

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
May 19, 2015
8:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Recordings have now started. Please proceed.

León Sanchez: Thank you very much. Hello, everyone, and welcome to our call number 33 on the 19th of May 2015 for the CCWG on enhancing ICANN's accountability. I remind you to please mute your line if you're not speaking, and I would like to of course go through the roll call and at this stage ask if there's anyone that is in the phone bridge that is not connected to the AC room so we can add his or her name to the roll call. Is there anyone on the phone bridge that is not connected to the AC room at this point?

Okay so hearing no one, then the roll call will be closed for who's actually connected to the AC room. And I do remind you to please mute your lines if you're not speaking. We have a little bit of background noise. Well as usual, I remind you to fill in your statement of interest. If you haven't done so by now, I urge you to do this at your earliest convenience, and please contact staff if you have any problems or you need any help with creating your - with the account. Staff will be of course happy to help you to solve any problem that has kept you from filing your statement of interest.

And well it's been a off. I think that we've all enjoyed a week off from work of the CCWG and enhancing ICANN's accountability. And with no further delay, I would like to pass the floor to my co-chair, Thomas Rickert, for the second point in the agenda. So, Thomas, could you please take the floor?

Thomas Rickert: Yes. Thank you very much, León, and hello everybody. This is Thomas Rickert. In the second agenda point we would like to briefly discuss what we heard from the community so far. As you will recall, we had two webinars on the 11th of May and also we had a session with the board, which some of you attended. And some questions have been asked during these occasions, and we are now in the phase where we compile answers to the questions that we got.

And we plan to publish a Q&A with respect to those areas so that we make the areas where the community has questions or concerns available to everybody who is interested. So this is a document that is currently being assembled and that is going to be made available on the CCWG wiki page very shortly.

Now what we've heard is that there seems to be some uncertainty and some questions with respect to the concept of unincorporated associations, so interested parties are uncertain as to what the requirements for their creation or whether there are any additional requirements for internal governments, the governments of these. So, you know, a couple of questions surrounding this topic.

Then we - the second area -- let me just scroll down -- was with respect to recalling board members. So the question was what criteria would be removed - would be used to remove director and what information would be made available on that. Then there were some questions with respect to the IRP, and that was relating to the independence of the experts, if the process is still paid

ICANN, about the binding nature and the final nature of the IRP decisions, and some more questions with respect to that. And there have been questions surrounding the reconsideration process and the ombudsmen.

Also we had some questions or one question with respect to the AOC and with respect to the stress test and timeline. I'm not going to go through all of these, but we - I think what we've seen is that there are some particular areas where the community has more questions, so we might wish to think more about that.

All in all, I guess what we can say is that the number of questions during the webinars was relatively low. Also when we met with the board, we did not get too many questions at this stage, you know, some questions for clarification but not so many questions on concerns or alternatives. And we think that this is due to the fact that people use these opportunities, both the board as well as the other community members, to better understand our proposal then dive more deeply into substance and then get back to us again.

So we see this more or less as a starting point but we would very much like to hear from you whether in your engagement with your respective communities whether you had more feedback or questions that you could share with the whole group.

Tijani's hand is up. Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, Thomas. Tijani speaking. I think that (unintelligible) had a very good question. They asked why we are treating the board (unintelligible). They asked that normally the member of the board has to act in the interest and in the benefit of the organization and not of the constituency that appointed him or her.

So they said why it is that this constituency that triggered the removal of the board director and not the whole community, why those who are appointed by the NomCom needs to have the whole community to trigger the removal. I think this is a very important question and we need to consider it carefully. And really I don't - I was against the requiring the board members and the work stream 1 because I had other idea about it, but nevertheless it is now in our report, but I think that we have to consider this remark, very important remark. And I think there is a rationale behind it. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much, Tijani. I guess it's good of you to mention that point. You will recall that we had some discussion in this group whether or not we should deal with removal of individual directors in work stream 1 or in work stream 2, and it was felt that since SOs and ACs can remove their respective directors anyway that it would be an easy thing to include it in work stream 1. And some, not all of you, including yourself, Tijani, felt that it was an important measure for the community to have to be able to recall their respective or to remove their respective director.

It now turns out that obviously there seems to be some confusion around this concept and maybe we need to be clearer that with the possibility to remove individual directors, we're just stating what's already the legal situation, so we are not adding additional rights to SOs and ACs and that for all other areas of removal we would actually have a common standard of review for those cases.

Because I, you know, just to be crystal clear I think (Sheri)'s main point was that when it comes to dismissing individuals or the whole board, the same set of standards should be applicable, i.e. if they don't act in the best interest of the whole community and not only with respect to their - respective groups.

And I think that we might need to be a little bit more focused or clearer in our report to make that distinction between the current legal situation, which remains unaltered and the new community mechanism or community power that we're defining.

I think I saw ~~(Josh)~~Josh's hand up. ~~(Josh)~~Josh, do you want to speak? If so, the floor is yours.

~~(Josh Hoffheimer):~~Josh Hoffheimer: Yes thank you. For some reason whenever I put my hand up it gets put back down. So this is ~~(Josh Hoffheimer)~~Josh Hoffheimer: speaking. Yes, Thomas, I just wanted to add to what you were stating. There may be some confusion in - towards the rights that are afforded to remove a member for cause versus without cause. And what we're - what we did focus on in laying out the board - laying out the community powers or the powers that would be available to members was the ability to remove a director without cause.

So the representative organization or representative member that appoints the particular director by statute under California law has the ability to remove that director without cause. So, you know, if the, you know, the At Large committee had appointed a particular director, the At Large committee could remove that director for whatever reason it had in mind and replace that person with another.

A for-cause removal is a different situation, and that's a power that is generally reserved to the board. There may be some discussion, you know, in work stream 2 or otherwise. There may be some discussion that is give to what does it mean kind of a for-cause situation with respect to a board member, but typically it would be for a breach of the fiduciary duties that are

enumerated in the bylaws and it would require some vote and a threshold of the board to remove that director for cause.

But - so there still can be kind of community action, if you will, but it's a community action that takes place at the level of the board of directors of ICANN to remove directors for cause, but removal of an individual director on a not-for-cause basis or for without reason can only be done by the member that appoints that director or selects that director. So I hope that clarifies.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, ~~(Josh)~~Josh. That's indeed very helpful. Let me just note that ~~(Jordan)~~Jordan stated in the chat that we're talking about the removal without cause, but I would suggest that we mark this topic as an action item for work party 1 to take a look at.

Next in queue is Kavouss. Please?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. Good day to everybody. Thanks to ~~(Josh)~~Josh. That clarified the situation. In the document that is published it is not quite distinctively mentioned we should mention removal of individual board without cause or without reason and removal of individual board with reason and have to clearly explain that.

Now the question is not only this, the question is what was discussed by one of the board members. As soon as a director is designated by a community, let us say for example At Large, that director is no longer serving that particular community; it's serving the entire community. It has a collegial responsibility; therefore, that particular community could not, without cause, legally take that board member from its duty because its reason may be that such board member has not acted in accordance of interest of that particular community.

However, that could be contrary to the fact that the accusations or the statement was not correct because that board has acted in accordance with collegial responsibilities. Therefore, we need to clarify whether initiation of removal of the board members by a particular community designated that is started but the removal requires the collective decision of the entire communities altogether, because we could not say that this board member has not performed the responsibility of what this particular community rather it might have done in the interest of the entire community. This is something which is not clear. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Kavouss. That's well noted, and I had asked for an action item to be noted for Work Party 1 to take another look at that section of the report.

~~(Josh)~~Josh?

~~(Josh Hoffheimer):~~Josh Hoffheimer: Yes I just - I did want to respond to that. Kavouss, I don't think you're representing that correctly. Let me be clear, the board if -- and let's use specific examples -- if the At Large committee appointed a director, certainly that director has a fiduciary duty to ICANN. They can still, in the exercise of that duty, they can still reflect and bring with them the experience, the concerns and the considerations of the committee that appointed them.

But more importantly, even if that board member is doing everything that that board member is supposed to be doing, the At Large committee could remove him without cause -- him or her. They could decide that they don't want to have red haired directors anymore that they appointed and they could simply remove him or her because the person has red hair. And that is their statutory right as a member to remove their director that they select, and it doesn't matter that this person was acting in a way that was - it doesn't matter how they were carrying out their duties.

If the committee that appoints the particular director is not satisfied with the work of that director, they can remove him or her and replace that person with somebody else. This is - the issue of when a larger group can take an action as a collective and can impose their will on the member that selects a director is one that can be taken if there is a for-cause determination. But I just want to be clear; a member can remove the director that it selects at any time for no reason. Full stop.

~~(Sebastian)~~Sebastien Bachollet: Thomas please can you add me to the list? It's
~~(Sebastian)~~Sebastien.

Thomas Rickert: ~~(Sebastian)~~Sebastien, yes. Okay I have to close the queue after Tijani, but there seems to be the need for dwelling on this a little bit longer. So
~~(Sebastian)~~Sebastien I'm going to close the queue after you spoke, so let's move to Tijani then Kavouss and then ~~(Sebastian)~~Sebastien.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, Thomas. I think that the problem is that it's not clear in the report this issue of with reason and without reason. And I think that removal of the board members without reason is already there. We are not adding anything, so we don't have to mention it in our report. It's something which already exists.

But we have to consider of the haste of removal with cause, and removal with cause is right, cannot be the same for board members appointed by the community and board members appointed by the NomCom, is that the trigger of the removal must be done by the whole community, not by the considered (unintelligible). I think this is the way to make this clear, not speak about removal without case because it already exists. It not a new power we are giving. It exists already. And explain about what we have. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much, Tijani. Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I don't think that we could say full stop. It is not full stop. It is one interpretation that the particular community could have - remove its nomination of its board member without cause while that board has acted in accordance with collegial responsibility and in general has acted in accordance with interests of the whole community but not only in the interest of a particular community. So there is another way to do that. It is not full stop. It's still to be discussed. That is one point.

And then if according to ~~(Josh)~~Josh that board member could be removed by that community, so what is the threshold? The 66% is within that particular community or 66% is within the entire community. That is also not clear.
Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you, Kavouss. ~~(Sebastian)~~Sebastien?

~~(Sebastian)~~Sebastien Bachollet: Yes thank you, Thomas. This discussion is very troublesome for me. I - maybe I don't understand the English but you are speaking with an example in present or in past and we want to talk about the future. And I would like very much that you show me where it's possible for a community to recall a board member currently.

Second point, we are becoming (unintelligible) and the board member will be even more because they are asked to be independent from where they were selected from. And I can tell you as a present board member that the number of times I wanted to talk about what At Large wanted to get or wanted to design, and I was called by colleagues to say you don't - you are not the voice the ALAC was serving that I can't count anymore.

My third point is that don't forget that we - the community elects in three years a board member and I don't see why and how in these three years we'll need to have any recall and especially if it can be for any recall. And now I am sorry with the lawyer we talked, but I hope the word was not mine. It is because I have red hair I can be recalled from the board, then we need to close this organization. It's not acceptable.

It appears that in our world today because it's not the red hair but because I am black or because I am woman because I am (unintelligible) or because whatever things, then I hope that ICANN would never go into that direction really. And the full stop is not acceptable either. It's not because you are a lawyer that you can say full stop. We are the community, we are the group and you're talking about, and I have too many questions but this (unintelligible) too much full stop from the lawyers then we need to remove those full stops and to reopen the discussion.

And my last point is that I am - I just want to recall you that we have not - this document it's not in agreement with everybody, it's the best way we thought all together to go to discuss with the community. That is not to say that one solution is better than the other. I will stop here, not a full stop but because it's a question of time, but clearly I think that maybe my experience and I guess I am the only one member of this group who are in the board of ICANN may be taken into account. Thank you very much.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, ~~(Chris)~~Chris. And ~~(Jordan)~~Jordan had raised his hand.

~~(Sebastian)~~Sebastien Bachollet: It was ~~(Sebastian)~~Sebastien; it was not ~~(Chris)~~Chris.

Thomas Rickert: Did I misspeak?

((Crosstalk))

~~(Chris):~~Chris Disspain Not that's a first. ~~(Sebastian):~~Sebastien and ~~(Bertrand):~~Bertrand have been confused together many times but I don't think - it's the first time ~~(Sebastian):~~Sebastien and I have ever been confused.

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: Okay. So thank you very much, ~~(Sebastian):~~Sebastien. ~~(Jordan):~~Jordan has raised his hand and as (repator) for Work Party 1 I would like to give him the floor to maybe make some closing remarks. I think we've - what we can obviously state is that there has been some confusion maybe because of a lack of clarity, and if we can add clarity to the report, that would be most appreciated. But let's hear ~~(Jordan):~~Jordan on this point.

~~(Jordan):~~Jordan Carter: (Unintelligible). It's ~~(Jordan):~~Jordan here everyone. Good morning or afternoon, or whatever it is. Look we can go around the block on this but I think it's clear that we...

Thomas Rickert: Excuse me. Kavouss, can you please mute your line? We can hear you speaking in the background. Thank you. ~~(Jordan):~~Jordan, please continue.

~~(Jordan):~~Jordan Carter: That was somewhat disconcerting. So we do intend for it to be without cause, but the way the report is worded doesn't set that out, so we do need to be clearer about that. There's no issue with the fiduciary problem here. Board members have those. Whoever gets appointed has a fiduciary duty to the corporation.

That isn't going to change, whether there's an explicit power to remove board members or not and the ability for the members to remove their appointed

directors, members or designators without cause gives them the power to deal with any causes that come along. We don't need to litigate whether there's a power already nascent or existent for the SOs and ACs to do that because the whole point of this method is to make sure that it's all clear and explicit and transparent.

So, you know, noting that the issue needs clarifying is helpful. I think that our intent has been clear all the way through internally. We just need to make sure that what we write is also clear externally.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, ~~(Jordan)~~Jordan. ~~(Rosemary)~~Rosemary, I guess you have also made a point in the chat. I'd really like to close the queue on this point, which I've tried twice but now I think we need to move to the next question. And that is the potential addition of webinars.

The - I think the question is twofold. Will we or should we additional webinars. We had two so far, which were quite well attended. And our question to you is whether you thought the webinars were helpful. If you think there's area for improvement, which I'm sure there is, you can have the floor now to voice your concerns or make suggestions, but we can also take that offline as you wish. And also the question whether you would like to have us conduct more webinars.

So can we get some views on that, please? And again for those who are not speaking, please mute your lines. Tijani's hand is up. Tijani, please?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, Thomas. I don't think we need more webinars because people who were interested attended to the ones we did. And as you said, they wanted another caution (unintelligible). They want some portion of expectation but

we didn't see that there is an alternative view or something like this. So I don't think it is helpful to make other webinars. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks, Tijani. That's very helpful. Any more views? Okay so I think that there's no spontaneous feedback on that at the moment. As mentioned, please share your suggestions or concerns on the mailing list or contact us directly if you wish. We will discuss whether we will drop of the idea of additional webinars or maybe hold a webinar on the specialized topic to dwell on the concept of unincorporated associations a little bit more for people to understand that better.

But as a first step we are considering - or we will further work on the Q&A that people can get their questions answered. That will be further populated as we get more questions, and also we're working on some videos that we will share the community for them to better understand.

I don't see any more hands nor do I see any further comments in the chat. So we can move to the third agenda item and the CWG's submission, and for that I'm going to hand over to Mathieu.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you, Thomas. This is Mathieu Weill speaking. Hello, everyone. It's been a long time without CCWG calls. And this particular agenda item is an indication of the closing of the public comment on the second draft proposals from the CWG stewardship.

We, as co-chairs, we have drafted a proposal for a co-chair submission to this process, which ends on May 20, so tomorrow. And we've circulated this draft on the mailing list. We have received a number of comments. The goal here is to ensure clarity both on the groups as well as for the community about how

the two - sets of proposals interact and our interrelated and whether or not we are addressing the expectations from the CWG.

And - so you have seen - you have in the interim the document, the draft in an interesting format, but I would say that so far we've had a comment about the budget aspects. It was noted that there is - there might be a budget gap because the CWG's proposing the creation of a new ICANN subsidiary, the PTI, post-transition IANA, which would probably have its own budget, and there is need for a specific review of this budget, at least as outlined by the CWG.

So currently based on this draft, I've noted the suggestion to note that the CWG would need to develop a proposed process to review the IANA-specific budget, which could be made a component of the bigger review and would still need a little bit of coordination between our two groups. However, I see there's no obstacles and principles to coordinating a proposals from that aspect.

So the point here is to check whether there are any other comments on this draft, and if there are none then we would probably proceed with submitting a comment to the CWG. I see ~~(Sharon)~~Sharon's hand is up. Please, ~~(Sharon)~~Sharon.

~~(Sharon)~~Sharon Flanagan Thank you. On the draft letter just a couple of comments from the CWG perspective. There is a reference I believe it's in the fourth bullet to the CSC the customer standing committee and a reference to that needing to be created under the bylaws.

And there's a note that the requirement is not specifically addressed in the CCWG proposal. It is actually addressed in Section 1.4 on Page 12. So I think

that response can just be tied now to the proposal because I think there is an appropriate response from CCWG on that one.

And then the second point is on the bullet just above that which refers to the IANA function review. There is one aspect of the IANA function review that is referenced in the CWG proposal and is not fully reflected in the CCWG proposal and that is the separation review or separation process.

And that is the possibility that as part of the IANA function review one outcome of that could be a recommendation for an RSP or some kind of a separation.

And that process is being worked on by CWG so it may be that the appropriate thing to reference in this letter is simply that you acknowledged that that is in process and then once CWG has further details on that to advise CCWG in order that CCWG can consider it and ensure that it's appropriate addressed in its proposal. And that's all I had thanks.

~~(Matthew):~~Mathieu Weill: Thank you ~~(Sharon)~~Sharon this is (unintelligible) very useful.
~~(Kabus)~~Kavouss.

~~(Kabus):~~Kavouss Arasteh: Yes ~~(Matthew)~~Mathieu thank you very much. I think that your question is very valid and on the point. But perhaps we could have one general paragraph before doing that as in the following context.

Saying that any review or any decision relating to accountability with regard to the (unintelligible) would be a subset, would be a subset of review and accountability in general.

Therefore we should say that although in the (unintelligible) project or CSC we could have a different explanation but it is understood that the requirement of the CWG is embedded and is part of the general requirement of accountability.

It should be understood for the community these two cases or the one we raise now there might be some other cases. Therefore we should make this clear for the community that the general aspect we address the issue would cover the requirement of the CWG. Thank you.

~~(Matthew):~~Mathieu Weill: Thank you ~~(Kabus)~~Kavouss. We'll try and find a way to address this but we need to make sure we don't over step into territories that we haven't discussed yet. So I would try to keep our submission as close as possible as our existing report but I understand the idea which is basically our system is going to be flexible to your expectations if they move in the future and that's (unintelligible).

Is there any comments? If not then I would ask for an action item to be added for the co-chairs to take this input into account and then submit the comment into the public forum, comment forum on the CWG. So we will do that by tomorrow.

And that will close our item number three on our agenda and I'm moving to item number four which is the planning for the analysis of our own public comment period.

And I will rely on ~~(Adam)~~Adam who has worked out a couple of details about the process right after our public comment period closes. ~~(Adam)~~Adam could you provide us with some of this short updates about what to expect after June 3?

~~(Adam)~~:Adam Peake: Yes can you hear me ~~(Adam)~~Adam speaking?

~~(Matthew)~~:Mathieu Weill: Yes.

~~(Adam)~~:Adam Peake: So (unintelligible) end of the public comment on June 3 we will have just about two weeks until we meet in Buenos Aires on the 19th. And this is of course including some travel days for all of us so we do not have very much time.

So when the comment come in on June 3 and this is actually something that we will do on a rolling basis as the comments come in now and I note that to date we have three comments.

That we will be populating the public comment review team which is a common tool that many of you will be familiar with. (Unintelligible) actually sent notes about this CCWG list on (March) 24 and so you'll be able to find those in the archives (unintelligible) archives.

We've suggested that we should break this review down into 14 parts. This will reflect the 13 question areas that we describe in the proposal and then a actual segment for any other issues and this will be a task for staff to populate.

It basically means that all of the comments are reviewed and put into the subsections so that the rest of the CCWG team members can see what is being presented and is in those different public areas.

Then as I said that is an ongoing task that will be playing out to make sure that we don't just wait right until the very end, excuse me. But it's worth noting that comments do come in very much towards the end of the comment period.

As ~~(Matthew)~~Mathieu noted there is only a day or so left for the CWG and they have less than ten comments at the moment. Their first public comment period had 49 comments so I think we're really looking at some backend things really do come in towards the end of these processes.

So it will be a lot of work in a short period of time. We will try and get the review available to you, this review format available to you and the working parties by June 6. So we'll have two or three days to get those comments together.

And after that it is the responsibility I think as the chairs have agreed and that the working parties will do the review of those comments and start looking at how the proposals have been agreed.

Whether it looks to be consensus and where there is less consensus on those issues and of course staff support will be available to the working parties and however it is that you wish to divide up the work and we will look forward to reviewing that together on June 19.

I think that's enough from me ~~(Matthew)~~Mathieu. Is there any questions or (unintelligible)?

~~(Matthew)~~Mathieu Weill: Thanks ~~(Adam)~~Adam, your sound was fading in and out so I think I will just from what I understand and I have the privilege of having had a preview of that obviously.

There is going to be populating of the comments into the public comment review tool according to the various sections of the report to facilitate analysis by the working parties.

Staff will populate the input by June 7 and so the amount of time we have to prepare for our face-to-face meeting on June 19 will be over about ten days between June 7 and June 16.

The proposal here is that we allocate the various sections to the working parties so most of the work of analysis will be done at working party level and basically three days before the face-to-face meeting in Buenos Aires we'll freeze the outcome.

So the working parties will have until June 16 to provide their analysis. And the goal we will have is to assess whether - which part of the report the community is in general agreement on, which part of the report the community has (unintelligible) view on or which parts of the report are we hearing concerns.

And at least knocking out those items so that we can move forward and ~~(Thomas)~~Thomas will come later on to what moving forward means. So in terms of logistics that means that we are going to turn to the work party rapporteurs to plan ahead for this crunch time.

And there will probably be a need to accommodate some intense work which might spread across the weekend of June 13 and 14. So we would suggest an action item and of course we'll take the discussion, we'll open the discussion.

But the action item suggested would be for rapporteurs to start planning their meetings and of course staff to start populating the public comment tool as comment arrive.

And with that I will - this is the time for discussing about this plan. So Avri you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you this is Avri speaking. I'm a little concerned about this particular process. Once the working parties finish their work and the work was invested into the entire CCWG it sort of became the CCWG's product.

I think that at the very least there should be a walk-through of all the issues with the entire group before parsing them out so that the initial view of the entire membership can be dealt with before the working parties start to take it up so that they are not starting from just a work party perspective but they're taking the comments plus the overall CCWG initial reactions as their input material.

So I don't know how others feel about that but I'm really concerned about sending it immediately to committee without the full working group having had at least one pass in conversation over it, thanks.

~~(Matthew):~~Mathieu Weill: Thanks Avri, ~~(Kabus):~~Kavouss you are next.

~~(Kabus):~~Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I fully support Avri's proposal thank you.

~~(Matthew):~~Mathieu Weill: Okay so I suppose if moving, taking this into account would mean we set up a dedicated call probably on 6 or 7 June, probably 7 June to have an initial pass through the whole set of comments.

We can try and arrange this. I'm seeing no hand up so we would take that on board and I am seeing no other comments. I would suggest that we start planning as proposed and move to the next item of our agenda.

And which is the organization towards Buenos Aires and beyond and probably starting with ~~(Leon):~~Leon about the legal section, ~~(Leon):~~Leon.

~~(Leon Sanchez):~~Leon Sanchez: Yes ~~(Matthew)~~Mathieu thank you very much this is ~~(Leon Sanchez)~~Leon Sanchez. And (unintelligible) the legal sub-team we have felt that it is important that we reorganize how the legal sub-team is working at this stage.

As you may recall the legal sub-team was constituted with three main objectives being the first one to interview and select candidate law firms that would interact and provide the independent legal advice required by the CCWG.

The second being drafting the scope and document that could serve as initial guidance for interaction with our legal advisers.

And the third one being to gather and coordinate the different questions raised not only within the list but also in our calls of the CCWG. So we could then in turn assign them to lawyers for in order to get the right answers from them. So as we come to the public comment period and we look to - into a little bit into the future of what we need to be doing in order to have a finalized proposal it seems evident there needs to be a more agile way for interaction between the lawyers and the working parties, which are actually with, which is where it is actually where things are happening and are happening really fast.

So this restructuring or this reorganization of the legal sub-team would require that now the lawyers would be interacting more directly with the working parties.

So the working parties of course would be able to require attendance from the lawyers to their particular calls. And there will also be a task for the legal sub-team.

It is not disappearing but it's rather maybe being a little bit less active. And the legal sub-team will continue to gather those questions that are raised on the main list and in our calls from the CWG at large.

And we'll of course continue to assign those questions that are raised in the general list or in the general CCWG calls. But so far there would be of course less need for the legal sub-team to gather and hold calls on a weekly basis as we were doing it.

And this might be something that we need to review and maybe we would be shifting to a call once every two weeks or maybe even more if it's required of course.

But what I mean is that we must definitely shift the way that the (unintelligible) is working and the lawyers would - will begin to work in a more closed way through working parties.

So of course I would like to thank all of the participants from the legal sub-team for the great work that has been done. I think that the initial mission that the legal sub-team was tasked with has been accomplished and of course as I said it's a wonderful job that I think the legal sub-team has performed.

And we would like to thank you for that and of course look forward to continue the work of the legal sub-team under this new vision with a more agile interaction with the lawyers of course.

So with that I would like to of course open the floor for any comments or suggestions with regards to this new way of function for the legal sub-team. I see Kavouss' (~~Kabus~~) hand is raised so (~~Kabus~~)Kavouss could you please take the floor?

~~(Kabus)~~:Kavouss Arasteh: Yes hello (~~Leon~~)Leon good day. I don't have any comment with respect to this new matter of work but there are some principle questions and now before us with the way that we discussed with some others with (unintelligible).

The question is that the way this unincorporated association function is it possible that one single community let us say one SO. In case that we go to the natural person to which it's chair and vice chair establish that unincorporated association without participation of any other SO does that unincorporated association have any power to take any action whatsoever as it is in our document?

The second way would be instead of not your person we talk of legal entities. In that case for the unincorporated association we need minimum two SO or one SO while one AC.

Does that (two) also have the power to act, to do some of those things for the (unintelligible) of the entire board member if there is no other membership? Therefore it is necessary to clarify the minimum requirement that such unincorporated association is valid.

A minimum number of participants either of these member from the viewpoint of legal entity or member from the viewpoint of natural person.

And the last question is that what is the advantage and disadvantage of legal entity and natural person in regard with that unincorporated association is there any deficiency in the natural person with regard to the legal entity with the example that they have given chair and vice chair could establish that and could act or could not act on behalf of the whole thing.

So there are this legal point which is not clear yet, thank you.

~~(Leon-Sanchez):~~Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much ~~(Kabus)~~Kavouss. I will definitely defer the answer to this question so we can put them on assignment for the lawyers to provide of course the right answers to your questions.

So I am taking note of those questions that you have raised at this stage and will of course assign them to the lawyers and will have an answer I believe pretty soon for those questions ~~(Kabus)~~Kavouss thank you very much.

And I don't know if anyone else wants to comment on this new way of functions for the legal sub-team. Okay I see no one raising their hand. So I would now like to turn to ~~(Thomas)~~Thomas for the level of detail expected on the work that we should be doing forward. So ~~(Thomas)~~Thomas could you please take the floor?

~~(Thomas):~~Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much ~~(Leon)~~Leon. In this section of the call we would like to discuss with you how we jointly manage our journey from Buenos Aires to consensus recommendations.

You will note, will have noted by now that what we're dealing with is quite a huge exercise. So far what we've done is we've done two readings on important questions but we have not done any consensus forming.

Certainly the two hearings were aiming at lowering the risk of the whole group being, having divergent views or divergent view on individual subjects. So we wanted to make sure that we're moving into the right direction by having these two readings.

But after Buenos Aires after we have had full community input we will need to make up our minds as to how we formulate or transform our suggestions into consensus recommendations.

And I guess that's the ultimate goal, you know, we're all here to form a proposal that is cohesive and comprehensive and that is based on consensus in the CCWG and will very likely be approved by the chartering organization.

Also if you will remember that we discussed in Istanbul that we would try to work from high level recommendations to a greater level of detail as time permits and I guess that this general idea still stands.

So we should aim at providing as much detail as feasible to facilitate an implementation at a later stage. Can we move to the next slide please? Actually I do slide control I guess so I can do it myself.

So we would like to suggest to you that we follow the methodology that I'm going to outline to you in the next few minutes. What we're working on is a set of recommendations.

So we have different community powers that have different escalation paths, we have language to be worked on for the bylaws; we have assignments to be made to the IRP and to the reconsideration process.

We need to talk about a legal vehicle for these powers potentially the unincorporated association but maybe another form depending on how our deliberations evolved.

So we think it will be very cumbersome for everyone to follow the discussion if we keep discussing and then in the very last minute say okay guys who agrees to this and who objects and by that determining consensus.

So we think the way to go about with this highly complex project is to try to take stock of several bits of our work. So we would take individual items and try to confirm consensus on the suggestions that we had in our report and not wait until the last minute for the whole package to be adopted by the group.

The risk of failure again is higher if we wait until the very last minute. So and then as a second idea we would suggest that we try to reach consensus on the higher level recommendations first and then move to greater detail as time permits.

And that would basically transform into the phases that you see on the slide in the Adobe room. So what we have now in our report are merely suggestions that's what we would call phase one.

We've come up with suggestions, we've come up with some alternative suggestions for some questions and these we need to transform into consensus recommendations.

So again what we have in the report, the level of detail we have in the report would be suggestions that could become consensus recommendations. And on these recommendations we will further work to the best extent possible in

terms of timing and also in terms of need actually work on more detail and make them refined recommendations.

And ideally we would seek or get consensus on the refined recommendations as well. The next phase then would be that we complete our overall proposal and that would consist of consensus recommendations on all the suggestions that we're making.

And these consensus recommendations could either be the consensus recommendations more or less as we have presented them to the community or refined recommendations with a greater level of detail.

And after that after we've done that, you know, so we've omitted all the steps like approved by the chartering organization and by the board and ultimately by NTIA but for our group or for the community, you know, we are representing the community if you (unintelligible).

We need to consider implementation of oversight because in a project with such complexity as this one we can't just make recommendations, send them over to the board and walk away.

So we need to make sure that there is consistency and to make sure that the implementation that is later being done or the wordsmithing or the details that are surely missing are being developed in the spirit of the CCWG deliberations.

So if you take these phases what does that mean in complete terms for the outcome of the public comment period? We can think of three different scenarios which ~~(Matthew)~~[Mathieu](#) has briefly touched upon in the earlier section of this call.

So we might hopefully have a lot of areas where the community agrees with our suggestions. And the suggestions for this Section 1 I mean where we don't have alternatives but where we made a suggestion that okay community do you like this.

Then we've asked the community to chime in on alternative proposals. And the community will provide feedback on those but different to Section 1 because in Section 1 we only had one alternative as a suggestion and Section number 2 we're providing different alternatives as a response to a particular challenge, policy challenge let's say.

And the third area that can happen is that the community disagrees with suggestions that were made and are these three areas - will trigger different ways forward or they require different ways forward.

Let's go through them one by one briefly. Now the first incident that I mentioned was where the community agrees with our suggestions i.e. where there were no alternatives presented to the community.

Our suggestion is that for these areas we would try to confirm the suggestion as a consensus recommendation. So we will do sort of like a mini consensus call on these individual items to be able to take them off the list and confirm them as part of the bigger consensus picture.

The second area you will remember is where we presented alternatives to the community and for that for these cases let's try to transform the community feedback that we get into the consensus recommendation on one alternative.

Now I've added in brackets that there might be the need to work on yet another suggestion in case the community did not think that alternative A and B let's say were good ones but if the community came up with option C that we (unintelligible).

Then we would need to work on that more and then we would try to form consensus on this further evolved alternative.

Third area and I hope that we're not going to see many of these is where the community demonstrates substantial disagreement with our suggestions. And that basically takes us back to square one for these areas and we need to develop the new suggestion that can hopefully find our groups consensus.

So if you will note that we have different levels of complexity for all these three areas. The first one is quite easy, the second one might be a little bit more complex and the third one is the most challenging one.

So this slide I presented to you earlier. So just as a reminder we would have the phases where we have suggestions the phase that we're in now. We would hopefully then have consensus recommendations.

We would have consensus on refined recommendations which have more details as time permits. We have the completion phase where we put all the consensus recommendations into one document and make that our proposal and then we would have implementation oversight.

And now that we have to allocate resources to deal with all this post Buenos Aires we suggest that we make it our highest priority to get all the suggestions in our report to phase two status, phase two being consensus. The second priority would be to get as many of these to phase three, i.e., make them

refined consensus recommendations because the more (leader) we have, the lesser will be the burden (and faced) in phase five which is going to be the implementation over time.

So as we go through the report, and Avri has made the great suggestion that we should digest the feedback that we got in the dedicated session which we're going to hold, awfully will get to a point where we, as a group, agree which suggestions have matured sufficiently so that we can take them to the phase two status, i.e., make them consensus recommendation so that those basically can be picked after this for priority one.

And then we would allocate small sub teams that more or less work in sprints to get the work done, so to get as many of these proposals to phase number three, i.e., the refined consensus recommendation.

And we would use the existing work party structure, work party one and work party two, with our (unintelligible) so it would basically be allocated under the auspices of the work parties but we might have smaller, specialized teams that can work on the individual subjects in parallel and more or less organize their work themselves.

And that would allow for us to have an iterative consensus building. It will help spread the workload more evenly in the weeks to come. Again, we would go from higher level of agreement to greater level of granularity.

In all cases, what we provide should be sufficient for implementation, so it should be sufficient, the starting point to get the implementation done. But we shouldn't be afraid of leaving blind spots in our report when it comes to (unintelligible) because we will have community oversight that is going to help with this.

And with that, I've finished my brief overview of what we think would be an appropriate way forward, but we would certainly like to hear your feedback since this is something that we should more or less all buy into.

Kavouss~~(Caboot~~, please).

~~(Caboot)~~:Kavouss Arasteh: Thank you very much for your very substantive and comprehensive (report). Did you discuss it with other people in the CCWG or is it just views from the co-chairs? It is very - at least at this stage, very (general) and I would say little bit complex, a little bit complex.

We need to have a very clear idea, one, objectives of what you said, two, the (flavor), three, the timing, and four, when you say recommendation, you refer to recommendation that CCWG with send to the board.

And that should go as we adopted within the timeline that we have already established. I understood that after the first public comment, we will insert or consolidate a comment into another proposal which have all the details and so on.

And then with the proposal go into any public comment or the proposal would not go to any public comment? Question one. Question two, you're going to translate the whole report with the views you have received comments into a more concise and simpler document having very, very broad and general recommendations of two categories - high-level recommendations and other level, whether they are medium or low, I don't know.

And then for each of which you try to build up consensus, so this, at least for me, is not clear the way they are going to work. Perhaps we need a little bit more information, the course of action they propose that we will reflect on

that and possibly, if you wish, we could comment. If you don't want to comment, that is your idea. Thank you.

~~(Thomas):~~Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much, ~~(Caboot)~~Kavouss. You mentioned a couple of points. Let me try to address those. First of all, this approach has been discussed, not only by the co-chairs, but also including the (reporters).

So we tried - during our preparation for this call, we thought of how to best navigate our work, how to best navigate our group in the next couple of weeks. And we do have the feeling that we want to facilitate things, not make them more complex.

And ideally, at the end of the day, the community would just get one report with a set of recommendations and they wouldn't even notice how we got there. So this is a more internal way of approaching things.

The idea, to put it in very simple terms, is to divide the overall package of recommendations into smaller bits and reach agreement on those bits. And our goal should be that we have consensus on the higher level ideas for the individual items for all of the areas and only work to a greater level of detail if time permits.

By doing that, we avoid the risk of trying to drill down to agree level of detail and not going anywhere because we need to be conscious of time. At the same time, we need to make sure that our group, the individuals that are putting volunteer time into this effort, are actually putting their time on to those areas, on to those questions that need to be answered most urgently.

And therefore, our proposal is let's try to mature all the areas of work (maybe) the community (powers), (maybe) the mechanisms to a level where we have

consensus on the higher level recommendations and only if time permits, drill down into further level of detail.

I hope that this answers it so it's not a - not meant to be an approach to complicate things that rather to make things easier. And this general idea certainly will need to transform into an overview of the different work areas their completion status.

We have something like that already. We had, for different purpose, to monitor which questions have undergone first meeting and second meeting so we will be able to easily adopt such overview to monitor the status starting in Buenos Aries. ~~(Caboot)~~Kavouss?

~~(Caboot)~~Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, your idea is very, very constructive and I think it is a positive. But the only thing is, could you provide some examples either now or immediately by sometime tomorrow, the (day after) tomorrow, just one or two examples of the very good in positive course of action you propose not to get into the (piaget), in French, or the problem going into too much details. Thank you.

~~(Thomas)~~Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, ~~(Caboot)~~Kavouss. Let me try to give you an example actually. You will remember that we have the community power to veto or reject a strategic plan or a budget.

So we have an escalation path described in the report. We have some rationale described in the report. We have mechanisms to avoid (unintelligible) actions by the community against the budget. So one may be of the opinion or a group may be of the opinion that this has sufficient detail to be implemented.

And so the idea under this concept would be if the community doesn't have any major objections with this proposal that we would take what we have in our report, in its current form, in our draft report, we take that section, speaking to the vetoing or rejection of the budget strategic plan or operating plan, and say, okay, does the group accept this as a consensus recommendation?

And if the group does, then we would tick that off the list, market is a community - as a consensus recommendation and (park) it's until such time that we would have resources available to work on a greater level of granularity to deal with that, i.e., to work on language for the bylaws that would - in trying this, offer to flesh out the concrete process between the boards, the community and the new community's group such as the unincorporated (ascertainment).

So that would be an easy case. Let's say for section number two, where we have alternatives, we ask the community when it comes to recording individual board members, that we have alternatives for dealing with NomCom (reportees).

So we asked the community, would you like that to be dealt with by the current NomCom or by special NomCom existing - former NomCom members?

And so we have asked the community to provide feedback on alternatives so there is no one solution that has been offered to the community. And in such a case, we are going to analyze what the community has responded and let's say the community has chimed in and said, "The current NomCom should be dealing with these cases."

Then we could bring this in front of our group or a sub team in the work party two to further digest the public comments, see whether it's supported or not, transform these two alternatives in one suggestion, bring them in front of the group and then we can have a mini consensus call on that specific recommendation.

That would be the second area. And where we have convergence, let's say, we have favored the submitter model and the membership model. Let's say the community came up with a completely different model that nobody of us, including our outside counsel, has ever thought of.

That we would need to go back to square one and have a sub team work on a completely new approach for that. So these are the three scenarios that we could think of. And we - and in terms of workload, we would try to get consensus recommendations for all areas concerned.

So we would try to deal with that as a priority matter in our call. And where there are alternatives, we would have some teams in work party one or work party two work on those and once they have come up with a suggestion that they think could be a consensus recommendation, they would bring it in front of the whole group.

And if we have reached this consensus on all areas, we would be good to go to work on a greater level of detail and (task) sub teams to work on greater granularity. And that is something we would need to balance and carefully manage our resources to ensure that we focus on the most important things first. Any further comments or objections, support?

So there doesn't seem to be - they don't seem to be any further interventions from this group. Let me just test whether there are any objections to this approach. ~~(Steve)~~Steve's hand is a. ~~(Steve)~~Steve, please.

~~(Steve)~~Steve DelBianco: Thank you, ~~(Thomas)~~Thomas. No objection. Something I said in the chat is that I think it's highly likely that one of the outcomes of the public comment period will be questions where someone will seek clarity about a proposal that we've described.

And our answer to their question may take us into somewhat new direction. It may, in some cases, cause us, in our clarification, to have to debate and decide upon something that we hadn't yet worked out.

So I understand the outcome of the PC which you have in Slide 5 is about suggestions, input and disagreement. But I think we're more likely to see confusion and questions and we ought to acknowledge that and be sure that we've answered it.

The FAQ is a good start but we may find that a big chunk of our resources are answering questions as opposed to translating this agreement or input. Thank you.

~~(Thomas)~~Thomas Rickert: Thanks, ~~(Steve)~~Steve. That's a good point. I think we need to take this back to the - to our debrief call with co-chairs and (reporters), how we best we've that into the overall workflow. It is my understanding that we would build up a Q&A on a continuous basis. So I think the action would go more or less in parallel. ~~(Caboot)~~Kavouss?

~~(Caboot)~~Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I don't think that the comments made by ~~(Steve)~~Steve have any inconsistencies with what you propose. Would you propose is still valid

because what we're doing now - you do the (thing) - step wise course of action.

And I think it is a good way to do that. Once we receive any questions from the community and the way we answer, it still does not change the way that you have proposed. So I think that you could still go ahead with the course of action they you have outlined. Thank you.

~~(Thomas):~~Thomas Rickert: Thanks, ~~(Caboot)~~Kavouss. That's helpful. Sebastian. Sebastian, we can't hear you. Sebastian, you might be talking to a muted microphone.

Sebastian Bachollet: I'm sorry, ~~(Thomas)~~Thomas. I was not talking to a muted microphone. I was struggling with my phone to be able to unmute myself. I'm sorry about that.

~~(Thomas):~~Thomas Rickert: No worries.

Sebastian Bachollet: Sebastian Bachollet for the record. Maybe it's not the right place to say this but I feel very much like we need to be sure that we go from an expert discussion to a real large, I would say, at-large discussion.

It's very tough to have inputs to that because it's a very complex issue and I hope that we will be able, during Buenos Aires, not to come just with what we think but to try to have input at least of the (unintelligible) of Buenos Aires to give us their feedback.

And (unintelligible) where one (unintelligible) where one is (for a year or two) and then that's very (just good for) I would say our normal (document). And as much as we can do - change that discussion from expert to normal people, I would say, (of which will be great). Thank you very much.

~~(Thomas):~~Thomas Rickert: Thank you, Sebastian, but let me ask a follow-up question. Are you okay with the principal of slicing the workload into smaller portions that we try to seek consensus on?

Sebastian Bachollet: I'm (okay) with your proposal, ~~(Thomas)~~Thomas. I was just referring to when we want inputs; we know that the comments period is one way to get them. I hope that (demonstrations) could be another way to get them by talking with community, by talking with the (occupants) because it's another way that is difficult to capture what we need to say because it's (by) people but it's a very important way to have input - another way of input.

We are struggling with public comments (each year) and we never solve it and we will not solve it for our group now. But let's try to have another way of input and take them into account. That's one - your proposal, it's fine with me. Thank you.

~~(Thomas):~~Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Sebastian. Yes, I mean, your concerns are well heard. We'll take that back and further think about it. But it's good to hear confirmation that you also like the idea of making smaller portions of our work.

The - unless there are more comments on this approach, I would suggest that we close this agenda item and move to AOB, which actually didn't find in the agenda but that doesn't make it disappear.

And there was one point for AOB that we wanted to bring up and that is the recent hearing - are actually the recent hearings in congress and the US where Steve DelBianco has testified and we thought that it might be worthwhile for

the whole group to get a firsthand report from the man himself, from Steve.
So, Steve, could you please take the floor?

Steve DelBianco: I can do that, (~~Thomas~~)Thomas. It only takes a moment. I know it's quite late for many. Last Wednesday, 13th of May, two US congressional committees held separate hearings on the IANA transition and ICANN's general accountability.

This is the fifth hearing since the transition announcement last March. And both of these hearings were held by committees that also held hearings last April.

And I can tell you that things have come a long way since last April, both in terms of what we've accomplished as well as, I think, toned it down the rhetoric between congress and the administration.

As one bit of background, many in congress from both parties were very frustrated that they hadn't been consulted as they felt they should have been consulted and the administration made the decision to terminate the NTIA custody of the IANA contract.

So initially there was a lot of frustration and that surfaced last year. But it was much more constructive hearing that was held in congress last Wednesday. It was a five hour total testimony.

The first panel in the judiciary committee used its jurisdiction over intellectual property and consumer protection to put eight witnesses often talked about a variety of ways in which operational, ability at ICANN is perhaps not as good as it should be.

They started with (unintelligible) policies. Bless you. There was a discussion of (dot) Amazon, online pharmacy, registrar accreditation agreement and rights protection mechanisms.

When a hearing like that comes together, we often have individuals who focus in on complaints that they have and look to congress to use some leverage to help remedy their complaints.

I'm happy to say that many people focused on the fact that this group, this CCWG and the CWG, has come up with proposals to give the community a greater amount of power in question decisions and in action on the part of management and the board and that those are constructive ways that the community could, in the future, prevent some of the lack of operational accountability that we - we're hearing complaints about on Wednesday.

At the second hearing in the commerce committee, and I pasted a chat - a link to that in the chat, this was the committee that has jurisdiction over the US Commerce Department and that's where NTIA lives.

And they were much more focused on the transition. They wanted to understand what progress has been made towards meeting NTIA's criteria for the transition. And they were also very vocal about their own criteria.

This committee is also concerned that there might be national security implications for US agencies like Dot Mil and Dot Gov. I realize that nearly every country has a mil and a gov, but most of them - I should say all of them live at the second level of a country code, whereas for the US of A, mil and gov live at the roots.

And that, as I said to the community, is a happy accident of having (invented) that aspect of the DNS, but mil and gov are in the roots and this committee wanted to understand for sure that those would remain permanently under the custody of the departments of the government that have them today.

There was also an office in Washington called the Government Accountability Office and we very rarely interact with the GAO, as it's called. But a year ago, this Commerce Committee chair decided to unless the GAO at analyzing several risks and implications of the transition.

You may recall that the co-chairs and others on this CCWG have been invited over the past several months to meet with GAO and they asked some very probing questions and they are well along with getting their report done.

One element in the Congress Committee was this notion that the GAO with study all the proposals they came out of the CWG and CCWG and then take up to a year to come back with input to congress.

Net Choice, speaking for my group, we completely discouraged that approach. We said instead, GAO, we've been working on this for several months, ought to weigh in now over the next month on what concerns they might have with risks and implications of the transition so that we can take them into account as of their public comments from interested parties.

I actually think we've got quite a bit of traction from that and the other witnesses on that panel, many of whom are involved here on the work that we do - (Matthew Shears), from CDC for a fellow witness on the second panel, and pushed hard on the exact same thing.

~~(Jonathan Zuckoek)~~ was a witness on the first panel. Phil Corwin, as well. Steve Metalitz - these are a lot of folks that you know and they also hammered home the idea that we don't want to second-guess the transition proposal but if congress has concerns, they ought to surface them now.

I think that it's also worth noting that with 13 total witnesses, when they were pressed, not a single one said that the transition of the IANA contract should be stopped or blocked but all are unified at backing up a request that I made.

I said to congress to give your input now and the biggest help that congress could be is to insist that NCIA require ICANN to accept and implement the community's proposals before they transition the IANA contract.

As ~~(Thomas)Thomas~~ described in the slide, we implement with oversight. Well that was embraced as an idea by both committees. And I think it made it obvious that September of this year, September 2015, is a little too soon for us to ensure that all that is done prior to the contract.

So then the final part of the discussion turned to well, how long is long enough? I offered my own estimate - as early as next April and perhaps as late as late next summer, and that was picking up on the CCWG's timeline.

So that's a summary. I hope that that gives you some sense. You can watch the video on the link I sent you or you can even read the testimony - the written testimony submitted that was submitted by (a witness). Thank you, ~~(Thomas)Thomas~~.

~~(Thomas)Thomas Rickert~~: Thank you very much, Steve. That's very helpful indeed. ~~(Caboot)Kavouss~~ has raised his hand. ~~(Caboot)Kavouss~~, please.

~~(Caboot)~~Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, it was very helpful but in addition to the video that Steve told us to watch, there wasn't any description of what was discussed and would it be possible that we have something, if possible, in a more written form because of very important interesting question that was raised - that is one.

Two, I had today I think two CCWG calls, some legal question and ~~(Leon)~~Leon kindly took note of that. And he promised that he would come back to that. We still are waiting that either publicly in the CCWG call, or in the (unintelligible) or in any other way.

I would have replied to those questions. And the third issue was requested that I raise and followed by ~~(Manal)~~ that the GAC is intended to have a meeting with the CCWG and CWG co-chairs possibly and then in that meeting, there is a necessity that we have - I call it a legal counsel being with us and we need to have a (conversation) whether that is considered and whether the legal counsel, they may be available in that GAC meeting to reply to questions which would be raised by the GAC members. Thank you.

~~(Thomas)~~Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much, ~~(Caboot)~~Kavouss. Steve, would you like to answer?

Steve DelBianco: Only on the written part, ~~(Caboot)~~Kavouss. The two links that I put in the chat, and I'd be happy to email them, contain the written testimony of all 13 of the witnesses. It should also contain opening statements through the chairs.

The videos are where you would learn what was said in the question and answer. The transcripts will be provided but they will be a few weeks until they are ready. So I hope that that gives you a start. As to the rest of your question, I leave it to the chairs.

~~(Thomas):~~Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Steve, and ~~(Caboot):~~Kavouss, with respect to the second point that you mentioned, i.e., questions from the GAC, we have reached out to ~~(Thomas):~~Thomas as GAC chair to offer him a Q&A session where we would answer questions that the GAC might have. So that point has been picked up.

A response is pending but I trust that you also make sure that there is communication between the GAC and our group and that we're hopefully having such a session in the very near future.

So I don't see any further hands raised. And with that, I would like to hand it over for - to ~~(Matthew):~~Mathieu for closing remarks. And I think that we can end this call early. What you think, ~~(Matthew):~~Mathieu?

~~(Matthew):~~Mathieu Weill: Well, unless my closing remarks take too long, obviously we should be able to close early. I have two closing remarks, please, on this call. The first one is a reminder that we are in a public comment period and we need to keep listening.

We need to keep engaging, for instance, with the GAC but obviously with all communities and even outside of the ICANN community. And there's something I'd like to stress - is pleased to report on your engagement efforts to the CCWG. It is very valuable for everyone if we can share back just like Steve did, the experience of presenting the CCWG interim report to our respective communities and what are the kind of questions we get?

What are the types of concerns we get? That's extremely useful and important. So please do report. And it has to be a dialogue that's going to be helpful because we shouldn't have - we should have as little surprises as possible in the comments we will receive.

And hopefully there will be as little as possible comments that are actually misinformed or have not read the report correctly. So that's very important. Second closing remark is, as you have noticed, this call was - we spent a significant amount of time on preparing the next steps.

It's also valuable that you take a little bit of your time and think about it as well because this is really a planning investment and it will pay back at least ten times if we are well prepared before the next crunch time.

You will remember that it's not comfortable to be in a crunch time and feeling that urgency leading everything. So now is the time when we can actually avoid this feeling in the future. So please contribute to that as well. And I think that's going to be all for now.

And I am already looking forward to our next call next week and for the various reports of your engagement sessions. And thank you for your participation today. Have a good night for some of you. Have a good day for others. And talk to you very soon. By everyone.

END