ICANN

Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
January 27, 2015
1:00 pm CT

Leon Sanchez: Cross-community Working Group on Accountability, enhancing the ICANN's accountability on the 27th of January at 19 UTC. So for the roll call we'll have everyone who is in the AC room added to the roll call. And if there is anyone on the phone bridge that is not joining us via the AC room I would kindly ask you to state your name to add you to the roll call. Is there anyone in the phone bridge that is not active in the AC room?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes it's Jonathan Zuck. I'm not in the AC room yet.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you Jonathan. Anyone else? Okay so it's only Jonathan Zuck joining us only on audio and as I said you're very welcome to join this meeting and a little reminder as in every other call I'd like to remind you to update your statement of interest if you haven't also already. There are new participants joining the group so I would kindly ask them to as well get in touch with ICANN staff to get their wiki account set up and upload their statement of interest. You can contact Grace if you have any questions with regards to creating your wiki account or building your statement of interest.

I'd like to also remind all participants and all members of this group to kindly focus on the work that we're doing. As you may be aware there have been some communications in (unintelligible) space and they have created some distractions from our work. So the co-chairs are very pleased that everyone has a voice in the mailing list but we would kindly ask you to focus on substantial work and substantive work so we can progress. We have a very tight timeline so we'd rather focus on what we need to do than any other situation that might distract our work.

So the next point in the agenda is the CWG update and the joint statement that has been published recently. And with that I'd like to pass the floor to Thomas. So Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much. Thank you very much Leon and hello everybody again. In this section of the agenda we're going to update you briefly on collaboration - ongoing collaboration and coordination with the CWG. As you will remember we have discussed the input that we received shortly before the Frankfurt meeting in Frankfurt and we have informed the group that we would both work on a co-chair statement issued by Leon, Mathieu and myself on behalf of this group but then at a later stage later in the week - in fact earlier this week we would also publish a joint statement together with the co-chairs, Lise Fuhr and Jonathan Robinson of the CWG.

This with the intention to demonstrate and update the whole community and the interested public about our coordination efforts. So I will get back to this joint statement in a moment but that's actually the sequence of what's happening. So in Frankfurt as you will remember we have discussed the areas of input or where the CWG asks our group for input and we have discussed how we would respond to that. And in the meantime we have prepared a

written response to the CWG which we've now passed on to (Aubrey), our liaison, for a final check.

Also we've gone through the feedback of our group during the last coordination call that we held with Lise and Jonathan last Friday. So that's work and progress and we are almost finished. So we are in constant contact on these points so once we have feedback from Avri we will also provide the written feedback and then await further input from the CWG.

With respect to the joint statement you will remember that the purpose of this is to demonstrate an evidence that the two groups are cognoscente of the fact that the work of the respective groups are interdependent and interrelated (unintelligible) evidence that we are closely collaborating on the respective work efforts and that we keep on updating each other on progress made.

Also we have stated that we would try to synchronize as far as possible timelines and milestones so that we can come up or we increase chances of coming up with a cohesive proposal in a timely fashion. Also you'll find a link to a flow chart which is a graphic depiction - graphic visualization of the interdependence of our work and I encourage you to reflect on that and take a look at that but that's more or less what our group has already discussed with the aim to make our work fit in nicely with what the CWG is doing.

In the statement we also mentioned the Frankfurt meeting and make reference to the earlier intense work weekend that the CWG has held and we also provide an outlook to the Singapore session. So that's also cognoscente outreach effort to inform the community about the various events that we are going to have in Singapore. And the aim is for the co-chairs of the respective groups to be there at the various events regarding the stewardship transition so

that we are fully transparent and can inform the community about the progress that has been made.

I think I should leave it there. So basically we've been working on the issues that we've been tasked with, almost finished this and unless there is anything to add from let's say Avrior folks in the CWG like Greg and Cheryl we can move onto Agenda Item Number 3. Comments or feedback? I don't see any in the chat nor do I see any - Kavouss has raised his hand. Kavouss please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes Thomas. Good evening. Good afternoon to everybody. Just half a minute. I have seen all communication. Everybody, everybody congratulations (unintelligible) co-chair I'm admiring you. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you so much Kavouss. That's much appreciated. Thank you so much. I think with that we can move to Item Number 3. So with that I'd like to hand over to Mathieu although I'm just seeing that there might be the wish to go through the response that was provided to the CWG. Would you like us to show you through what we discussed in Frankfurt or shall we stay with the effort and move straight to Number 3? I'm virtually looking at my fellow co-chairs. Avri has raised her hand. Avri please.

Avri Doria: Yes hi. Yes you sent it to me and I just sent you back a quick answer and in that answer the question whether I was authorized to pass this on to WA3. If I am in which case I would say I would do that and then hopefully get back to you in a day or do. Is that okay?

Thomas Rickert: I think if you're happy with the response we would send it to our group and also to the CWG leadership so it's public. So you're more than welcome to pass it on.

a   Okay thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you (Aubrey). And with that I can hand it over to Mathieu who will take care of Agenda Item Number 3.

Leon Sanchez: Actually if I may jump in for Number 3, Leon.

Thomas Rickert: Oh I'm sorry (unintelligible).

Leon Sanchez: Okay so our next point in the agenda is (unintelligible) requirements and organizing our further work. As we all know in the Frankfurt meeting there was a (unintelligible) map that we put together, Mathieu put together, this (unintelligible) map with all participants. And we divided the work on two working parties. The first one regarding review and redress and the second one regarding community powers (unintelligible). Mathieu correct me if I'm mistaken.

                        And while further work has been organized in these two working parties volunteers have been called and they have also come forward to join these working parties. And so the next stage is to further develop on the requirements and on the (unintelligible) map that we're seeing on our screen so that we can coordinate between of course each of the parties and the legal advice sub-team that was created also in our Frankfurt meeting.

                        So to put it another way what we need the working parties to help us with is to further expand on these requirements, then begin drafting and creating some iterations with the legal sub-team with regards to questions that would be needed to be addressed by the legal experts. And with this I would like to open the floor for comments and for contributions on whether which could be

the questions that we could be seeding into the legal sub-team so they can begin also working on it.

So I would like to open the floor as I said and if anybody has a comment or a contribution I would appreciate to get in the queue.

Okay so Mathieu do you have your -

Mathieu Weill: Yes. Thank you very much Leon. I think just for clarification I think mailing lists are now set up and we have two (unintelligible) for the two groups but we still need to - this action item to call for volunteers on each of the groups. I think there's a bit of confusion with the Contingency Group that has been fielded during the Frankfurt meeting. So I would just clarify for everyone if you're wondering (unintelligible) volunteer it's still to be sent out and so there is still plenty of time to volunteer on each of these working parties. So I thought this clarification would be useful.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much for this Mathieu. You're right. I was mistaken. Of course we'd need to open the call for volunteers to join each working party having (Becky) and Jordan as coordinators for each party. So could staff please add this as an action item to call for volunteers? And of course everyone is encouraged to join these working parties. So I see Kavouss has his hand raised so please (unintelligible).

Kavouss Arasteh: Just a point of - can I speak? Please can I go ahead? Yes just point of clarification. By working parties you mean these two groups one dealing with empowering the community and the other is review and redress. Am I right?

Leon Sanchez: That is correct Kavouss. The two working parties one refers to review and redress and the other one is regarding the community empowerment.

Kavouss Arasteh: Thank you.

Leon: Okay now there are of course some expected deliverables from these working parties. I would like to hand it to Mathieu so he can explain those which will be the expected deliverables for the working party.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Leon. I think it's one key aspect we haven't had time to cover in Frankfurt and we need to be very clear about what we expect these groups to deliver. We are still very much in a requirement phase and we need to keep in mind that we don't want to be describing a solution truly but rather to describe the kind of requirements, detailed requirements we need for those parties.

So the initial discussions we have launched and that we wanted to share tonight (unintelligible) tonight with you were that we would expect these groups to deliver a short document to describe the scope of - put a little bit of sentences and written English, understandable written English around the bullet points that we have on the (unintelligible) map at this stage. And that's the first deliverable.

Secondly a list of key issues that have to be discussed and the requirements that are associated on issues such as the composition of a group or panel for review and redress, how they make decisions, is there a threshold or is it consensus decision making. What would be the - who can initiate the (unintelligible) so the standing grounds. What kind of standard of review are we talking about? Is it just for process-focused or is it also on substance? Is it a matter of performance or only of how the interest of various stakeholders have been taken into account.

And of course a number of significant other issues such as the cost of a review process, for instance all the delays there might be. I think a number of - a lot of work still needs to be done on this item and we still - keeping in mind we need to stay at the requirement phase we need to work these out. And when that is defined then we can go to a list of questions we would raise to access legal feasibility of the mechanisms and ask questions such as how could we get a process that has this composition and this kind of powers -- et cetera.

So those are I think the three steps that we need these groups to go through and we of course - and we need to work with the assumption that these outputs will be public-facing and will form the basis of something we will ask for feedback on publicly and maybe even form the skeleton of the future public comments that we would have to send out.

So that's just to stress how important it is that we kick-start this work as early as possible. Before handing over to Leon I'd like to check whether (unintelligible) those expected deliverables are - first of all you understand what's expected. Second of all is confirm it's compliant with what we said in Frankfurt and finally whether you think it's useful or not. And I see Kavouss has raised his hand.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes Mathieu. Good afternoon and good evening. I have given some (unintelligible) about these two groups. For Group One, Working Group One, review and redress, the convener of the group needs to study whether the review would be a predetermined periodical review every six months, every one year, every two years, or review will be done based on some criteria (unintelligible) the review. (Unintelligible) some feedback that something is not going well then we have to review.

So these are the things (unintelligible) review first. They have to be carefully mentioned. Then once the review is done, submitted for the redress you have to identify the criteria of the redress, what are the criteria, how far we go and how we ensure that the redress procedure have been or will be implemented and if not what we will do. These are the things that the Working Group One also needs to take into account.

And I think with Working Group Two the most important is membership. There have been discussions. Some 52 e-mails have been exchanged and (unintelligible) Thomas and other co-chairs that we need to see what is the situation. So there are difficulties and problems on the membership. There have been other documents between the other communities. Someone said that in various areas for instance GAC could not be a member because of the restriction of the (unintelligible). We need to think very seriously of the membership, criteria of membership (unintelligible).

And then the area that Working Group Two could react, what type of decision could modify but not all decisions. So criteria of the decision. So there is a lot of things to be clarified and that (unintelligible) grateful to them if they put these things or those things on the table that we review and possibly recommend. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Kavouss. I think you've highlighted a number of these underlying issues I was referring to that the groups will have to work on and I see you've already put a lot of attention and thought into this so I hope that you will share this with those groups and participate in at least one of those and I'm pretty sure you will.

And finally I think you are alluding to one thing which is in terms of tools we need to work on documents and use e-mails for discussion and then feed on a

regular basis under the (unintelligible) guidance feed those inputs from the e-mails into a document of requirements that will be the (unintelligible) and that's something that we're stressing on I believe.

I see no other hand raised so I would suggest to hand over to Leon to wrap up that item. I think Leon you could give us an update regarding how this synchronizes with legal advice.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Mathieu. Yes so the legal sub-team was created in Frankfurt. We've created a mailing list early today and I think all of the members so far from this sub-team have been - they've received notification about the creation of this mailing list. And I sent a couple of minutes ago the document - the document with the CWG that - with the work that the CWG has so far made regarding legal advice so we can have that as an input for our work but obviously not to be our main or only document to work on.

And I'd like to take you through these slides that you're looking in your screen. So the way we've envisioned these legal advice engagement since the two groups, the two working parties, will cease in some way the work of the Legal Advice Working Group regardless of the Legal Advice Sub-Group thinking about their own and independent questions to ask to the legal experts.

So avenues one and two of the legal sub-group as you see in the slide (unintelligible) avenue working groups to provide (unintelligible) to the legal sub-group. Based on this input the sub-group will produce a scoping document with precedent for external legal advice.

One thing I would like to show here is that the path we would follow for legal advice would be of course trying to get an answer from within the group or our legal experts within ICANN first and then if we don't get coherent reply

or the group thinks that that reply doesn't meet the expectations of the working group then we would look at some efforts to engage with external and non-conflicted independent legal advice to answer such questions.

Why we envision the path this way is because as you well know we have very limited time to take this path forward so we'd rather look into the expertise that's already in our group and within ICANN and if we fail to have an answer with regard to - or a (unintelligible) answer with regards to the questions then we would of course take this to further legal advice from an external source.

And well of course we need to request immediate legal advice and so these would take us to (unintelligible) expert to answer broad initial questions (unintelligible) what (unintelligible) mechanisms can be ruled out or shortlisted. And so in order to engage (unintelligible) as with the scoping document we would have to wait for the feedback that we get from both working parties -- Working Party One and Two -- and the questions that would be produced within the legal sub-group by following what has already been done by the CWG by the CWG document that has been already circulating into the legal advice sub-team mailing list.

So now I would like to open the floor for comments or any questions that you might have with regards to how legal advice is envisioned to be engaged and if there are any members from the legal sub-team that have any questions of course we can begin work in the mailing list and while of course we should be looking at or for immediate advice as we see in the second slide (unintelligible) the mechanisms that will empower the community to take various measures regarding ICANN board action and inaction of course and (unintelligible) for the community to approve the organization's annual budget which is one of the issues that has been raised in our meeting in

Frankfurt, to have the ability to recommend and implement changes to the bylaws in case it's needed and to have the ability to approve changes to the bylaws to overturn or require reconsideration of decisions of the board that were contrary to the bylaws.

And in the case of an action on a board on an issue developed through community concerns to require the board to take that action and ways to prevent ICANN from acting outside its mission and to dismiss one or all members of the board.

As I said the approach is that ICANN would provide the initial response for the set of questions designed by both the working parties and the legal sub-team and for areas where questions still remain or we don't have (unintelligible) answer from ICANN legal team ICANN would work to get that independent legal advice from (unintelligible).

So now I would like to open the floor for questions or comments. I see Kavouss hand is raised. Please Kavouss go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I have a general question. If we engage the external legal advisor or advisors or if we do something internally the most important issue is that the scope of the work and mandate of these two groups need to be looked at to see whether there is a conflict between the current non-profit public benefit codes that ICANN (unintelligible) at present time. So whether it is compatible with that or not because I think - I may not be correct but I think ICANN remains as it is as the corporation and will be governed by (unintelligible) most probably and then whatever we do should be consistent and compatible with that.

If there is anything not compatible we have to find a way for that. So these are areas that at least I -- I'm not talking about others -- have little (unintelligible) or (unintelligible) compatibility of what we will do with what is the incorporation law or incorporation codes of benefit of ICANN. So this is a very, very important legal question. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Kavouss. You are right and that's precisely why we are willing to scope our work on first with the working parties on which would be the mechanisms we should be looking for and then turn back into questions for the legal sub-team and the legal team to answer on how we can achieve that. So first it comes the what and then we look into the how. And the how would be the answer that we would be looking for after legal advice.

And I see Thomas has his hand raised so Thomas could you please go ahead?

Thomas Rickert: Yes just to add to what you initially said Leon I guess we have to be very clear that the timeline that we're working against is very aggressive. So for all those that have now typed comments questioning why we would reach out to ICANN legal in the first instance this is pretty much in line with what we've discussed in Frankfurt because you will remember that we stated that - or that we agreed I hope that we would try to tack on legal advice that ICANN has previously sought to start with.

Also we think that it may well be that ICANN legal already has given some thought to certain scenarios and we think that we are well advised at this stage to make this a parallel and iterative process. So a full-fledged scoping document will require some time. As Mathieu mentioned the two avenues will need to be worked on. Specific questions will need to be framed and these will need to be put in front of the lawyers.

While as a result from Frankfurt we already have a couple of requirements and what we're suggesting is that we pass on these requirements to legal experts more or less regardless where they come from to get some initial reactions that may help (unintelligible) so that we've not moving into a dead end street to find out only at a very late stage in the process that the direction that we're taking doesn't actually hold water.

So certainly we don't have to do this (unintelligible) but we thought that we would (unintelligible) by trying to reach out to some initial high-level legal direction and then take it to a greater level of detail or granularity as the work of the two avenues progresses.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Thomas. I see Jordan Carter has his raised hand. So please Jordan. Jordan are you muted? I think Jordan's line is muted. We can't hear you Jordan. So I see (Aubrey's) hand is raised as well so we'll continue with Aubrey and come back to Jordan if he gets his line unmuted. So Avriplease take the floor. I don't hear Avrias well so I think she might be muted as well. Avriif you're - okay now we can hear you.

Avri Doria: Sorry I had double mute on. I had double mute on accidentally. Avri peaking. Yes I guess I had a different understanding of what it meant when we said we were going to utilize processes that had already been begun or build on processes that already existed, that that was in reference to the work already being done to get the CWG independent legal advice and that we were going to add content to those questions that they were asking and use the same independent legal that they were going to use. I think there is also an assumption that of course any questions we are asking outside ICANN legal will also have an answer to or will be exploring on its own and I would certainly hope that they would feed that information back in so that kind of should almost happen automatically.

But I thought that really we were going after the outside legal and that - so I don't quite understand the exclusivity of going the internal ICANN legal advice route as opposed to joining with CWG. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Avri. Yes what we would be looking at as I said previously and as Thomas also stated is at our (unintelligible) timeline and we would like to of course get the answers from the expertise we already have in-house and look for independent legal advice where it would be needed. And yes one of the exercises we would be doing is to take a look as I said at document that's been drafted by the CWG and engage with that independent legal advice if needed.

I see Becky Burr's hand up. Please Becky go ahead.

Becky Burr: I think that there are some areas where we know now and we should not postpone a decision about seeking independent legal advice on because they are areas where ICANN - both ICANN's legal staff and its outside lawyers have expressed opinions and views about certain issues. For example the issue of binding independent review processes and whether that would be or could be made consistent with California law.

We know that there are a variety of different perspectives on this that responsible legal practitioners have expressed but we do know what ICANN's position to date has been on that and so while I am perfectly content to use ICANN's legal resources wherever possible on that one issue I don't think that we should be fooling ourselves about the workability of that route.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Becky. Anyone else with comments or questions? I see (Thomas') hand up. So Thomas please go ahead.

Thomas Rickert: Yes thank you Leon and I feel like I should step in again in order to maybe rectify that impression that we're not suggesting to deviate from the route that we've agreed in Frankfurt. So we will try to coordinate seeking legal advice with the CWG although we would use separate scoping documents. But the idea is to use ideally the same firm that's going to be used by the CWG. What's sort of new and what's our suggestion to this group is that we should try not to wait for this identification of a law firm to be finalized and we should not wait for our fully fledged coping document to be ready to go before we reach out to legal.

And in order to bridge that gap in terms of timing, in order to make best use of the time and make best use of this group by giving them some initial reactions from legal advice, from legal experts, we thought it would be a good avenue to take the resources at our fingertips. But certainly that's going to be checked by an independent firm. This is merely for ensuring that we get some legal indication of whether we're moving into the right direction not as soon as practically possible.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Thomas. I see Kavouss has his raised. Please Kavouss go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I think I feel there is some sort of maybe overlapping or misunderstanding, that we mix up any advice that we may receive from the ICANN internal legal advice or legal view which are not independent and any legal view or legal advice we receive from external legal advisor which is independent. So we have to not replace one with the other. They are complementary. And we rely mostly on an independent legal advice. This is the first point.

The second point reference is made to the CWG (unintelligible) how long CWG will last because their main task was to provide reports or (unintelligible) reply to that and that will have some deadlines. Once that reply was provided whether it would be 31 of January or any other date that CWG has specified (unintelligible) CWG activities continued because we are referring to the CWG.

We are at the beginning of process. Our work is not limited to the transition. It's an overall accountability after transition as well. So our collaboration or our interaction with CWG will only be possible if CWG (unintelligible) delivering it's report to (unintelligible) will continue to exist within the area that we need to collaborate. This question is not clear. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Kavouss. So just (unintelligible) the (unintelligible) firm has not already been identified nor engaged and the approach would be to get to ICANN legal first but it is definitely not final say and we would always go for independent legal advice in the end. So if anyone has further questions or comments they're very welcome now and if no one has further comments or questions we would move to our next point in the agenda which is contingencies and organizing for the work. And for that I would like to hand over to Mathieu.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you very much Leon. The contingency where one area where we made significant progress in Frankfurt. As you will recall we agreed on the list of 22 contingencies grouped then and agreed that we would provide additional analysis to these contingencies by responding to a list of questions. We had an exchange regarding what the relevant - the appropriate questions would be.

There was also progress very recently on an outstanding action which had been earlier in the process to request the board Risk Committee a list of

contingencies that they were using as part of their mission to manage the risk framework for ICANN. And we have received thanks to (Bruce) intersession as well as a number of the board Risk Committee members we have received a communication that I shared on the list with a list of board risks and that is extremely useful because it enables us to double check that our list has no missing aspects and probably maybe to adjust a couple of the items.

And once again I think our goal here after Frankfurt is to make sure we have a clear path forward to make progress on all our work streams. And regarding contingencies we have a group and I think the next steps are to start answering the various questions. These questions have been shared on the list and I will just provide a quick reading. It's not on the screen at this moment but I will read them.

The first question for each contingency would be how relevant is this threat to the transition of the IANA stewardship which means how does the transition affect either the likelihood of the event, of (unintelligible). The second question; are there existing remedies in place. And we can rely on work area one (unintelligible) to provide that. So what you have on the screen here were the questions in their initial wording and thanks to comment from Steve DelBianco who said we would have to get these questions closer to what the charter of our group mentioned. I circulated a new version which I think tries to capture the essence of both approaches.

So the second question is are there existing remedies and how (unintelligible) are they. And the third question would be whether addressing the contingency can be achieved through amending existing accountability mechanisms or through creating new ones. And the suggestion for the group that has been formed and has a mailing list now is to engage and to review (unintelligible) every contingency with these questions and reporting to the (unintelligible) on

it (unintelligible) so we can ensure we have - we share the assessments before getting into defining priority contingencies (unintelligible) as we describe the Work Stream One proposals.

So this is the situation, how it looks like. I would like to check with Cheryl and the other group members whether this is clear enough for them to move forward. And of course others are absolutely (unintelligible) ask questions about this work area. I see Steve you have your hand raised so please Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. Steve DelBianco here and I don't see Cheryl or James Bladel on the Adobe Chat. So if they're here I would happily defer to Cheryl and James but I had a couple of things I wanted to comment on. I believe that the way you've restated the three questions on contingencies and stress tests is outstanding. The first question you asked was about how relevant is it to the IANA transition and its likelihoods.

The second and third questions have to do with do we have existing contingencies or can we address these contingencies through amending and adding accountability mechanisms. Of those questions two and three are far more relevant than number one. The issue of trying to tie a contingency to the IANA transition has long since lost any significance here as the IANA transition creates our only - our last best hope to put into place accountability mechanisms that are actually better than those which we have in the IANA relationship today.

It's a wholly imperfect one. We discussed this in Frankfurt. This notion of a stick I think Roelof had used, that a stick is a blunt instrument by definition and not so effective. And they're using accountability. I mean that to say that the IANA, the threat of holding the IANA contract was a very imperfect and blunt instrument. We can do much better and we already have come up with a

lot of great ideas. I wanted to comment that today at Washington D.C. at the State of the Net under Secretary Strickling gave a series of remarks on what is happening with the current transition and then we heard from a staff member with the House Commerce Committee of the US Congress.

They both mentioned stress tests more than a dozen times. That's because the administration and Capitol Hill, the Congress of the US, is keen to understand that stress tests are sort of guard rails around the process. And the questions they'll care about the most are questions two and three. They don't care about whether it's relevant to the transition. They'll want to know whether we've designed accountability mechanisms or amended the ones we had in a way that gets some ways down the road at addressing the contingency.

And finally Mathieu and Thomas I wanted to point out that ICANN's response to your query on corporate risk assessments is a very helpful list but it includes one item that the members of this call will be shocked to see. There are some 60 items in the letter that they sent back and I'd appreciate if that letter could be brought up if (Grace) or (Brenda) could do that. I'm speaking of the response letter, ICANN's response to the CCWG accountability risk.

In their list they indicate an item that amazed me. It says the perception of failure to implement and help achieve a global multi-stakeholder distributed internet governance ecosystem according to the widely accepted NETmundial principles.

This is the one bullet of 30 -- and it's hidden somewhere in the middle -- which says to me that ICANN has strayed far beyond its limited technical mission to where it's now taken on the responsibility of implementing the multi-stakeholder Internet governance ecosystem on a global basis simply because it was in the NETmundial principles. And to my mind and to that of

the commercial stakeholders group that is not part of ICANN's limited technical mission and it's the example of the kind of scope creep that a number of us in Frankfurt were very anxious to be able to prevent or to override should it show up.

And I realized it's not up there in the screen. I'll just read that one more time and I'll be quiet. ICANN is claiming that one of their stress tests is a perception that ICANN failed to implement and achieve a global multi-stakeholder distributed internet governance ecosystem because it's part of a widely accepted NETmundial principles. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you Steve. Regarding the item you just raised I think I would encourage discussion with the group about the board regarding why they think they have used this wording. What I am quite reassured by is that this is really under our radar and we know we have a contingency covering that from our perspective and we know this is part of the requirements we have set. So this is pretty positive for our group.

I think you've raised also an excellent question regarding whether we need to ask questions regarding assessing how contingencies are relevant to the transition of the IANA stewardship (unintelligible). And just to be clear I think I would say - I would open the floor to the group whether if someone has a different view of this should be maintained that we could expand on this now in order to - I mean if we can remove a question that's perfect. That's less work and we can go faster but I'd like to check that there is - if there is counterarguments on that suggestion.

Next in the line is Kavouss. Please Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I have (unintelligible) to Steve. I do not think that we should remove the question but we have to reformulate it in a manner saying that do these contingencies strictly related or associated with the accountability in regard with the transition or it is covering or addressing the overall accountability which goes beyond the transition. So the answer may be yes, it is only restricted to the accountability for the transition.

The answer would be it is for accountability beyond transition or accountability up to transition and beyond the transition. So we have to clearly reformulate the question. The question I think it is valid. It is important to see whether this contingency is related to what. I don't think that we should remove that. That is one point. Not to waste the time I have another question. We made this list of contingencies in Frankfurt with some limited number of people.

Did we or do we expect comments from the community in general to see whether these are the only questions or contingencies or there might be some other comments added or modified? Do we need to wait for some time while we continue to work to see whether there are some comments to these, addition, deletion, modification of the text or number of these contingencies because that is very important.

People agreed on these (unintelligible) limited number (unintelligible) participants but (unintelligible) so we have to be very, very careful of that. The third point I want to raise, people refer to NETmundial as standard principles. We can take note of NETmundial. We can (unintelligible) but this is not (unintelligible) principles because NETmundial tried to make a sort of the balance between multi-lateralisms and multi-stakeholderisms in order to make the people happy. And (unintelligible) they called them a soft consensus (unintelligible) although (unintelligible) and I'm sorry (unintelligible) and

Jordan made the comment that I don't think that this is something that is (unintelligible). I think it's something we consider and we take note that it is not (unintelligible) to take all of them into account as principles. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you very much Kavouss and I have noted your suggestion to reformulate the question. Thomas you have your hand raised?

Thomas Rickert: Yes thank you Mathieu and let me start my (unintelligible) by responding to Kavouss quickly. You will remember that we have not reached agreement on the list of contingencies in Frankfurt. We've clearly stated that we would wait for our next meeting whether there are objections. So we will stick to our rule that we would not (unintelligible) decisions as a group in a single meeting.

But also you might remember that we have clearly stated that there might be more contingencies being brought to our attention and we will certainly not be ignorant to those, that we have to make sure that we incorporate all contingencies there might be to take a holistic view at accountability.

So that is clearly on our radar. And also in our co-chair statement after the Frankfurt meeting we have made reference to our work on the contingencies. So the message is out with the interested community and we will certainly take a look at all feedback that we might receive. With respect to the questions that Steve posed on the first question I think I'm perfectly happy with (unintelligible) that third question, Number 3 (unintelligible) but I think looking at the document that we have produced in Frankfurt the chances are quite good that all of these might pass the test for Work Stream One.

So I think it's more a correct methodology for us to work on to (unintelligible) and maybe even more than that to clearly state that the items that we're looking at are related to work stream number one. And should we find out that

certain items belong to work stream number two -- i.e. they're not related to the transition -- then (unintelligible) wouldn't abandon them but then we could put them to work stream number two.

So I think this is just double-checking but again I think that this is not going to hold up the team substantially with the team that's looking at the contingencies.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you Thomas. And to reinforce this point I mean the question has never been meant as a way to disqualify a specific contingency but rather flag the ones that were directly related or maybe more indirectly related to. Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: We're circling back to you.

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco: Of the three questions you've posed with respect to contingencies and stress tests questions two and three are practically taken directly from the charter that all of us have agreed to for this group but question one is nowhere in our charter. I still don't know where that's coming from and I made an argument earlier that it's not relevant to be concerned about trying to tie it somehow to the IANA stewardship and others on the chat I think have agreed on that.

So my recommendation is that if it isn't in our charter that we not take it on as one of the roles that we have with respect to stress tests and contingencies. On Page Four of our charter it's very specific goals of what we need to do. Having said that Cheryl and I discussed along with James Bladel when we were in Frankfurt that as soon as the chairs in this group thought it were useful we would take this consolidated list of five stress tests and we would put an

appendix on there that would put a lot of the narrative behind them, some of the work that (Eric Williams) had done, some of the work that (Cici) had done so we don't lose the narrative behind the risk and the consequences that are rolled up into these five categories.

I for one believe that reducing it to these five categories makes tremendous sense but I don't want to lose the work that was previously done. So to the chairs I would say that those of us on that contingency stress test group we will be happy to do that. We want to do it before the working group has approved the list of five but once they have we'll be happy to add all of that. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Steve. Kavouss you have your hand raised again.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I want to perhaps reformulate what Steve said. Question is valid but follow-up action maybe what Steve said. Let's raise the question is this contingency strictly related to the transition or not. If the answer is yes and everybody agrees it's yes and there is consensus on that whether or not we take that question for further processing with another issue but let's make sure that this question (unintelligible) reformulation is made. Follow-up action is different from raising the questions.

So that may satisfy Steve (unintelligible). Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Okay the suggestion I would make to get us closer to our charter but also ensure we cover the different views that we're having now would be to start and reframe this question, put it at the bottom. Certainly not the most pressing one to define priorities. We I think have all agreed on that. And sort of rephrase it to determine whether the contingency is one to be addressed before

the IANA transition takes place -- Work Stream One -- or can be in a second group that would qualify as Work Stream Two according to our charter.

I'm not even sure we'll have many going into the Work Stream Two category but I have the feeling that we might lose some information if we don't get to that. So the proposal would be to rephrase it into sort of a Work Stream One, Work Stream Two type of question. Steve what do you think about it?

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. Steve DelBianco. I appreciate both the moving of the question but more importantly -- and I agree with what Kavouss said earlier that if it's just a yes no question fine let's answer it but it shouldn't be a gating factor. But what you've just said now Mathieu is when we analyze contingencies, analyze whether - how they relate to Work Stream One versus Work Stream Two. And I want to remind the group that when we designated Work Stream One versus Work Stream Two that had nothing to do with whether we could point to something in the IANA contract that addressed it.

Our Work Stream One Work Stream Two distinction is about giving the community the redress mechanisms and the authority and oversight that we need to be sure that we could hold ICANN accountable and then if there was consensus later on that we could implement the Work Stream Two items. So I applaud where you're going now in that using our definition of Work Stream One and Two, that is relevant to the consideration of stress tests but let's not get tied up about whether it's part of the IANA transition or not.

Mathieu Weill: Okay so we'll try to reframe this in that manner, sort of a yes no and making sure it's clear that it's not a gating factor into sorting out the contingencies. So next step on that point is handing over those questions to the group and my suggestion would be if IANA - would be I think for everyone to get onboard with the process. Maybe try providing such responses for a couple of

contingencies first, share it with the group, ensure we have the same understanding on what (unintelligible) and so maybe try probably next meeting or the meeting after to have a short discussion on a subset of contingencies to make sure we're making the progress that everyone was expecting.

Would that be okay for the members of the group -- I have seen Cheryl on the Adobe Connect room as well -- if we proceed like this? If there's no objection I will proceed. Then I want to also follow up on one of the inputs from Kavouss. I think around this list of contingency this is one of the top priorities for us to engage with the community in Singapore. That is one item that we need to make extremely clear and put forward to the community either in the engagement session as well as - or in all the sessions we'll have in our respective groups that if there is anything we're missing now is the time to provide this feedback.

So I would definitely welcome and I know it's an action item to add a specific contingency part into the communication materials that we will edit for Singapore. With that I think we can move onto Item Number 5 and I'm handing over to myself. And along with Berry Cobb who is within ICANN managing the project plans for both the CCWG and CWG.

We have after Frankfurt tried to update the timeline and in order to of course take stock of the progress we'd made in Frankfurt but also try and see how we could fit this timeline into the ambitious goal that has been set up by the board which would be to provide something for board consideration in the Buenos Aires meeting in June.

So you will see on the screen high-level timeline. There is (unintelligible) we are also attempting to synchronize with the other groups and what I will now

do is give (Berry) a couple of minutes to take us through this overall timeline, this high-level timeline so that we can understand it and then discuss the key lessons that it (unintelligible) to your attention. (Berry) are you in a position to (unintelligible) this?

Berry Cobb: Yes Mathieu. Just give me one second to get this properly uploaded to (unintelligible).

Mathieu Weill: Is it uploading?

Berry Cobb: It's still not the right one. I apologize. Okay all right sorry about that technical difficulty. It's coming. Can everybody see this in the Adobe Connect right now? I'm going to (unintelligible) the document so that you can scroll and zoom. It's going to be a little bit difficult for you to read in its own form but you'll have your own ability to scroll and zoom as appropriate. So thank you Mathieu and this is Berry Cobb for the record. First I'd like to point out we've discussed in previous project plans in the past what we produced was more or less a Gantt chart or more project management-related tool to guide or work.

But in discussions with the chairs it was a little too overbearing to make sense of so what we're trying to do is use this tool as an easier way to communicate where we're at, where we're going and certainly what we have in front of us in relation to the deliverables that we have for the CCWG. The first thing that I'd like to point out is that this is only a draft thus far and it's still subject to a couple of changes as we mature this document. And as Mathieu had mentioned the CCWG is also working with the chairs in the leadership of the CWG to coordinate timelines as well.

There are two primary components that you'll see here first. One is that the ICG timeline is listed here which everyone is aware started back in July and is

expected to conclude sometime in September of this year with their efforts. And then as well as the second row which is the CCWG timeline. That includes our current activities as well as our expected deliverables and delivery date. One thing that I'd like to mention in terms of the interaction with the CWG there is a third timeline that will become a part of this document and that's the CWG timeline.

And they're still working through some of the details of that which will be incorporated into this document once those have been finalized and agreed upon within the CWG. So let's get into some of the quick details about what we're looking at here. And what I'd like to first point out is this is meant to show a delineation between our delivery of Work Stream One versus Work Stream Two but there is one small caveat. Work Stream One is our critical path and so most of the detail or practically the detail focuses around Work Stream One.

And when you get to the lower right part of the document you will see the path for Work Stream Two but it's really only in its generic form and that will evolve over time as we have more clarity about the work effort required to deliver a proposal for the Work Stream Two component.

So let's spend just a little bit of time on the Work Stream One aspect. And I'm actually going to work backwards up to where we are today just to highlight some of the key points of what you'll see here. First and foremost I think coming out of Frankfurt the CCWG was advised by the ICANN board that they would like to have the Work Stream One proposal ready by the Buenos Aires meeting which is approximately mid-June.

And to do that each SOAC as well as the board have certain lead times by which documents and proposals and other activities are due so that they can

be properly processed and deliberated on during the ICANN meeting. Typically those are usually 10 days or 15 days depending on which SO or AC or the board that we're looking at. So approximately in the June column time frame you'll see two white boxes that highlight that the Work Stream One proposal would be submitted to the board at some point in time when they've reviewed that and of course - sorry, once the CCWG has completed its proposal to be submitted to the board and that's where you see the red arrow moving up in connection to the overall ICG timeline.

Prior to that -- and again we're working backwards -- is that the CCWG will first submit its proposal to the SOs and ACs for their deliberation and approval before the CCWG will submit to the ICANN board. And again there is lead time required to distribute the materials to the respective SOs and ACs for their consideration. So for the most part that essentially puts us at the 20th of May to have the Work Stream One proposal completing in time to make those lead time dates as we had mentioned.

The next thing I'd like to point out to you -- again we're kind of moving right to left -- is once the CCWG has developed its first draft of the proposal of course we'll ready this for public comment and the public comment that we have listed here is going to be for - is currently showing for the duration of 40 days. And then after the public comment period is closed then of course the CCWG will review through the comments and see how that may affect the draft proposal and to ready a more final draft for submission to the SOs and ACs as well as a public comment report summarizing the comments will be created as well.

And then moving through that or up to that point of course the CCWG will be developing the draft proposal itself as has been discussed extensively on this call as well as on the list that there is this component of legal advice for the

CCWG to help facilitate the development of the proposal. And what you'll notice is that there are essentially two areas of a gray bar that highlights the legal advice.

Now in reality I believe that the legal advice will be a series of deliberations between the small committee that's formed here as well the larger CCWG and whatever legal firm is providing that advice. But the reason for the split between the legal advice stream here is that it's anticipated that the CCWG will at least receive some initial advice based on the questions that are being submitted and need to be determined. And then at some point in time in the future there will be more formal advice that's also submitted to the CCWG which of course will be folded into the draft proposal however the groups perceives that.

And then just moving slightly up from right to left then you'll see a series of streams which as defined are for work areas which we basically had started at the end of December; Work Areas 3 and 4 will likely continue on into March and then as was discussed today there were two work parties formed as well that will be moving into March as well as again working in parallel with the legal advice.

So the other couple of small things that I'd like to highlight before I turn it back over to Mathieu is you'll see a series of red and green dots. These are to signify face-to-face meetings which are green and red which are ICANN meetings. So of course in January we had our face-to-face meeting in Frankfurt. February really literally starting a week and a half from now we'll be in Singapore for the ICANN meeting for which there is a series of sessions that we have planned.

And then looking into the March and May time frames are tentative face-to-face sessions that in terms of exact dates are yet to be determined and locations as well. And then of course leading up into June then we have the Buenos Aires meeting by which we hope to have the proposal submitted to not only the SOs and ACs but the ICANN board.

And then the last element that I'd like to draw your attention to is basically over on the right there is a bigger legend defined here as risk factors. And through the timeline there is a series of caution triangles for lack of a better word that denote where these risk factors might impact the timeline. And the idea here is to first identify these risk factors. And then of course we'll work together to hopefully mitigate these risks through various opportunities that we can determine to ensure that we maintain the timeline.

But the first three stem around the legal advice such as procurement, duration to acquire the legal advice. It's unclear yet how complex that legal advice might be. Third in case if there are any contradictions in that legal advice. In general there are some relatively unknowns from a project management perspective as to how that will determine or feed into the exact draft proposal. And then the fourth, fifth and sixth risk factors that are at least identified now really relate to the SOs and ACs and/or our own CCWG in terms of the consensus-building component or if there is not enough time for a particular SO or AC to approve. So overall that's the highlight.

Again as I mentioned as we get closer to completing Work Stream One then we'll definitely start providing more detail about what Work Stream Two will be but at this point it's just a little bit unclear. And then the last thing I'll close in on which circles back to our original project plan as well as Mathieu presentation a while back is once the proposal is accepted by the SOs and ACs and ICANN board then there is a light red line that extends from into June to

beyond September which is some sort of implementation oversight. And so that's what you see there as well. So I'll be glad to answer any questions and other than that Mathieu I'll turn it over to you. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you very much (Berry). I'd like to really express how grateful we are and thankful for the provision of such clear and useful oversight - I mean outlook on our timeline. And I think that's extremely important that we have this in mind as we progress with this very, very tight and ambitious timeline. And that's useful to have both the dates but also the risk factors and we see there are numerous of them.

Just for the record and stressing that because there have been questions on the chat the current draft -- this is a draft, this is a proposal for the discussions here -- has one face-to-face end of March, very beginning of April to finalize proposals for public comment and another one probably end of May, second half of May to take into account the feedback we get and finalize our proposal for the SO and AC approval.

And that is going to be - so that's currently what it looks like. And the second very short-term information that I'd like to stress is that according to this timeline we would have to finish up Work Party One and Work Party Two with the deliverables we discussed earlier in this call by the end of March. And that's quite short. And I think we need to be aware of that.

So now it's time for discussion and I see Kavouss has a question. Please go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes two minor questions. One, why we link these activities to ICG? ICG according to what I understood does not expect anything from CCWG on the issue for their activities. They expect something from CWG (unintelligible)

community of naming resources. Number two is that I still don't know whether the timing is realistic or is just objective to think of September (unintelligible).

Many comments made with respect to what is going on saying that you may not achieve that objective. And point three is that are we not going to submit whatever we come up to the chartering organizations? Is that the case? Is it similar or inside the public comment period of if I understand this correctly 40 days or not because for some of the chartering organizations the comments should come from the face-to-face meeting of the organizations. I'm talking (unintelligible) of GAC.

GAC could not do it by correspondence. They need to have a meeting and so on and so forth. And so simple questions do we sent something to the chartering organizations for comments? If that is the case should it be the same time as the 40 days of public comments? And the second one why the (unintelligible) all of them with the ICG. This is totally - not totally, it is almost different from what they are doing. They are talking of transition, you are talking of accountability.

Overall part of that may be for transition for the main part is overall so I would like just to have some clarification and (unintelligible) question to Leon did not reply or did not perhaps get my question is that how far CWG continue after providing their reply to the ICG? If they don't exist after two months, three months, there is no link between CCWG and CWG. These are the three minor questions I raise. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Kavouss. I think regarding the question you're raising regarding the link with the ICG is actually - it's a matter of presentation on this graph because the input from our group does not go into the ICG but into

the green line there which is the ICANN board but for reason of presentation that we could probably improve for the sake of avoiding confusion the ICANN board is very close to the ICG on the group.

So we probably should isolate the ICANN board a little more to avoid this confusion. And thank you for raising this. You were raising also a point regarding the ability for the GAC to approve something if it's not at a public meeting. That is an item that we'll need to take care of. I'm not sure we can do that right now in the meeting but that is a very relevant aspect to raise. Thank you very much. And Berry can you remind me whether this graph is based on a 21-day or 40-day public comment?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I understood that the commenting period would be sufficient in order to enable the public to comment because there was complaining that several commenting period was very short. I don't want to name anything but what would be the commenting period, three weeks, four weeks or five weeks for public because it is a very important issue.

Mathieu Weill: Okay so Berry is confirming it's a 40-day comment period at this point and I want to also point out that - and that's why we need to be very much close cooperation and synchronizing with the timeline with the other groups. I would not expect the community to be able to respond to two or three parallel public comment periods regarding the transition from the various groups at the same time so we'll need to be very careful on that.

So as you see there are a lot of challenges on the timeline and I would expect this to be something we need to monitor very carefully in order to not create expectations that cannot be met and yet put all our efforts into meeting the aggressive deadlines that are being set. So we should definitely try. We must

be realistic and the feedback provided on potential risks or issues we would not have been taking into account so far is extremely useful.

Are there any comments regarding the timeline? We have well noted your comments regarding the usefulness of the graph and how they should be on the wiki. (Unintelligible) do that as soon as we get enough certainty regarding the draft character of these because bear in mind that the CWG timeline itself is still very much being elaborated as we speak so we will certainly have to sync with them and that's one of our goals.

I see no other questions so I want to thank Berry once again for - he's been very quick in providing this - I mean in the turnaround on the update on the timeline was very quick so it's a very, very useful exercise for us and we need to keep an eye on this. With that I suggest we move to our next point on the agenda which is the plans for Singapore. And I will hand over to Adam Peake who we as co-chairs had tasked to come up with a proposal for outreach from our group in Singapore. And Adam can you share with us the ideas that you came up with?

Adam Peake: Yes, sure, thank you Mathieu. It's Adam Peake speaking. I think the first thing probably just to remind everybody we've got a number of meeting scheduled for Singapore and there are two working - full working sessions of the group for three hours each, one on Monday afternoon from 4:00 and one on Thursday morning from 7:00 there's three-hour ordinary working sessions of the CCWG. They'll be open to observers but otherwise it's the usual rules of participation.

On Wednesday morning there is an engagement session which we will use to take comment from the community broadly either responding to what may have been seen on that Monday session or more generally as a response to the

work that we've been doing. And also hopefully it will provide us with some direction for what we'll be doing on the Thursday afternoon working session - sorry, the Thursday evening working session.

And we're also planning a meeting for the CCWG with the board. That will hopefully be on Thursday. We have some meeting clashes on the schedule at the moment. As everybody knows the ICANN meetings are incredibly busy so trying to ensure that we don't have clashes with other relevant meetings is difficult and so we're trying to sort that out at the moment.

The reason for saying that is really that we also have opportunities then for you particularly as the members of the group to think about how you're going to be discussing the work that's been done by the CCWG with your sending organizations . I'm thinking particularly of the constituency day on Tuesday and the meetings that the supporting organizations and the advisory committees have.

Staff would be happy to try and prepare some documents to help you in your outreach as members if that would be - we can prepare a briefing document that could be sent around or perhaps a slide deck if that would be helpful. And you've probably seen that earlier today I sent a note to the list which was a summary of the past week's e-mail messages that have been sent to the CCWG lists. We send this to the expert advisors. Some of them are on the lists and some are not. We found that creating just this simple -- and it's quite rapidly produces -- list might be helpful to them.

That would be something that I hope you might send around to your groups and would give them some idea of what's going on. But just coming back to Singapore again then so on that Tuesday constituency day you might like to think about whether the members would like support from the co-chairs in

going to those meetings or if you're happy just to do it on your own and provide briefings back to your groups then please let us know if there are any briefing documents that staff can produce; happy to do that. And just let us know what that might be.

On an ongoing situation as we go forward I think one of the things we're learning from these processes is that given the very short and tight timelines that we've been discussing we really can't afford to have any surprises when it comes to putting out our recommendations for comment or for endorsement by the chartering organizations. So I think the idea of socializing the work that we're doing so that your groups are aware of what they'll be presented with in some months' time is extremely important and this idea of no surprises when it comes to public comment -- et cetera -- is important.

I don't think we're going to have an opportunity for a second round of public comment so it is important to get this right. And I'll just close by saying again if there are documents that you need then let us know and we'll try and prepare things to help with that outreach. Thank you and I hope that's useful.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Adam. (Unintelligible) proposals. I know we are all preparing for engaging as there's probably going to be sessions around the constituency day for instance. As co-chairs and within the limits of our physical availability we are happy to help in engaging. The action item I would put on our conclusions would be that we take on the proposal by Adam to prepare a very short summary, some form of one-pager and a short slide deck that we could share together during next week's meeting -- so before Singapore -- in order to have it already available before we all fly there.

So unless there are objections I would add this action item which is now in the notes with a deadline which would be submission and discussion at our next

meeting. Are there any other comments regarding preparation for Singapore? We should mention we're also in trying - staff is trying very hard to arrange a meeting with the board. I'm not sure it's been completely booked now. It's very difficult to find slots but it's still on the agenda if ever you wonder.

And (Robin) we have seen your request for a room and we'll probably get in touch with you to see what we can do. And I see no hands raised so would suggest we move to the next agenda item. Are there any other business? Yes Kavouss you have one.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes this is a very simple and humble request for the next face-to-face meeting. I would be highly engaged in the meeting from (unintelligible). I am a little contributor. You can do whatever you wish. I may not be a good contributor but I would wish very much to be (unintelligible) in the face-to-face if possible considering having something (unintelligible) if possible. Just consider. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Kavouss. It's well noted and our goal is to set that date firmly by Singapore. And so we'll - we try to make the best arrangements as possible for the group. Any other business? So I'm glad we are finishing early. I like meetings which finish early. So in terms of closing remarks I won't go through the whole list of action items but I would just like to share a personal view on how we are progressing. We've made outstanding progress in Frankfurt but we still have a lot to do in a very short time and I think the most difficult aspects of work are now in front of us.

And so we don't - we really don't have any room to rest on our laurels or waste time in any discussion that is taking us away from our goal. So really I would encourage everyone to press on with the various work groups (unintelligible) the documents that will be supporting our progress and the

substance keeping in mind our approach which is very requirement-based. And I know that's sometimes challenging.

And really hoping that I'm sure we can count on every one of you and have everyone onboard to both contribute to the groups significantly and engage in Singapore so that we can get as much feedback from the community as possible to avoid those surprises that Adam was mentioning. So by the next meeting I hope we have some first results to discuss on substance from the various subgroups and I also will - so we'll probably go through those different subgroups turning to their (unintelligible) and we'll certainly have this discussion (unintelligible) the material and the questions we raise with the community in Singapore.

With that I think (unintelligible) coming to a close in advance and I'd like to wish you all either a good end of day or morning or night for those of us who are in the evening. And I look forward to the substantive discussion that will take place during the week before our next call next week. Thank you very much everyone.

Woman: Thank you.

                                        END