have - is there - Brian Cute or another member of the PEG on the call? But they are currently from what I understand selecting advisors. And hopefully we will soon be able to benefit from their expertise.

Advisors will participate just like regular participants. But also we will have to define how we rely on their expertise to do research - oh, Brian is on the call. I will hand it over to him. So do research, provide us with issue papers and advise in our work. Brian, thank you very much for joining the call. Maybe I can let you elaborate a bit on that.

Brian Cute: Sure. Thanks Mathieu. Brian Cute here. Just a brief update on the status of the PEG, Public Experts Group. We will any day now be making an announcement and we were hoping to last week but any day now making an announcement of six advisors that we have selected in our process.

I apologize that we couldn't get it earlier and we were hoping to have perhaps those advisors attending the call today. But I'm sure as soon as they're announced they'll be able to get up to speed quickly with the public record of today's call.

There is a seventh advisor that we continue to try to identify. There's an area of expertise that we've identified as critical, which is international law, choice of law and jurisprudence and we continue that search. We will endeavor to select that seventh advisor as quickly as we can and make that announcement as well.

The only other point that we have to make is that in terms of how the advisors engage with the CCWG. They are advisors as that has been clarified over the course of this work stream and that the Public Expert Group is not offering any advice, guidance or counsel to the advisors.

It is clearly up to the CCWG to engage with the advisors and to define the modalities of that engagement so that the advisors' expertise can be brought into the process in the most appropriate way. And that's it for an update.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you very much Brian. Alan, your hand is raised.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. A question for Brian. One of the questions that often gets raised in ICANN accountability discussions is what is and is not allowed under California not for profit law. Will we have an expert on that?

Brian Cate: We're endeavoring on that front. We know that not just California law but also international law will be an important dimension. We're looking as best we can.

I would say this. That the advisors we put for to the extent that there are gaps on substantive questions such as California law, there is nothing provide - preventing the CCWG from accessing expertise, subject matter expertise, on those questions and certainly asking the advisor that's been appointed or advisors if they a friend, a colleague, who can bring that expertise to bear.

Again, the advisors are - hopefully they're not just for their own expertise but for their networks of expertise and colleagues they can leverage that as well into the process. So two avenues there, CCWG directly tapping into that expertise or tapping into it through the advisors.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: I see your hand (Malcom). You have the floor.

Malcolm Hutty: Thank you. I had a question about another element of the charter. And since you've briefly gone over the charter, I wondered if now was a timely moment to raise it. Is now the time to raise a question on the charter?

Mathieu Weill: If it's not on expedite, I'd rather make sure have covered this advisors section. Keith Drasek is raising on the chat an important point that there is a provision in the charter that enables the CCWG to request additional advisors and identify our own experts if need be at some point. And I think that's also worth noting. Thank you very much Keith. Any other - if there's no other...

Becky Burr: Mathieu.

Mathieu Weill: ...aspect on advisors. Yes.

Becky Burr: Mathieu, this is (Becky). I apologize. I'm not in the Adobe room at the moment. But I just wanted to ask Brian one question. Have you identified a legal resource or are you still looking for that legal resource? That's just what I'm trying to figure out from the international law - choice of law. Does that mean that the expert does not have at least legal expert at the moment?

Brian Cate: That's right (Becky). And that is the one area where we've not yet successfully identified an advisor. We continue to search. We've been going through people that we know, experts in the field and asking for references and trying to build our pipeline. We've yet to identify that advisor resource. If there's any recommendations or suggestions, we certainly are happy to entertain them.

Becky Burr: Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Brian. (James).

James Bladel: Hi. Thanks. (James) speaking. And just wanted to point out that while I don't disagree that we may need to consult with legal advisors that both ATRT1 and ATRT2 I believe engaged in outside groups on some of these questions.

And I don't expect that some of these issues have changed all that substantively in the intervening months and years. So I would recommend that wherever possible we draw from that work first before engaging outside advisors just in the interest of maintaining our timeline. Thanks.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you James. I think we - there's a number of arguments here on potential need for (initial) experts. We'll certainly look forward to the advisors hunted by the Public Experts Group.

And of course in the course of our work we'll have to assess whether we feel there is need for additional expertise. And we've made sure in the charter that we have this flexibility of need be. But as was mentioned by (James), I know there's already a lot of expertise around the table. And that's probably going to be extremely useful.

Is there - I think - Grace, do we have the next slide? I think this - the next slide on the decision-making methodology, which is already going into our next agenda item. So before we move onto that, I'd like to ask whether there are any outstanding questions regarding the charter. And I had heard already a number of comments that we really need to take this document as one of our ground documents to organize work.

I certainly relate to that. And wanted to make sure whether there was some additional comments on that. Malcolm, you had a comment you wanted to add.

Malcolm Hutter: Yes. Thank you. My question relates to the process for forwarding the output of this group. I wanted to know whether it was within the scope of this group to propose accountability solutions that it is not within the ICANN's or the ICANN Board's capability to deliver but would be for NTIA to action.

Is that within - is that within scope to propose things for NITIA to do rather than for ICANN to do relating to the ICANN accountability? And if so, what is the mechanism for the output of this group to be conveyed to the NTIA as part - any recommendations that we might have for things for it to do prior or as part of transition?

Mathieu Weill: Thank you very much Malcolm for raising this important question that was raised on the list as well. The mechanisms by which our proposals are to be

provided in the transition process are described - I'm struggling with the charter right now. Is - they are supposed to be described - provided to the Board. I think Grace we had a sentence on that on one of the slides.

So what the charter says it's on your screens right now. It's on the middle bullet. It says we are delivering our outcome to the ICG and CWG to (Richard). And then when we have a Work Stream 1 proposal -- that's one sentence that may not be extremely clear to everyone -- it's going to be forwarded to the Board.

Obviously the NTIA will also have it. It's going to be public. And if there are some suggestions for the NTIA it's going to be provided as well. And that the NTIA has to ask ICANN to come up with proposals for the transition and therefore it is through ICANN that we will be providing this proposal. We have terrible noise in the background.

Mathieu Weill: Hello.

Woman: Hi. We're working on it. Sorry (unintelligible).

Mathieu Weill: Do you hear me?

Woman: We can hear you (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Mathieu Weill: Okay. Now it's better. Someone - okay. Someone...

Man: There is a big echo.

Woman: Okay. I temporarily removed the microphone (unintelligible) for everyone.
And everyone on the phone (unintelligible) and we will go from there.

Mathieu Weill: Okay. I think everyone now is on mute and I'm alone on the call. That's perfect. I - so Malcolm, I tried my best to answer your question. I think one of the points you're raising is - and it's been raised already. What happens if the Board disagrees? And that's certainly something we need to anticipate through the Board Liaison and by making sure we have good communication with them upfront.

And of course there have been some discussions at Board level to provide clarity about how the Board will take the decision to provide the transition. It's been addressed as well in the other groups, especially the ICG. And we will need to be very aware of those discussions and keep on following them but I'm not sure we can close the discussion right now.

I have Olivier on the line. I don't know if - let's check whether it's - we're making it work. Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes. Hi there. It's Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. Can you hear me?

Mathieu Weill: Yes I can.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Okay. Fantastic. Thanks. Just a question on the interfacing between the work of this working group and the work of the Cross Community Working Group on IANA Stewardship Transition.

I note that there is a liaison between the ICG and this working Group. But I haven't seen a liaison or any formal link between this working group and the

IANA Stewardship Transition Cross Community Working Group. How does that interface together?

Mathieu Weill: Great question Olivier. Thank you very much. We actually have not one but two liaison with the ICG; Mr. Arasteh, GAC delegate for Iran and Keith Drasek from the GNSO. And with the CWG we have - we are in the process of instituting regular co-Chair conference calls to liaise at co-Chair level. That is currently our intent to liaise with the CWG.

Malcolm, you wanted probably to come back to your - probably - or maybe you have another question.

Malcolm Hutty: No, no, no. It was a follow up on this. And I - we're moving towards clarity but I would like to - on this very important point I'd like to get complete clarity here. The slide - the middle bullet point from the slide that you have on our screens at the moment says that the WS1 deliverable will be provided to ICG and CWG Stewardship. Is that by us or is that by the ICANN Board?

If it's by us then are we presenting the output of our work for the consideration at CWG Stewardship so that they can incorporate such elements as are necessary in a proposal from the naming community for the ICG to present as part of it combined report to the NTIA? Is that the way the process will work?

Mathieu Weill: Yes. My understanding it is by us. It is not mentioned wherever that it would be through the ICANN Board or through ICANN staff. It's direct relationship between the groups, which I think is more appropriate as you were stating.

Malcolm Hutty: Thank you. That gives me considerable comfort. Thank you for clarifying this important point.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you for raising it Malcolm.

(Carlos Arosay): Do you hear me please?

Mathieu Weill: Yes. If you can say your name but I hear you.

(Carlos Arosay): Yes. This is (Carlos Arosay) from ICG.

Mathieu Weill: Welcome.

(Carlos Arosay): Yes. I have several questions that I noted of late because I was (unintelligible). My first question is that in the deliverable and timeframe you referred that the delivery of the WS1 (unintelligible) proposal is expected to occur following approval of the ICANN Board.

Are we dealing with the ICANN accountability or not? If yes, why the accountability of ICANN should be approved by ICANN? I don't think that we need such a thing. I don't know why this is necessary that they should approve the accountability that's come (unintelligible). Why they need to be approve that?

Mathieu Weill: Thank you very much for this question. What this sentence means or at least the way I understand it is that the delivery to the NTIA of the proposal that was requested - the NTIA asked ICANN to provide proposals for the transition.

The part - the proposals for the transition that relies on - that is within our scope as accountability is to be provided by ICANN to the NTIA. And therefore there is a back and forth with the ICANN Board.

The ICANN Board in its last meeting in Los Angeles, as Keith was mentioning on the chat, did adopt a resolution about the conditions upon which it will deliver these proposals. It is something that we need to make sure is extremely clear for everyone.

I don't think we can solve this right now. But something that we have to work on, on a constant basis all across our work with the ICANN Board liaison we have and of course with the Board if necessary.

(Carlos Arosay): Excuse me. From the very beginning we had difficulty with this resolution of ICANN. Sending the output of the group to IANA - to NTIA is different from approval. The output should go to the ICANN - to NTIA without any modification.

However, should the Board have any comment on that, they may separately provide their comments, attach it to the proposal that they send to the group, the CCWG. They should not modify that because this is much more important issue that we have to have a separation between the policymaking and policy implementing. ICANN is policy implementing.

And policymaking a part of which is accountable should not be touched by ICANN. And this is the main problem that (unintelligible).

Mathieu Weill: I understand your point completely. I'm definitely with you. And we need - I need to remind ourselves and the Board will not be in a comfortable position because our proposals will go out for public comment. They will be absolutely available to anyone including the NTIA, including the whole world, which we'll be monitoring what is happening.

And if what the ICANN Board provides the - if we have consensus and the ICANN Board does not deliver this proposal to the NTIA, then it will be crystal clear what happened in the middle and therefore I think everyone is going to be accountable for its own actions.

So I am absolutely confident that as long as we provide a consensus position there will not be - we will have consensus with the Board as well. It's going to be a natural process I believe. Thomas, you wanted to add something.

Thomas Rickert: Yes. Just to add that it is my understanding that the Board members have agreed that they would get involved in the process at an earlier stage, make themselves heard to ensure that their position is included in the process. So I think actually there will not even be the need for the Board or a desire by the Board to modify.

But as you correctly stated, I think that the chances of the Board modifying the outcome of what is community consensus proposals are merely theoretical.

Mathieu Weill: Okay. My suggestion since time is moving on is that we now move to working methods. And I would gladly hand over to Thomas for that topic. We've had already a number of suggestions and I think it's important that we put our ground rules clearly.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks so much, (Matio). Let's get back to the - excuse me - to the working method. There are a couple of items that we would like to raise. Certainly we can't go through each and every aspect as far as collaboration but there are a couple of points that we think are worthwhile noting.

Not only because some of you have mentioned those items on the mailing list but those were items that we already had on the radar in planning this meeting.

The first item we would like to highlight or to mention is the starting time of the meetings that we have. And original proposal was that we would use starting times rotating to share the burden as we note that colleagues that are joining these calls are spread all over the world. So we have suggested 11 and 14 UTC.

But we heard that there are questions surrounding that so we've asked ICANN staff to further look into that. By the way, the starting times that we've mentioned here are starting times that have proven to be amicable starting times for this type of activity so that's not something that was just chosen out of the blue.

I know that Grace has looked into this quite a bit so Grace, can I hand over to you to provide a little bit more of information to us?

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you, Thomas. This is Grace for the record. I'm still looking into it. We have quite a broad range and a few suggestions that were made on the list so if it's okay with the group I will review the different suggestions and the regional locations of the group and send a proposal to the list by end of day today or tomorrow.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Grace. So I'd like to ask your patience then for a couple more hours. But rest assured that we will - that we are open to rotating so the dates that you see in the Adobe - or the starting times you see in the Adobe Connect are not carved in stone.

And I'm sure that we'll find a solution that everybody is happy with. Not happy for each and every meeting but so that everybody knows that the burden is shared amongst the colleagues on these calls. So everybody should be equally unhappy with what we're coming up.

The other point is a point that I alluded to earlier during this call and that is that no firm decisions are taken during any single meeting. Without the substance of those decisions having been articulated and open for review/consideration by those that have not been able to be present during the meeting.

We do know that we're going to have very regular meetings that was a huge investment in terms of time from all of you to join. We do appreciate that not everybody can make it for every meeting and there should not be any disadvantage linked to that. So rest assured that we will operate in a manner that will ensure that you can make yourself heard even if you miss a meeting.

Can we please move to the next slide? So let me go through this - through these very briefly. Members are expected to communicate the views of the communities that have selected them to the CCWG but also communicate back the information and deliberations from the CCWG to their respective communities.

And members and participants are expected to be familiar with and remain consistent with the preexisting documents and documents developed during the course of the work of the CCWG. I think this is important. We do know that this is a substantial commitment that all of you are making.

I think it is a matter of respect for your colleagues' work that we make sure to be sufficiently updated to make - to have informed decisions so that we can

always base our discussions on the latest development and not do too much recaps that would be, you know, time that can't efficiently be used for working on solutions.

Next slide please. So we have a couple of working tools. We have the wiki space which is going to be populated over time with documents that we're producing, background information, participant's lists and everything that's related to our work.

The new do have the mailing list. Please do note that all emails sent to the mailing list are being archived. And therefore if you have lost emails in your email account you can still go to the archive and read what happens.

I see that there is a queue forming so let me go to Evan please. Evan has lowered his hand. Alan...

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: ...if you would. I'm just double checking if Evan still wanted to say something?

Evan Liebovitch: Sorry, that was an old hand about the previous issue so go ahead.

Thomas Rickert: Okay thanks, Evan. Eberhard is next.

Eberhard Lisse: Yeah, I was in about this 15 after meetings. Cheryl just stated on the chat that some working groups use a rotation. I was at the Framework of Interpretation Group and we used a single one and six or one in eight hour rotation so that we can share the pain. And I think everybody will have to get up in the middle of the night once in a while and I think that's the best way of doing this.

It's not fair to the people who have to come up every - in the middle of the night every time, that's not productive.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks for this contribution, Eberhard. Rest assured we will try to find a fair solution. Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Thomas. Steve DelBianco, NetChoice and the Business Constituency and CSG. With respect to the tools available to us, one that's valuable is the wiki space. And I'd like to know the chairs' and perhaps the group's preference for the right way to post what we believe are relevant documents to the wiki space and annotate them appropriately?

I realize we can circulate documents by email but for some it may be more convenient to have a point to a place that's in the wiki. The BC, for instance, commented earlier this year on particular accountability mechanisms (unintelligible) stress test. How do I get them into the wiki?

Thomas Rickert: Steve, thanks for this note. I think that's a very good suggestion. I think the way to do that would be to send that to ICANN staff and Grace would be the person maintaining the wiki which would then be the single source of information for this type of document.

But Grace, you've raised your hand so please go ahead.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi, everyone. This is Grace for the record. So, Steve, that's a great question. If you have a wiki account you can actually upload documents yourself. I have a document upload tool in the wiki right now. And I can go ahead and - I have one set for current drafts but I can put another one in for resources from the

cross community working group, that way the group can update that section that's not related necessarily to current drafts that are being worked on.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you.

Grace Abuhamad: Also just as a reminder to everyone, if you don't have a wiki account and you would like one please email me directly and I will have one created one for you. Let's not overload the GNSO secretariat with that. Well go through - we have our own secretariat for that. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Grace, that's very helpful. Let's go back to the working tools. So we have the Adobe Connect room. I would suggest that, you know, we've done this little test with raising and lowering the hands, actually the Adobe Connect is a much more powerful tool.

So if you would like to get a little workshop on how this can be best used please do send an email. I hope that I'm not all promising if I say that send an email to Grace and if there are colleagues in this group that would like to get a little tutorial we will arrange for that and update you on the - on how to best use this outside of our meetings. So please do send a note to Grace if you would like to be trained on the Adobe and we'll make sure that this is happening.

Then the participation on calls is limited to members and participants but we also have observers who choose just to follow but who do not plan to actively contribute to our conversation and they are in listen-only mode.

So these are the items that we wanted to flag. There is a little bit more that I would like to raise first of which is that when we send files rest assured in future we will not only circulate documents and proprietary formats but there

will also be a PDF version together with it for those who don't like to use proprietary file formats.

In terms of frequency of our meetings it is our suggestion that we have weekly meetings. Time is of essence with this important work so we would like to keep this on a weekly basis.

Now before we use the remainder of the time of this call to discuss the next steps in terms of work we do something which I think is a little bit out of the ordinary. Usually you would scope your work and then you would see how much time it needs to - you need to deliver and then base your work plan on that.

In this case we actually have to design our work plan to the timeline. And we will move to Berry Cobb who's been working on the timeline and explain that to us. But before I hand over to him I'd like to hear from Paul who has raised his hand. Paul, the floor is yours. Maybe you're on mute? Paul? Paul, we can't hear you unfortunately. I suggest that we move to Berry now to show us through the timeline and then get back to you once your audio is properly working.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you, Thomas. This is Berry Cobb for the record. The following slides I'll only briefly touch. I will make sure that this is also posted into the wiki for all of the group to view.

I'll first start out stating that these following slides are at a very high level. And as we further identify some of our detailed tasks the durations, everything that Thomas had just mentioned, all of this will be fed into more formal project plan that we'll share on a weekly basis that will include the defined

tasks, their duration, their percent complete as well as an associated Gant chart.

Next - oh that one now. So this next slide here is just a high level of our key milestones. I should point out that all of these deliverables and timelines are subject to revision as we refine and get closer to a more formal project plan. But most of this was derived from the charter.

There are two main takeaways from this slide. First is essentially that Work Stream 1, we're targeting the end of June for final delivery. And that the second takeaway is Work Stream 2 as to which we do not have a defined target date yet just given the - we're not sure of the entire scope of the accountability mechanisms that would be listed within the secondary work streams.

I'll go ahead and move on to the next slide. This is a high level visual of our timeline. First I'll point out that just as the previous slide had mentioned you can see within the Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2 that we're targeting for the end of June for delivery of Work Stream 1 and, as I mentioned, Work Stream 2 down on the lower right part of the slide, you'll see beyond September is kind of a unknown. And hopefully as we do define the project plan we'll get more visibility into target dates and those kinds of things.

Pointing your attention to the top left you'll notice that the chartering exercise has been completed and adopted by the chartering organizations. Then we'll move down into the secondary bar and the gray area, which as I understand the group will begin to assess current and proposed accountability mechanisms and make a determination as to which ones will perhaps belong under Work Stream 1 and which ones will perhaps belong under Work Stream 2.

Both work streams are, at this point, very similar in their structure. Each will have a public comment period as well, you know, if depending on the type of work maybe more than one public comment period but at the bare minimum in terms of developing the overall proposal this will be established - a formal public comment period. Then the group will look to publish the final proposal and then of course submit the proposal to the chartering organizations and such forth.

Then the last slide I'll just move - this is a high level view of everything that's going on in relation to the ICG, the CWG in regards to stewardship and the CCWG for Accountability.

The primary critical path that you'll notice here of course is the ICG which is the purple in the middle. Then of course each of the three communities that are involved in the NTIA stewardship transition, the names, numbers and protocols, each have their own defined projects to submit their proposals to the ICG.

And then of course down under the lower - the last kind of horizontal section of this graphic is the accountability work stream which is, again, is just a summarized version of our detailed - more detailed visual that I provided to you in the previous slide.

Again, I'll just reiterate that a lot of this is subject to change as we start to identify and uncover additional tasks that the group will be performing and the deliverables and durations. And I'll be happy to answer questions if you have any. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you, Berry. I think the - the intent here no this timeline (unintelligible) conclude on anything at this stage but to get your feedback about what we - what milestones we will have missed or items that you (unintelligible). And, Berry, can we roll back one slide maybe to the - yes, this one.

I've seen a couple of comments in the chat but I'll hand over to Malcolm maybe to get your feedback on this tentative timeline.

Malcolm Hutton: Yes, thank you. I have a question about Work Stream 2 really, the timeline on Work Stream 2. As laid out for the timeline, it appears to describe this group producing a final report that is delivered to the Board.

My question is, is it intended that this group will ultimately produce one report and then finish and close? Or could this group decide to continue as a standing group on Work Stream 2 issues? That is so that it might produce one report and then maybe a year or two later another report updating it? Or is that excluded as a possibility or is this undefined?

Mathieu Weill: I think, going back to the charter, it does not say that we work on any indefinite basis. And I think our reading is more that we will close the group at some point but have no idea what kind of recommendation we might come up with whether this would be some kind of outcome that would sort of create an ongoing basis for such a group or any other mechanisms, that's too early to say.

Malcolm Hutton: Okay. My question is actually about the charter on this rather than the expectation. So if the group were to decide that it wished to remain standing either for a further period past its first final report on Work Stream 2 or either for a definite period after that or for an indefinite period, is that open to the group to decide that within its charter or would that require a charter change?

Mathieu Weill: Good question. I don't know about others but within the charter I don't see any clear answer on that. Thomas...

Malcolm Hutto: Okay, if this hasn't been considered and there isn't a clear answer on that yet that's perfectly fine answer for now, I don't want to push you into giving an answer where there isn't really one.

((Crosstalk))

Malcolm Hutto: But if so that is just noted as something to be - that will need to be considered.

Thomas Rickert: This is Thomas. Mathieu, if I may chime in?

Mathieu Weill: Go ahead.

Thomas Rickert: The charter provides for flexibility. So the group can determine how it wants to go about with this. Also, I'd like to clarify that the timeline that you see in front of you, which Berry has thankfully provided, is a suggestion to the group. So this is not carved in stone.

We do think that the timeline, as it stands, is ambitious but feasible. But we could do it any other way so we could choose to establish sub groups inside this group that would work on Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2 in parallel. So this is open for this group to determine.

Nonetheless we would caution that we should not endanger the success of our work by putting too much on our plate so I think it might be worthwhile considering - not to do too much work in parallel but rather sequentially.

Also, a quick word on the questions that were raised and comments that were made in terms of stress tests. So the stress test according to the charter really to be designed in a session that the can be conducted and amendments be made to the proposal it need be as the outcome of the stress test prior to the finalization of the proposal.

So this is not baked into this process or into this timeline at the moment. But we would certainly flesh out the timeline more if we've done more scoping of our work. And that is something that we're going to be - going to discuss in the next agenda item.

Thanks, Mathieu. This is what I wanted to throw in.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you.

Kavouss Arasteh: I have a question.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you. Yes, Monsieur Arasteh.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I have two question in fact. One is with respect to the Work Stream 1 I see that sub group work is (unintelligible) one final report to the work. Would it meet the timeline of the ICG? Has it been checked and corrected or matched with that or not? At what time this final report will be available for ICG? As far as I understand ICG mostly is involved in the result of Work Stream 1 rather than Work Stream 2. Am I right or wrong?

Mathieu Weill: You are absolutely right. And I am turning to Berry but I think that is - in order to be in sync with ICG that this kind of timeline has been set. That is what you can see on the slides right now on the screen. I don't know if you are in the Adobe room but...

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I have the...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: But this is not very visible or...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: ...too small in any case. Yeah.

Mathieu Weill: But to answer your question, yes, this is what...

Kavouss Arasteh: Yeah.

Mathieu Weill: ...what was intended. You had a second question?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yeah, my second question is more general. All of the work that we are dealing with accountability. And we try to establish accountability. So what is the mechanism that this accountability will be implemented? It is mentioned in the charter that it is not the work of the CCWG but whose work is that for providing the mechanism for implementation of the accountability?

No matter how precisely you have the accountability terms and conditions if there is no mechanism proposed to implement that accountability the whole result will get no where. So what mechanism is - or would be available and who established that mechanism?

I hope that you will not reply me that the mechanism will be the global community and so on so forth because there should be an entity; there should

be a physical entity and it should not be (waged) that at the end ICANN will be the accountable - the entity to itself because at the end ICANN would be the global community or multistakeholder community so the accountability of ICANN to the accountability of ICANN. So what is the procedure?

Still I have not touched that - I don't know how it works. It is the main question everywhere is asking. Could you reply to that?

Mathieu Weill: I think my reply would probably be a little bit frustrating at this stage. I think we need to be patient, that's definitely what we have to define within this group as far as our scope is concerned. And we need to be careful to the points that you're raising and it's not enough to just define general mechanisms but also look at the implementation will be one of our concerns. So I think we're pretty much in mind that this is going to be what we need to come up with.

Malcolm, was that an old hand? I understand yes.

((Crosstalk))

Mathieu Weill: Okay. So what I would suggest is we will circulate this tentative timeline slides on the list. Please provide feedback. Of course it's going to be populated, fleshed out and adjusted as we work. But it was to provide a first sense of the kind of time constraints we have.

One of the topics that is underlying and it's on the slide just before, Berry, if you can move one back, is so far we're planning to have a face to face meeting in Singapore probably on the Friday after the ICANN meeting.

We wanted to test with you the idea of trying to organize a face to face meeting around mid-January as well and get your feedback on that idea at this

stage. We're not making decisions on the first meeting, just trying to get your feedback at this stage.

Mr. Arasteh, was that and old hand?

Kavouss Arasteh: Unfortunately on the last - on Friday of - it is 14th of February, I will be busy elsewhere unfortunately. I wish very much to be in the face to face meeting but 14th of February I will be in another country. But if it's in 15th I will be available but not 14.

Mathieu Weill: Okay. Other comments? Isaque. I'm sorry if I'm not pronouncing it correctly. Next on the line is - we have hands raised. No, maybe we come back to that later. Paul, you're back.

Paul Rosenzweig: Yes, I'm just here to see if this works. Can you hear me now?

Mathieu Weill: Yes, we can hear you loud and clear.

Paul Rosenzweig: Then I've figured out my problem and I'll be better able to participate next time. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Excellent. Excellent. Okay, any other feedback on those ideas? We'll circulate this on the mailing list and please provide your feedback on this as we will have to make arrangements quite soon now.

Man: Excuse me, when you decide on the face to face meeting? When would we finalize? Because I have to make my tickets in a very...

((Crosstalk))

Mathieu Weill: Yeah. I think we're - ideally at our next meeting.

Man: Next week.

Mathieu Weill: Yes.

Man: Okay.

Mathieu Weill: Evan, a question?

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah, I just wanted to ask that it not be on the Friday. Pretty well all the At Large people with the exception of a small number of the executives have already made their plans to leave on Friday. And so if there's any way it could be done before that even if it's a briefer form of the meeting that would be much appreciated. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you. That's valuable feedback obviously. So we'll circulate tentative dates in January and February and make sure we try and arrange as much as possible. We're obviously aware that it's a short - I mean, it's short delays and therefore it's going to be a logistical issue for many problems with other engagements obviously.

Evan, old hand? Now? Okay. Thank you. Suggest we move to our next agenda item. Thomas, trying to set the foundations of our work plan.

Thomas Rickert: Yes. Thank you very much, Mathieu. And I'm very conscious of time so hopefully this is not going to take long. We were wondering how we best get our work started and enter into a substantial discussion. I should also say that, you know, this call has been exceptional as the first call because we had so

many procedural and administrative matters to discuss so this should not be the case for any of the upcoming calls.

But since we were - we are tasked to deal with accountability we would like to suggest to you that we try to establish the status quo of what needs to be done and look at what has been done already. So we have identified a couple of areas that can be looked into to see what accountability mechanisms there are already.

So ICANN already has accountability mechanisms. So our suggestion would be that few of - few colleagues in this group volunteer to look at the existing accountability mechanisms such as the bylaws, the ombudsman, the consideration process and list those. And maybe already add a little bit of comment as to whether they think that those need to be modified to be suitable to help with Work Stream 1. So that's the first area, to look at the existing accountability mechanisms.

The second area would be to review the outcome of the public comment period that has already been conducted on the accountability topic earlier this year. So there is a report taking into account all public comments that have been received.

So we would hope that you join us in supporting the suggestion that we take a look at this previous work, look at the requests and the proposals that have been made during the public comment period and then categorize or make an attempt to categorize the individual items of the public comment report into Work Stream 1, Work Stream 2 or both. So that would help us populate the two baskets, i.e. the Work Stream 1 basket and the Work Stream 2 basket.

The third area that we should look at is the CWG. We do know that the CWG, during its deliberations, has touched upon accountability mechanisms several times. We are cognizant of our own mandate and we're cognizant of the mandate of the CWG. Nonetheless there are explicit mentionings of accountability work that needs to be done in the proposal that has been published by the CWG on December 1.

And we think it would only be appropriate for our group to take a look at what has been done there, to list the tasks that have been identified by the CWG, maybe even comment on whether that is something that we need to look into and whether that's all Work Stream 1 related.

So I think that would be the three areas where we could build on what is there. To recap, Number 1 would be to look at existing accountability mechanisms; Number 2 would be to review the list of the proposals and comments that have been made during the previous public comment period on accountability; and the third area would be reviewing the work of the CWG in terms of accountability.

And then we would suggest that we establish a fourth subcommittee or a fourth group that would collect a list of contingencies. Because I think if we - as you will remember the charter asks us to look at individual contingencies and to see whether existing accountability mechanisms are good to counter them and if not to modify them.

But in order to think about and modify and establish remedies, existing ones or new ones, we need to know what the contingencies are. So our suggestion is that we would have one sub group listing contingencies that could be relevant or that we need to look into when talking about accountability mechanisms particularly for Work Stream 1.

So this is our suggestion. It's a suggestion by the co-chairs so if you don't like the idea please do blame us for it. But we were thinking of straightforward easy access points to this challenging task. And the idea is that once we have these lists on the table we can then merge them and establish a matrix, slice the work and then flesh out the work plan and the timeline and work on the individual items at the level of detail that is required.

But at the moment we don't have that insight yet and we think we need to scope the issue to work on responses. I see a queue building up. First one to speak is please, Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Thomas. With respect to area 2, many of the comments that you received previous - that ICANN solicited previously over the summer went so far as to assess the current accountability mechanisms in light of whether they were really adequate at giving the community the accountability it wanted.

Moreover, a few of the comment submitters, including the BC, went ahead and suggested potential accountability mechanisms that would give the community the accountability they seek, and those would be all Work Stream 1 type measures which we didn't know at the time but might now suggest.

This is only a starting point and doesn't represent, in any way, a full CSG consensus. But the idea is that area 2 is not just an assessment of ICANN's accountability but it could include suggestions for accountability mechanisms that this working group needs to develop.

Thomas Rickert: So, Steve, do you still think that the suggestion I made is a worthwhile exercise? And if so would you maybe even volunteer to take charge of that specific area?

Steve DelBianco: If that area includes the proposal of some accountability mechanisms, if it's just an assessment - well, clarify for me what kind of a responsibility you're expecting for that.

Thomas Rickert: Well this is just for the scoping phase. So I think this exercise should be over by the next call. But I think we should have a list where - of items that have been suggested and that have been put into either the Work Stream 1 or Work Stream 2 bucket or both.

And thirdly, we are cognizant of the fact that suggestions have been made earlier on and these will be built on, at least I think the working group should do that. But...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: You had me at hello. I'm happy to volunteer for that.

Thomas Rickert: That's excellent. Thanks so much. And for the others in the - other colleagues on the call we will need three more volunteers to take care of the other areas. But let's move on in the queue so Kavouss Arasteh, please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, (unintelligible) the way you have explained for the accountability you have three parts. The first part is existing accountability; second part is from the public comment; and third part look into the CWG.

Let's take the third one. CWG accountability if there would be any result of limited to the naming only the accountability of the CWG is much more than that and is beyond the CWG. So perhaps while we could take into account

whatever CWG (unintelligible) we should not rely on that and we should do our work with much more larger (unintelligible). This is the first one.

Second one, you talk about the existing accountability. There is no accountability currently in effect (unintelligible). This is totally something within the ICANN and the recommendation. So what accountability exists today? If there was any accountability why we have this (unintelligible) of accountability.

No doubt you can take into account whatever you have but we need to work to have a - from the structure a very (wide) way of accountability not taking on (unintelligible) or existing system or common public comment and so on and so forth. None of those is covered in the accountability that we are looking.

And you know that the latest information is that if the accountability doesn't work there would be no transition and there will be no transfer of function from IANA - from the NTIA to the global community, whatever global community is, for which I don't have any definition for the time being.

So I think it's a very narrow way of thinking. I'm very, very please excuse me, I apologize for that.

Thomas Rickert: There's no reason to apologize. The - I appreciate and respect your assessment of the accountability situation with ICANN. Per definition ICANN does have accountability mechanisms, whether you think these are effective or not that's certainly up to your own assessment. But the purpose of this exercise is just to establish the status quo.

I did not intend in any way to make a value judgment on what is there and what needs to be done; that's entirely for this group to determine and work on. Mathieu.

Mathieu Weill: Yes. Thank you, Thomas. I think this discussion really highlights one of the key topics we need to address when we start this work. And this is valid for all four of the - at least the first three areas we have identified.

I take you back to the very definition of accountability that we're using in our charter. And it really has very important key words, independence, checks and balances, review, redress. And my point is I would encourage the different areas to really connect the data whether it's existing mechanisms or proposals, and make sure this - the ideas that are collected are really put into categories.

Is it a review mechanism? Is it a redress mechanism? What kind of stakeholders may be using this accountability mechanism? If we build this up then we will actually be in a position where we can take a global view of all accountability mechanisms existing or proposed and actually compare them - actually address some aspects regarding efficiency.

And so I would strongly encourage Steve - and I thank you, Steve, for volunteering but also other coordinators to think around this definition and make sure the collection of data is put in relation with our definition for accountability so that it facilitates exploitation that our work after that. That would really be my point when we launch this collection of inputs.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks so much, Mathieu. And I would like to echo this by saying that, you know, since we are already running late for this call we would hope that all of you join us in trying this exercise to make a collection of the status quo and then take it from there.

So in the remaining few minutes I would like to ask for volunteers that take care that we will have work results before the next call is taking place in one week's time. So we are still in need of one person taking care of the subcommittee to establish a list of existing ICANN accountability mechanisms. We need one to extract accountability issues from the CWG work. And one that takes care of the list of contingencies.

And the - that does not mean that this - that these individuals will have to do all the work by themselves. I'm sure that in this group there will be sufficient number of individuals that would like to add to that. So Grace will establish individual mailing lists for these subcommittees. And we will repurpose these subcommittee mailing lists for other subcommittee work as we move on.

But for the time we'd really like to get volunteers that would help with that task so that we can make substantial progress between this and the next call. Are there any - so Eric is volunteering in the chat. Eric, could you identify for which item you would be willing to volunteer? So Eric is typing and while he's typing I think Arasteh, that's an old hand. And I saw that there was another hand raised but now it's lowered again. Was that David? David Maher, please.

David Maher: Yes, I'll volunteer for the area 1 subcommittee, existing accountability mechanisms.

Thomas Rickert: That's excellent and much appreciated, David. So your name is noted for the first item, the collection of the - or creating the inventory of existing accountability mechanisms. Eric has now identified himself for area 4 which are the contingencies.

So that leaves us with the third work area and that is looking into the CWG work. And maybe we have somebody who is both in this group as well as in the CWG and has followed the discussions which I think would facilitate the task essentially. Any volunteers to look at that third work area?

So please do consider this. It would be greatly appreciated. And while you are considering to put yourself forward as a volunteer, let me say that it should not be our usual practice to run - to make these meetings run long. So the intention is to keep them on time.

I think what we would like to suggest to the group though is that we schedule the calls not for 90 but for 120 minutes which I think would be appropriate for the size of the task and the limited time that we have for it. But we will certainly keep the calls to that time limit. This is an exceptional case because we need to make sure that we get the group running.

So again the final call for the caretaker for Subcommittee Number 3 which is looking at the CWG accountability mechanisms. Mathieu, your hand is raised.

Mathieu Weill: And I'm not volunteering. I have enough on my plate. But I have noticed on the chat that Samantha Eisner was volunteering to help as well on Area 1. And I think it was worth mentioning. And we had a comment about making sure that ATRT recommendations would be included in the list of inputs. And wondered in what area we should put that whether it would be more appropriate in Area 2.

Thomas Rickert: Since we have two volunteers for Number 1 why don't we add that to Number 1 and maybe Samantha could then take special care of the ATRT recommendations? And sorry, Samantha, for not mentioning you, that was an oversight.

So for - I would hope that we find a volunteer shortly on the mailing list to take care of Work Item Number 3 and I would like to close this specific item on the agenda.

This suggestion I've seen has received some support in the chat. There also have been some concerns. I think what we should do as we move on is take a little bit more time to discuss how we best go about with things. This proposal was sort of presented to you with limited possibility to modify but please be patient with us. It was our best effort attempt as chairs to get the ball rolling. And we appreciate that you help us with it.

So please do send a note to Grace which of the sub committees you would like to work and then contribute and you will then, with your respective leaders of the sub committees, work on a timescale so that the work results are ready for the next call.

And with that I'd like to move to the last agenda item which is AOB. So can I ask for any input in terms of AOB? Please make yourself heard. And in the absence of that the last item for me was to fix a time and date for the next call. And I would like to hand over to Mathieu for that. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you. So our proposal is to use the Tuesdays. I think we had an option to rotate at least the next call at 1100 UTC, was that what we were talking about, Grace?

Grace Abuhamad: Yes, that's correct, Mathieu.

Mathieu Weill: That's right. Which would be starting a rotation so that would be our proposal for the next meeting. And then of course in the meantime we will provide further suggestion to - around time rotation on a more regular basis.

Man: Did we decide which day?

Mathieu Weill: On Tuesday, 16th of December.

Man: Sixteen December.

Mathieu Weill: So we will obviously send around invites and all call details and please in the meantime if there were any logistics issues provide feedback to your secretariat so we make sure we have everything covered by next time.

Grace, you wanted to add something?

Grace Abuhamad: Yes, Mathieu, thank you. It's Grace for the record. One thing I just wanted to note is I know a lot of you had difficulty receiving the call details for this particular call that for some reason they were going into spam boxes or junk boxes in your emails. I will endeavor to send a reminder before every call just with the details again.

And just as a note for our policy is that we don't circulate call details on the publicly archived list, we circulate them to the individuals, which is perhaps why if some of you checked the archive you weren't able to locate the call details. Those would be circulated to you individually.

So I will make sure that I send a reminder. And if you can to avoid my emails going into the junk box add me as a contact to make sure that you receive my emails. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you, Grace. I see no other hand raised therefore I think we've sufficiently benefited from all your times. Many thanks to everyone for getting available on such short notice. I am very pleased to see that we are getting some - we have agreed on some basic rules. We have, I think, a good understanding of the charter now and are getting on our work right away which is very encouraging. And I look forward to the upcoming exchanges on the list and of course we will be very pleased to talk to you all at our next meeting next week. Thank you very much, everyone. Have a good day for those who are during the day. Good night for the European people at least. And see you soon.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And good morning from the Antipodes.

Man: Thank you, Mathieu.

Mathieu Weill: Oh yeah and good morning to the...

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: And this is Thomas. Let me also thank you and make a promise we will stop on time next time. There will be less talk about procedure and more talk about substance. Thank you to all of you and bye-bye.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Bye.

END