

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
June 30, 2015
1:00 am CT**

Operator: The recordings have started. (Please proceed).

Leon Sanchez: (Thank you), operator. Take a very much. Welcome everyone to the CCWG on (unintelligible) the call number 38 of 30 June of 2015. Mathieu will be joining us in just five or ten minutes at the most. He (unintelligible) that's as far as I can tell.

Thomas Rickert is on leave. He has apologized for not attending this call. And my name is Leon Sanchez. I will be leading this call. And, as usual, we will be the roll call on the Adobe Connect in attendance.

And also if we have someone that is on the phone at this stage that is not already in the Adobe Connect room, so please just say your name so we can add your name to the roll call.

Roelof Meijer: Leon, this is Roelof Meijer. I am joining through the telephone line.

((Crosstalk))

Alice Munyua: And this is Alice Munyua also joining to the telephone.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Roelof. I'm sorry, who was that last one person?

Alice Munyua: Alice Munyua also joining to the telephone.

Leon Sanchez: Excellent. Staff, please note that Roelof Meijer is joining us through the phone bridge and Alice Munyua as well. So with that, a reminder, on business interest if there is anyone who haven't filled in their (messages) so far, please do so.

As usual, if you have any problems are you haven't created the Wiki – a Wiki to account for a user, staff will be glad to assist you on doing that. And I see that Kavouss has contributed a series of comments on the chat box and we have (his country), so Kavouss, could you please take the floor and I will kindly ask you to give a short since we have very little time for this call.
Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: I will be kindly mindful because we have limited time. We do not want to view the SOAC models and the SOAC designator model. We know that since two models, there have been hundreds of pages of explanations and I don't understand what does it mean that the lawyers give you a review on what that - we have to look at what was the difficulty in terms of (unintelligible).

The difficulty was membership. (Unintelligible) and if you want, so we have to see what we can do for these countries. We still want to review - should not be more than ten days, ten minutes, sorry - not more than ten minutes.

We know what is the problem so have to solve the problem. I have provided the agenda earlier in a compromise fashion. I have given you the situation and we have to find out if this is workable.

We have less than two weeks (in the country) and we don't want to review and review and review. So please, can you be considerate, the maximum ten minutes and give us the problem of the membership.

Thank you. Taking all this, (unintelligible) association (unintelligible) the other problems. And I have put in the chat that there are still other problems that we have. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you, Kavouss. As I said on the chat box, we're not reviewing the models in this call. It is only a follow-up to the action items that we had in our list from Buenos Aires. It was just a reference to the work that is being done and that should be done before our (Paris meeting).

So you can see in the agenda but it's not happening in this call. I hope this is clear enough and we can proceed and continue with our call. So in review of the action items from Buenos Aires and going to agenda item number two, we have tasked the lawyers, the (outer) counsel.

We review of the (unintelligible) OAC membership model and the (unintelligible) model in order to inform us for our discussions in Paris. So as I said earlier, lawyers are looking into this. We're not discussing that on this call.

We'll just let you know that this is happening and that we will be having a thorough discussion in Paris. So we can flesh out the details as suggested by Kavouss in different aspects such as the IRP and the many implications which

the different models might have depending on which model we choose to go as a group.

So the second action item is to take into account the (drafted) constraints and timeline and the requirements for minimal changes. A work party will be constituted to address the emerging issues outlined in the discussion starting to take place.

So I believe, then, the email that was sent to you previous to our call, that was working party three - a working party three draft document and I believe that we already have some volunteers in place to form this working party three.

For starters, I, as co-chair, would be volunteering, of course, to take part of this working party. And I remember I have some comments from Alan Greenberg as to volunteering for this working party as well.

So I would like to, of course, call for volunteers to form this working party. And we can proceed to continue. We'll also - the action item on the (reference) to organize work under working parties and of course, the agents have met for a discussion and they are not dependent to the model discussion.

This means that we're looking, of course, to those areas in which we are not dependent of any model that we choose to go with. And that can proceed so we can, of course, advance on the work (and discuss) regardless of the model which is (in scope).

I believe that Kavouss is asking what are the emerging issues? We do have some emerging issues. It's in the mail that we sent previous to the call. You can see it in the documents that were attached.

There was a list of emerging issues and they would kindly ask you to review those emerging issues. Also I remember that Mathieu (percolated) a couple of (charter) papers for discussion on these emerging issues so I would kindly suggest that you take a look at these documents.

And we'll have the co-chairs to coordinate with ICT and (CLDT) to prepare our reply to the NCIA letter. We will be addressing these and any other business. We do have a draft already. We discussed with the group in our last meeting in Buenos Aires.

We asked you for a discussion and you kindly gave us that discussion to draft this letter, so we have got the letter and we will be sharing it with you as a draft so we can have a look at what we've come up with as our reply to the NCIA letter.

In the bylaws drafting process, we need to discuss this on the list, and so these are the next steps before our next (unintelligible) meeting in Paris. There have also been flowcharts that have been distributed (relative) to our call. You can see that as an attachment to the email that was sent earlier today.

It is a flowchart (referred) by Mathieu and it has a (seven) step process which we will be, of course, willing to shorten. But for that we would need to come back to you and, of course, have consensus whether we can, in fact, shortness process. And we will discuss any change in a moment.

And then we have the working parties to make sure all comments and the following comments will have responses for publication no later than the day we publish our public comment (two) and also the (unintelligible) to coordinate work in their respective working parties. So with this, I'd like to

open the floor. I see Kavouss' hand is up again. Kavouss, is that an old hand or a new hand?

Kavouss Arasteh: This is a new number, a new hand. Please (find out which by now) we don't have agree- we have not agreed yet on any (model). We have not agreed on the IRT (unintelligible).

First you have to decide (where) we are. Starting (unintelligible) the long list that Mathieu provided three pages, - it is not an emerging issue. It's just a shopping list. What are the difficulties? I mentioned that the difficulties with the following - first you have to see ways and means how to comply with the accountability requirements of the CWG.

This is the first item. We do not go to the bylaw. How we could achieve that? This is a (sentence) for our (laws). Where is the (need) to meet the requirement of accountability as contained in CWG? (Unintelligible) with the ICG.

We have to take it from this point. Before writing a long list - and we don't want that any chairman will impart himself to have an agenda for us for something that we don't agree. So please kindly consider the only items of top priority is what are the accountability requirements of CWG, how we could achieve that? This is the first item. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Kavouss. And I couldn't agree more with you. We need to discuss where we are in order to decide where we want to go. And this is just planning ahead. It doesn't (mean) you have a (unintelligible) to our call.

It's only planning ahead, so we don't want to get to Paris and not have a plan. So all you see in the attachment is, of course, as I said, planning ahead so we can best - so we can have the best use of everyone's time in our Paris meeting.

So if we still want to see where we are at and where we want to go, I could ask staff to please display the scorecard that was attached also to the email that was sent earlier to our call. An agency the scorecard we have on-screen. And this refers to, of course, these issues that we have assessed...

Roelof Meijer: Leon, this is Roelof. Can you put me in the queue please?

Leon Sanchez: Your next, Roelof. If you want to say something, please do.

Roelof Meijer: Okay, thank you, Leon. This is Roelof Meijer for the record. Maybe I misunderstood but I just want to warn that we don't take ourselves back to the complete beginning.

Our departure is the draft proposal that we filed and that comment that we received. So we, in fact, did agree on a model in our first draft. We have, on the basis of the comments we received on that draft, we're now reconsidering a certain aspect of the model, but let's not do it if we are starting from scratch because that's not the case.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Roelof. That is right. We are taking up from the comments received. That is what the scorecard is for. And we're not going back to square one, as you said.

We're just speaking up on the work that's been done with regards to our first draft proposal considering those comments we received from the community. And from there, we will make steps forward of course. Okay, so reviewing the

scorecard, it - I don't know, Mathieu, do you want to comment on the scorecard?

Mathieu Weill: Thanks Leon, and hello everyone. This is Mathieu speaking. So the goal of the scorecard is precisely as Roelof said to check where we are in terms of, based on initial report and the feedback we've got, and see how much work and on which items we need to further investigate.

So if you take the first line of the scorecard and you have (score) control so you can probably make it larger to make it more readable. During the (intermission), commitment and (cover) use, we have most of the wording and sections of these refinements of the mission which is supported.

There are - there were some comments made on the balancing (cover) you section which is orange because there're a significant number of comments that we need to consider.

And, (still), from this agreement on the private sector wording which needs to be worked out by work party two because a number of mostly government raised concern with the wording that is in the current bylaws.

And so the rest of the scorecard like this, highlights the various issues that we have highlighted during our session, our face-to-face session in Buenos Aires in order to check what is currently supported and can probably proceed and the areas for further refinement of - for work party one and work party two.

And if you take the second item, for instance, the fundamental bylaws, the scope and everything seems to be supported except for some of these agreements that are still being had about whether the headquarters in the US should be a fundamental bylaw.

And maybe that can be pushed to (unintelligible). That's an option to consider. The IRP got a lot of orange because there's been a number of feedback about the selection process, a number of feedback about constructive engagements, proposals, a number of feedback about the type of arbitration and whether you can go to court to appeal from that.

But also a significant - a number of aspects which only need some refinement from outside. The same for reconsideration process. Overall supported except a significant point of discussion on the conflict of interest policy for the board members which was to be considered.

So that's all the summary of what we discussed on the Friday in Buenos Aires. On the community power as well, there is a discussion on the model but it's only one point among many because there are various powers as they are, need some refinement for some of them such as the need to check that the budget strategy veto right does not create endless (loops).

That we need to work out, if we go for a board recall, how the caretaker mechanism would work out. I'm moving down to not for you with all the details. The DOT reviews are very much supported and that's a requirement from the CWG to incorporate this.

And then the stress test will - we got some feedback to add new stress tests and refine obviously the stress test and some of the new items we had identified are (also the) accountability, staff accountability, diversity enhancement as well as board - the board's responsibility which is related to the power of individual board removal.

So that's a tool to check where we are considering that we will certainly start with the initial report we have an edit this. And that is designed to track our progress towards public comment two which we have to publish by the end of July and the key discussions, we need to have in Paris so that we can be streamlined operation of public comment two in time for the end of July. And I think that's all for going through this scorecard.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Mathieu. I see Kavouss has raised his hand. Kavouss, can you please take the floor?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I am speaking as a liaison of ICG. In September 18 and 19, we have to almost finalize our assessment of the three proposals. With respect to the names or naming proposal, we have to ensure that the accountability in that (unintelligible) properly (accepted) by CCWG.

For us, that is the important element. We know that our (concern is) (unintelligible) proposal from (key operations) of (community) could go back to NTIA (unintelligible) so this is important for us.

How we could ensure that those accountability - five or six areas, are properly addressed without any difficulties? And certainly we know that there are (unintelligible).

There was one (unintelligible). That was the budget which may be a difficult - take it and put it directly in the bylaws. Never associate that with any other problems. So we have to listen to the (unintelligible) are the most important (unintelligible) issue are those issues. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Kavouss. Yes, we (are clear) with that. That is why we're trying to build the (lightest instance of) solutions that can, of course,

satisfy the (unintelligible) with the CWG and that can fit into the (possible steps of the ICT) (clearly) as a single proposal. In the queue I have Alan Greenberg. Alan, can you please take the floor?

Alan Greenberg: Think you very much. I guess I would like a little bit of clarity, and maybe it's just me that's confused as to what we're trying to accomplish prior to Paris and what are we deferring to Paris?

I'm really afraid if you look at all the issues that are not green on the scorecard, we could well run out of time in Paris and come to loggerheads. And I really feel some of these more contentious ones we need to be working on. And I'm not quite sure how they're going to be worked on or when.

As I put in my email earlier today, I see - I've seen three teleconferences scheduled - one a week from now and two, two weeks from now and immediately before we leave.

I think that's a somewhat outrageous demand to put on our time given that we're giving up several days of the week, to also ask us to give up for hours the day before we leave. But regardless of that, I guess I'd like to know what the game plan is going forward and what are we trying to accomplish in the next two weeks.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Alan. (Unintelligible) the different working parties are already working on building the agenda, of course, scheduling are working party calls.

We have (too) clearly some issues that need to be maybe considered for discussed before (unintelligible) in the scorecard. So, of course, my

suggestion would be to (be) discussing those issues that are apparently (needless to say) (unintelligible) and based on compromises in Buenos Aires.

We set out the different issues that the different stakeholder groups in different participants have in mind. So this can guide us into (each of) the common solutions for those outstanding issues that haven't reached support so far.

So I guess that the working party references will be reaching out to (participants) of the (unintelligible) groups and we, of course, need the (TLCs) working party three, as I said, and well, now we need to begin planning for meeting in Paris. And I see some comments.

Alan Greenberg: And just for - Leon, well I still have my - I don't have my hand up anymore. Someone took it down. I see in the chat, there seems to be someone saying that the meeting on the 14th is rescheduled, not added. That was certainly not clear from the messages that one out, unless some of them didn't get to me.

Leon Sanchez: Okay, certainly I think that we're looking to scheduling, and I see Kavouss is (requesting) (unintelligible) for everybody. May I please ask who hasn't been able to speak at this meeting? And next in the queue, I have Tijani. Tijani, please, could you please take the floor?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, Leon. Tijani speaking. For the question of Allen, yes the meeting was (rescheduled) and not - we didn't add a new (unintelligible) to read the invite regretfully you see that the old date was removed a the new date, the old hour was changed to the new hour.

Leon Sanchez: I have to upgrade my calendar. Thank you very much. I (unintelligible) an update Deb and Michael as well. So I will have to go and review that and I

will ask staff to double check on scheduling of the meeting that is the next item for staff and inform in detail the group our next (quote) before the Paris meeting.

Next in the queue I have Kavouss. I would kindly ask you to explain why you did agree to the way that we are proposing to handle our next (quote) meeting. So Kavouss could you please take the floor.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes (unintelligible) mentioned that you need to (unintelligible) does not allow for (unintelligible) take into account (unintelligible) I thought I gave this long list of the core calls. All of these (unintelligible) issues that we need to address first.

What about this long list? We need a short list a small list to I think reach out to most people and I think that we have to have that now. And I don't believe that the chairman of working party (unintelligible) pushing us and then does not allow us to speak and (unintelligible) or interrupting us in the middle of our talks as they had done before.

They did it in Buenos Aires I was talking and Mathieu interrupted me impolitely. I don't that please. Please provide a short list of (unintelligible) items that we must address.

Not our shortcomings the shortcomings is this (mandate) issue. I don't understand why you need to go the budget and the (unintelligible) plan and having its final word on that and going to the binding and enforcement and (unintelligible).

Importantly we (unintelligible) of the CWG that we must (unintelligible) the proposal (unintelligible). And what I will do I will assist ICANN and (unintelligible) our list and how to (unintelligible).

Mathieu thinks there's just something (unintelligible) this is not important for me everybody is not ready. I would have to know more (unintelligible). People have (unintelligible) difficulties of membership considerable.

So you have to find something. All of a sudden Friday or I don't know when it is or Thursday Mathieu (unintelligible) something called hybrid. I don't understand what's a hybrid (unintelligible).

Nice work hybrid, hybrid of what? The (unintelligible) the list is presented (unintelligible) once again please find out (unintelligible). You need to have priority, we need to work on priority thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Kavouss. I believe you have a major point and I remember interrupting someone yes in Buenos Aires and that was because of time constraints.

Time is one of our most valuable reserves and we don't want to wait to (unintelligible). So next in the queue I have Mathieu can you please take the floor.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Leon Mathieu Weill speaking. I would actually ask a couple of questions to Kavouss to fully understand where he's going. My understanding is that you have an issue requirement from the CWG.

And I am - I think all these items in this call need to be (unintelligible) if we want to meet these requirements. There is no meeting the CWG requirements without sentimental (unintelligible).

There is no meeting the CWG requirements without an IRP. There is not meeting the CWG requirements without budget powers, without the individual of both removal or recall.

Those are the CWG requirements and so my question to you Kavouss would be which are the items on this call (unintelligible) to drop? My personal view is that we're informed of CWG requirements, community expectation that clearly say we need a consistent account to reach a framework. We can't just patch this here and there it has to be consistent.

And some of these (unintelligible) some of these still need some work and so what I'm struggling to find here is what are the items we need to drop in this (unintelligible)? So that would be my question actually.

I'd love to be able to drop a lot of things and make our work simple but so far I'm not seeing this easy.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Mathieu. Kavouss would you like to answer Mathieu's questions?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes I want to raise my hand but the system does not allow me to raise a hand. My question is Mathieu to take the reverse action. Going to the CWG sorry, CWG and taking the items that CWG - I give an example (unintelligible).

They want to have a work on budget that (PCI) budget should have the stability and not change the (unintelligible) were committed. For that it was CWG budget issue which are the areas that we have to do.

Then we have to go to the IRP for the function, IANA function of CWG. Then which are the ICANN that are collected to that. Then we have to go to the removal of the board and (unintelligible) in the reverse direction but not of all these lists and associated with them.

Provided that you mentioned that all of these are required in CWG. We are looking - only proposing on that. So let us think that which are the items of CWG and put that for meeting that I think we need to reschedule.
But I don't...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: ...the budget properly, talking the budget with the CWG does not talk about the total budget it's talking about the PTI budget that's all. We could address it independently at (unintelligible) without going to total budget issue.

Total budget is still (unintelligible) we don't need to go anything more than readjustment. We don't need to do that, thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Kavouss. Your points are well taken and noted. I believe that we have (unintelligible) problem here and of course when we speak about budget we are talking about the linkage between the CWG work and our work.

So I think that we kind of are doing the things that did suggest we do but we're just not clear, we're not mediating to communicate the message to some

of the participants. So next up is Roelof Meijer, Roelof could you please take the floor.

Roelof Meijer: Thank you Leon, this is Roelof Meijer for the record. I'm sorry but I do not really understand where Kavouss is trying to get and when I look at the (unintelligible) right here your response I think (unintelligible) the same problem.

So maybe I can make (unintelligible) this is taking a lot of time from our call and I don't think that we've been getting the impression that he is getting anywhere.

So maybe the co-chairs could take it offline with Kavouss and have a dialogue and see what his issue is and then get back to us because this way I think we will be spending a lot of time and discovering that we are not (unintelligible).

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Roelof your suggestion is also taken and we will definitely continue with our next agenda item. I believe that Mathieu wanted to explain a couple of points with regard to the scorecard. Did you want to add to that?

Mathieu Weill: Actually my suggestion would be as Roelof said to add an action item for as co-chair to provide a peer review of how each of the items in this call (unintelligible) requirement and provide more substance on this.

That would be something that we can do easily so that - and then we'll share this with you Kavouss and see if how we can interact on this and then come back at the next meeting to see if it has helped us focus our work which I understand is your key expectation is that we do not waste time on aspects that are not critical to the main timeline.

And I think this is a goal that we all have to make sure we keep our focus and so that's my suggestion is to have this action item which I see captured in the notes now and move to the next item of the agenda meanwhile.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Mathieu and actually the next agenda item is for you so I will hand it to you to take care of agenda item number four, emerging issues working party three, so Mathieu.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Leon and that one of the items we concluded we would work on during the Buenos Aires meeting. So and the key factor behind this was that during the public comment we did see a number of comments asking us to consider some issues that were not very much even in our public comment number one that's why we call them emerging issues.

Those issues include staffing management accountability, (SOSE) accountability also called (unintelligible), enhancements of diversity and (unintelligible) definitions or all the responsibilities of the board.

There is a key aspect of timing behind this and a key - we don't have much time for taking this comment into account and yet I think we recognize that those concerns were valid.

And so we need a small group to work on what would be our recommendation and with a clear focus on (unintelligible) what needs to be absolutely work stream one versus the rest.

And we need to take into account that we are (varied) through time available for work stream one and we also need to take into account that when

proposing new ideas there might be unintended consequences so we need to operate under the minimal change principle.

So the core essence of this group will essentially be to try and find what needs to be work stream one. And so we are reminded of our (unintelligible) of work stream one which is that the mechanism that would provide the community with confidence that any further improvement in accountability could be implemented if it had consensus support from the communities even if there was resistance from ICANN de-organization or management et cetera.

So that was our definition. So the core goal of this group in a very short amount of time on this issue would be to see whether we need something in work stream one for this issue and whether we put the rest of the core discussion on these issues to work stream two.

But at least so that we can answer this comment we got from the public comment period. I see Roelof's hand is back up or is it an old hand I'm not sure?

Roelof Meijer: I'm sorry that's an old hand.

Mathieu Weill: All right, Kavouss (unintelligible) his hand so please Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes Mathieu I explained to you in several calls this (unintelligible) who (unintelligible) doesn't work you will open the Pandora box, you turned around a ring who versus the, you know, the (unintelligible) SO and AC what is ICANN board then you want to follow the (NCC) to watch SO and AC.

And another entity to watch that entity for what is SO and AC. This would create difficulties point number one. Point number two is some SO's and AC's in particular in one SAC there is no mechanism that you watch them.

I'll give you an example of GAC. The GAC are presenting the government of the country there is no watch there is no responsibilities. They are responsible to their government. You cannot have a watcher to watch the government.

Maybe other AC's work but in GAC it doesn't work. There is no other watch. (Unintelligible) as a AC so you cannot take it - (unintelligible) this is one idea from two or three people and (unintelligible) this is not (unintelligible) maybe good but not realistic. Who watches the watch?

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Kavouss. I think this is not just (pitting) from a couple of comments. This particular point has been raised from the start by our advisors and our charter clearly states that our group has a requirement to consider input from the advisor.

And that's been in the comment from (unintelligible) from the start, (Willie Curry) said that as well. The (unintelligible) raised this as well and so on and so forth.

So I think it's not only one comment and this and on the other side there's more than our report shows in terms of accountability mechanism for SO and AC.

The SO and AC's except the GAC are subject according to ICANN bylaws to regular reviews. That's an existing accountability system. They have their own transparency requirements.

They have their own operating rules. And so our goal is certainly not to create an external body that would watch the SO and AC but at least we need to be able to explain how this community mechanism that is based on the SO and AC is itself accountable because the model we're creating is a mutual accountability model.

And we need to ensure some form of accountability of the SO and AC's to the rights of the (world) and that being I think more than a few comments but that's particularly the question that we need to ask, what would be a work stream one item on this.

Maybe none I have no idea. I have no preconceived idea at least but I think we all, the comments we've received (unintelligible) consideration on this matter.

I see a queue forming and I have Steve next.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Mathieu. For items that were put into work stream two I think we have to have some idea of how the community can suggest the bylaws changes after the transition that are necessary to fulfill a work stream two item.

That would allow the board to consider and put that bylaw change up for community approval or community veto. I'm not aware of a mechanism today where the community or even a work party like work party three or work stream two could develop bylaws language and force it to be considered for adoption.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Steve. I'm not sure if that was a question I'm not sure I captured it because there was a lot of distortion on your audio. Any comparison (unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: Yes it was a question to say, do we need to assume the ability for the community to generate a bylaws proposal post transition and if so what mechanism do we need to design to fulfill that. I hope that was clearer.

Mathieu Weill: Thanks (Steve yes so your question is whether we need to set up a mechanism for this community (unintelligible) to generate bylaw changes. Which came up in some of the discussions on the side discussions (unintelligible) very strongly in the public comment (unintelligible). Kavouss I assume it's a new hand.

No. Kavouss if you are speaking we can't hear you.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I understood Steve saying that you have to do all action required (unintelligible) in the work stream one. I am not (unintelligible). Bylaw is something that we could change this according to the (unintelligible) accountability.

The accountability beyond (unintelligible) so we don't need to address all notification to the bylaw with (unintelligible) greater accountability beyond (unintelligible).

We do it when it is required. Once again we have to (unintelligible). We have only 14 days. If you want to have a support for (unintelligible) mentioned the support is not of consensus is not good.

They reduce the requirement in addition to the minimum. Do something (unintelligible) we don't need to have this all (unintelligible) thank you.

Mathieu Weill: So maybe a quick reminder of the mechanism that's currently being proposed for work stream two is the transitional article of the bylaws that recognizes

that further changes of the bylaws will be proposed to address a number of issues.

So in terms of how if the work stream two outcomes are bylaw changes then certainly our group will be legitimate in proposing them and then they will move to the board for approval and then probably is it's fundamental there will be the prior approval of the community and so on I mean we will be in the mechanism we're setting up.

That's the current status of our - regarding work stream two. Malcolm you're next.

Malcolm Hutty: Thank you Mathieu. You said a moment that we are not providing any mechanisms in the who watches the watches to watch the community. So that's not correct and I need to correct you on this because it is a major underestimate and misstatement of what we've achieved in the other important work that we've done the WP2 work.

We have set up a - we've established core values that we believe that the organization should hold to and we've established an IRP mechanism for people to make complaints that the community for example in its own policy development (unintelligible) work has not held to those.

Now ultimately the community is the ultimate guardian because the community can change those bylaws, can change those values but we hope that changing the bylaws it's established as deliberately to be something that is (unintelligible) and regular policy development.

And we've got a statement of fundamental bylaws which is even harder to change than regular bylaws. So this provides an important mechanism by

which the watchmen watch themselves with a mechanism to ensure that that practice is actually effective.

Now the reason I raise this now other than just letting slide your comment is because I think that we are repeatedly falling into the trap of focusing only on the WP1 work the community (powers) mechanism and forgetting about the importance of what we've achieved in the WP2 work.

And the importance of protecting this and making sure it's effective. And in failing to do that we are just because it hasn't been a controversial area because we've managed to achieve it really quite successfully and relatively easily WP1, I understand what that's doing, that's happening.

But unfortunately it's leading us into error in the discussions that we've been having for example around the different models because we were only look at the effect of those models on the WP1 and not on the WP2.

So please remember I beg you to remember the importance of what we've achieved in this WP2 and when describing the work that we've done and also in deciding how we go about implementing the same questions on the consideration but the effect on that needs to be brought in mind as well, thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Malcolm I think you unfortunately misunderstood my comment because I think we're very close to each other here but it was a good clarification if I wasn't clear enough.

So that's the core aspect of this proposed (unintelligible) is to actually clarify this and at least get to a point where we can explain what's in place on this

matter and what's going to be worked on in work stream two and if necessary working stream three included into work stream one.

I (unintelligible) discussion started which I will not go into too much detail here because that was just to collect some of the summaries of the comments we received as well as some of the inputs and ideas that had been circulated.

The key point for our meeting today is to ensure we launch this group and task the group to come back by the, basically July 14 with a proposal that we could consider in this (unintelligible) although that might not be given - I mean that will certainly be the core focus of our work in Paris but that's an aspect that we need to take into account.

So that's a two week short workgroup where (Leon has volunteered to lead the discussion for this group. And we would obviously welcome volunteers.

I can see in the chat Keith and Malcolm volunteering. And thanks to them for that.

I have - I know from private discussions that our advisors (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) also agree.

I see Giovanni also has mentioned he was willing to do that but I'm not sure he's on the call. I think Alan you are also indicated you are willing to be part of this effort?

Alan Greenberg: I did indeed.

Mathieu Weill: Excellent. So I think we have already a core group that makes it achievable. And we will do an action item to circulate a call for volunteers, set up a sub

mailing list obviously. And we will provide the required support to (Leon) and the group in order to get to a point where we can have your proposal for discussions in Paris.

Any objection to that or on the terms of reference I've described on your screen? No. so I will - so we'll include the action items and move to the next agenda item. Alan, you...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Yes I'm not sure what board duties means.

Mathieu Weill: Yes I think the question behind this was the board's role and responsibilities. It's a question that's been raised by some in the comments also by Larry Strickling in his blog post and address in Buenos Aires that he - there was a feeling that there was a need to clarify what was expected from the board and what fiduciary duties referred to in order to avoid some confusions about what the board was expected to do once the work the board members were elected.

Add that certainly referred as well to the - some of the feedback we had in the comment which said that while it was agreed that the board - the individual board member removal was legally without code some in the community were asking for clarification about what kind of situation would lead to that and that different way of looking at rules and responsibilities I suppose.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Mathieu Weill: So I'm not sure we can do a lot on this at least in Workstream 1 but I think it's better to say there's been an issue raised.

Malcolm I understand it's an internal hand.

Okay so with that we are moving to agenda Item Number 5 which is a follow-up on the discussion that we had on last Wednesday in Buenos Aires on the way to draft the bylaws.

So we received a potential proposal from Bruce Tonkin -- thank you very much Bruce -- which we have sort of refined taking into account some of the requirements we had heard from Wednesday's session and also acknowledging that there was - not everyone was in full agreement on the way to proceed on that. So we have to find a common ground on this.

So the requirements we tried to take on board was that the approvals and decisions on the - at the beginning when kicking off bylaw changes as well as moving them to public comments and obviously in the end making sure it's a valid were on the CWG side, that the CCWG required the view of independent counsel on the bylaw changes, that of course the ICANN board was bound to ask for ICANN legal to provide legal advice as well. That's just good governance. And that we would try for a drafting process that would be number one based on clear certification drawn from our initial report.

And number two, a collaborative effort between the various parties involved. So that's the key requirements we tried to take on board.

For process that describes on Slide Number 1 in text and Slide Number 2 in a more graphical way. But basically the idea behind it is that the specification or based on the CCWG report and the public comment we have received so some refinements in time.

And if the CCWG that clarifies that it can move forward for bylaw drafting about five blocks once it's ready.

The drafting and refining is via (unintelligible) in collaboration with independent legal counsel so they will certainly hold the pen in (turn) on something like this.

I think there is existing processes to do that for activity between lawyers.

The CCWG subgroups for instance Work Party 2 or Work Party 1 and would review the language to make sure it meets the specs.

I understand from the requirement that at some point we would turn to independent counsel to get their formal advice on whether we can proceed with the bylaws.

If need be the CCWG subgroup would revise the text and then it would be our group as a whole would be deciding case of conflict of interpretation about which bylaw change we propose to the public comment and to the board in the public comment.

So that's what we're suggesting to do. And we would suggest and then I turn to the queue to kick this off with one item of our initial report which is the drawing the most support actually which is the incorporation of the AOC reviews into the ICANN bylaws.

And that would be an excellent candidate to do a proof of concept of this drafting and bylaw drafting process. I see Greg has raised his hand so please Greg?

Greg Shatan: Thank you Mathieu, Greg Shatan for the record. I predict that what will end up happening here is something a lot closer to the normal process of drafting legal documents between two parties across the table.

But I think that if it doesn't or even if it does and I see some potential issues here first the idea that the CCW itself will be drafting actual bylaws language gives me pause.

You know, bylaws themselves are legal instruments and should be drafted - first draft by the lawyers. Frankly while I would like to have our counsel take the first crack at it I would rather have ICANN legal take the first crack at it than assume that we amongst ourselves with varying backgrounds and the like could actually draft bylaws per se.

The idea of drafting a specification terms of reference, term sheet -- whatever you want to call it that creates an roughly plain English or convoluted non-legal English -- what it is we intend to accomplish by the bylaws that's certainly what we should be doing.

But when it comes to actually cutting open the patients and starting to operate let's leave that to those with the skill in the field to do so.

Secondly I think on Number 3 ICANN legal in collaboration with independent legal counsel I think that's a fantasy not because our counsel and ICANN counsel are at loggerheads but because the idea of them sitting in a room together and collaborating and singing Kumbaya would be a first.

I mean I've only been doing this about 28 years and I felt we're only (unintelligible) about 1500 or so agreements and documents of various types we my clients and the other clients, so there's always a first time.

I think in the end it's going to be more like ping-pong rather than a tango. It's not going to be a collaborative dance. There's going to be a back and forth.

And I think that with regard to any of these documents when we're talking about legal documents we really need to look to our counsel for legal advice about whether they work as we go forward.

So, you know, I would not want to see anything coming out of our group and going to the board for instance as in Item 6 without it being, you know, really worked on by our counsel.

This is not going to be a - there is not going to be any cost savings or time savings by kind of having the wrong cast of characters doing the right thing.

Let's follow the right cast of characters. We each have our lane and will be best off if we stick to it. In the end I think that's how we get agreement across the board. Thanks.

Mathieu Weill: So just to make sure you're right your point number one there's no intention. And so if the reading shows otherwise it must be corrected that our group drafts the initial bylaws.

So that the bylaw drafting is legal matter and it has to be handled by lawyers so that would clear and the - on the exception is where on the initial report already has a sort of initial rough bylaw drafting which has not been reviewed by lawyers so far.

And that's the case for the mission and core value for instance where it's sort of already is an edited version of the existing bylaws. But that's agreed.

The second on the drafting end what I understand you're saying is you be in favor of independent counsel to draft the initial version of the bylaw. Am I correct?

Greg Shatan: Yes I would. I am in favor of frankly that's my first choice. My second choice is having ICANN legal draft them because I'd rather it be done by a professional rather than a DIY job.

I would not do a first draft and then ask or build a first house and ask my architect to fix it for me. I'm sure that our counsel whatever ICANN legal throws at our counsel they will not be shrinking violets if they disagree with anything on approach and vice a versa. This is how the process works.

Mathieu Weill: Okay. So I think that was the major point of back and forth who is holding the pen between ICANN legal and independent counsel. I see Alan's hand is up.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I said this in the last meeting and I'll say it again. We're looking at budgets and people are aghast at the costs are so high.

It was pointed out by number of people at the last meeting that these are ICANN bylaws and ICANN attorneys have to sign off on them.

We trust our own legal counsel enough to give us opinions. Why do we not trust them enough to look at what is being drafted by ICANN legal counsel and identify to us where they think there's a problem?

It's not up to the lawyers to fight each other. It's up to the CCWG to tell ICANN legal and whoever else is involved that we do not believe the bylaws are acceptable and we're not going to approve them.

We have ultimate approval on this proposal. And we - if we're trusting our lawyers should be trusting them enough to make sure that the words that ultimately go into our final proposal are good.

So I don't see why we need to have our legal counsel at our expense do all of the detail work. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Alan. Greg you wanted to respond?

Greg Shatan: I thought I was going to want to respond but Alan actually said - I agree with what Alan said. And I think that we need to trust our counsel to do the right job and do it cost effectively. And we just need to make sure that we are managing them cost effectively.

But, you know, we don't take the quarterback out on the 1 yard line and substitute the other team's quarterback hoping that they're going to put it across.

So, you know, if that isn't what Alan said, you know, sorry. Multitasking apparently at 3:00 in the morning is not completely my strong suit.

But what I will say regardless of whether it's what Alan said or not is that we need to let the professionals do the professional job working with us on this until it's done.

This is not the time to try to save a few pennies. The money we've already spent frankly I think has been well spent. And the money we will spend - have been with appropriate management of our lawyers and of the process will still be money well spent.

So, you know, this is not the time to cut corners. This is the time to get across the line. We're not going to be doing this again for quite a while, maybe not ever for some of us. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Greg. Robin?

Robin Gross: Hi. This is Robin. Can you hear me okay?

Man: Yes.

Mathieu Weill: Yes Robin.

Robin Gross: Okay. So I think it's really important that we have our own independent counsel to the drafting of the bylaws and I think it's fine if ICANN legal wants to make comments on that and review that like as anyone else can.

But I think it's important that our own independent counsel do the actual drafting of this.

I find it otherwise if ICANN's lawyers do the drafting then I feel like we're just always going to be on the - always going to be in the reactive mode and having to argue and convince for why we need certain language changed in those ICANN legal drafted bylaws.

And I think that it really should be the reverse, that it should be our lawyers representing our interests that do the initial drafting.

And if ICANN legal wants to make suggestions they can convince us that the language needs to be changed to accommodate their views rather than the

other way around and us always having to be reactive and try to get changes into the bylaws they've drafted.

So I think it's really important that our own independent counsel holds the drafting pen on this extra site. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thanks Robin. Isn't the process you're describing also going to apply to ICANN legal? I mean if one of them holds the drafting pen and the other just goes into opposing all the time and asks I know just pure assumption 88 questions on the existing drafting is that really what we need to be looking at?

I'm not sure whether that's - because the argument you're giving can work the other way around can it?

Robin Gross: It could. But the problem is is that we are supposed to be in charge of this exercise. And so we're the ones that should be holding the drafting pen.

And if somebody else wants to come to us with 88 questions they can convince us that we need to spend our time and energy in answering those in a certain way.

Again I think it's important just in terms of who's in ultimate control of this exercise that it be the community that the CCWG and our lawyers that are holding the drafting pen.

Mathieu Weill: And I would before turning to Alan I would like to note (Tim Frazee)'s suggestion from the chat. He's suggesting that the bylaw edits could be divided up between the two legal teams which (unintelligible) as half and then the exchange can be made. So that's just a suggestion I'm reading out loud for everyone's benefit. And I have Alan next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Since there seems to be some discussion on what I really said and what I meant I'll try again. And I'll say it in the context of I have drafted my share of bylaw changes and more than my share of contracts.

And on contracts when you're negotiating as you're drafting it is always nice to be the pen holder because then the other one is on the defensive and you have - then have to convince you to change the words that you already put on paper. That's not the mode we're in right here.

If we are doing, we the CCWG are doing our job properly we are going to be very clear as to what the bylaws are supposed to be causing that happened.

So I don't think the bylaw drafting should be the negotiation phase as it often is in contract during contract negotiations.

And I believe that it is less expensive and more effective to have ICANN to the initial draft and our people look over it with a fine toothed comb and make sure that that it is saying exactly what the CCWG is dictating should happen.

I think that's effective. And ultimately we are not negotiating. If our lawyers tell us the contract that something is being slipped into the bylaws which nullifies what we're trying to achieve they'll say it and that we will basically say we're not - these bylaws are not acceptable.

I don't think it's the crafting of the words that the critical point. It's the concept that we're trying to set right now. I find it completely acceptable to trust our own attorneys to critique what is written and call out if there's any problems. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you very much Alan. Next in the queue is Steve. Steve, could you please take the floor.

Steve DelBianco: Yes thank you. Before we give anybody's attorney something to draft we're supposed to get the process steps one and two completed first. And that was to take our initial report, CCWG report and then apply changes that were suggested through public comment.

And I would ask the cochairs let's describe the steps for going to take and how we're going to divide that into work teams.

The example that Mathieu gave earlier was bringing the affirmation of commitment reviews into the bylaws. And that's a section of roughly 11 pages of public comment from many different parties.

The good news is that it's not widely divergent. It ought to be easy for us to go through that. But it is going to require that we decide what to do with let's say two or three commenters wanted the reviews to be more frequent than every five years which was the CCWG's proposal.

If we're going to get this done before we arrive in Paris a subset of the work party one is to say what's our rule going to be if only one or two commenters made a suggestion?

Can we respectfully turn it aside and finalize this back so that we can move onto drafting of bylaws or do we need to keep alive this debate over a point where perhaps a very small minority of public comments disagreed with the CCWG proposal?

So it's really a process question not a substance question, but a process question on how to get steps one and two in your process completed and divided up amongst the different work parties. Thanks.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Steve. Next is Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Greg again. I think, you know, one thing to consider -- and I put this in the chat -- is whether - and to what extent ask well it's kind of the level specification before we get to bylaw drafting.

We tried to have a dialogue with ICANN legal and ICANN legal clients so to speak. As several have noted it the easier it is - the better you get your timesheet or your terms of reference agreed with the other folks that your trying to get to yes with the easier the drafting of the definitive documents whatever it is.

If the big points are agreed there will always be little points to deal with. But trying to kind of come to terms on fundamental terms while you're drafting the definitive documents is the slower and more painful way of trying to work out key issues.

Key issues are kind of better left to the first level. And then the persnicketyness of drafting so that you meet the key issues that you have agreed to is where lawyers have fun and the clients go and get a beer and then come back and say how are you guys doing?

So if we want to ensure that everybody's in the room and dealing with the bylaws at the same time we can just leave them, kind of leave the fundamental issues that we might have for the bylaws and not for the specification. But I would advise otherwise. Thanks.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Greg. Malcolm and then we will try to find a way forward.
Malcolm?

Malcolm Hutty: thank you Mathieu. Some of this discussions has proceeded as though there was some clear and crystal bright line device between the expressive work that we are trying to do is to what we would like to achieve and this other alien word - world of the legal text that implements it which is completely different in a completely different area but we couldn't possibly engage with and ourselves.

And that somehow the lawyers have this magical ability to turn what we are aiming at into their special code of language in a way that there could not possibly be any grounds for legitimate disagreement as to whether or not they have actually managed to transpose what we want into the documents that are being produced.

I'm afraid I have to stand by it, yes. There is just too much deference to lawyers in this.

We will need to keep a close eye whoever has the hand on the pen a close eye on the output so as to be able to see when we are satisfied that this delivers on our intent especially since frankly we're not working from a huge degree of consensus in all areas.

So whoever has the hand on the pen we're going to need to look very closely at the output and not be - allow ourselves to be pushed into the position of, well, the lawyers have said this is the way that you do it and therefore that's it.

Because that's showing far too great a deference to the judgments of the lawyers as to what's an appropriate way to go about things and indeed the judgments of the lawyers as to what an appropriate outcome might be.

So I mean for those reasons I think it's a considerable waste to the idea which - of having our own lawyers so they're at least trying to reach what they think is what we're trying to achieve as opposed to ICANN legal obviously have their own clients' interests and concerns, which may not be in line with what we are trying to achieve. And they have their first duty to the corporation.

So I think for those reasons as well as for the areas - optical challenge as to how it looks - the outcome of our work although it was produced by ICANN lawyers, I don't know if this agreement later as to whether it properly represented what we were seeking to achieve or effectively delivers on what we were seeking to achieve.

So I would argue strongly for having our lawyers having their hand on the pen and ICANN kind of - for all the reasons that Robin said, you know, be invited to give every comment that they wish into the process as well. And that would be very welcome.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you. Queue is closed and I still have Kavouss and then Greg.

Kavouss Aresteh: Thank you, this is Kavouss (unintelligible). We discussed that - in Buenos Aires after 20 minutes of discussion, you said yes you would take that, that we - ICANN may not depart from legal counsel plus volunteers (unintelligible). And (unintelligible) what we are discussing now.

Mathieu Weill: I'm sorry, Kavouss. I've - my own correction of this discussion in Buenos Aires was that there was to be a proposal - written proposal on the table so we can discuss it further and that's what we're doing.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Aresteh: Yes, but written proposal that we mentioned - written proposal is based on something that we know. It can be (unintelligible) but not something that still we have not yet decided.

If you have an area that we could (unintelligible) drafting these are - (unintelligible) ICANN plus legal advisor or something, (unintelligible) they could get together and it is the draft or something, it would be (unintelligible). This is what I don't understand.

Mathieu Weill: I'm not seeing a lot of differences what we're suggesting. And there's going to be a (unintelligible) on the ccWG group but what we're drafting - and I think it's been said very clearly and important that the clarity on the specifications of what has to be drafted and the goals that are (unintelligible) is really what matters in this process.

Probably more than who's holding the pen and we need to set our intentions right to make sure our group focused on that very clearly.

Greg, you're last.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Mathieu. I wish I had something appropriate final to say but I just wanted to respond briefly to (Malcolm) and say that's not at all what I was actually suggesting that we were somehow or that lawyers are somehow, you

know, magicians who need to work in cloistered separation from their clients, quite the opposite.

It needs to be a collaborative process between the clients and the lawyers so that the - everyone gets to where they're going. And you know, in essence everyone gets to play - does get to play, the right part at the right time. So it's not - no idea that the lawyers are going to go away.

The remark about having a beer was an exaggeration but there are sometimes when the lawyers do need to kind of assess nuances of language in - for purposes of fitness - for purpose and clarity, (unintelligible) and alike. Not for elegance. It would be nice if we had something elegant especially through the bylaws that are out there and public.

But you know, in that sense I trust the quality of our lawyers and frankly I trust the quality of ICANN's lawyers to get this right because we are trying to get PS. I think we're all well represented here and the big point here is to get this process off the ground.

Once we get into it we'll actually probably be quite amused with some of the things that we argued about, thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you, Greg. And that fits very well into what would be my proposal moving forward from this discussion is, number one, we need to be very clear on the specifications and that's the key success factor of the bylaw drafting if we want to avoid any discussion about whether the bylaws are well written or not, well written is about us meeting - managing to provide clear specifications of what has to be incorporated in the bylaws.

There is obviously an amount of discussion about which lawyers should hold the pen. And - but I think what you've just said, Greg, is important. We need to take this off the ground. So my suggestion would be that we take the section of our report about the AOC reviews, which is very well advanced in terms of clarity of the specifications.

I don't think we have much to add to this specifications to enable them to be passed on to lawyers. So that would be our proof of concept would be (unintelligible).

And I would test the system by asking ICANN legal to hold the pen on this one once we have the specifications approved. And based on this experience it would be probably easier to see whether this system with ICANN legal holding the pen works out or not.

And I think that also creates the right incentive for our group to make sure we're extremely clear about our specifications to avoid any potential problems after that.

So I think by kicking off the process off the ground with this approach for this particular item and making a more final decision on who's going to hold the pen later we would have actually a third data point that would help us make this call - maybe it was more peace in mind after that.

So that's the way I'm proposing we move forward with this particular AOC review block of the report.

And really encouraging everyone to make their best to really make this work smoothly because as was reminded in the chat, it's been made clear that the bylaws - the work stream one related bylaws need to be incorporated and need

to be approved by the board before Congressional approval, that's part of the certification process from NTIA. So this is very much under critical path so we need to make that work.

So (Jordan Carter) is the (unintelligible) for work party one. He handles the AOC review incorporations and so he will be tasked to come back with clear specifications to our group and then we'll hand over to bylaw drafting to the lawyers. And maybe we'll end up exchanging pens at some point, whatever, but for this one let's move like this so that we can get this started and off the ground.

And with that I will - so the action item is for work party one to come back with the specs on this group, on this part ideally by next week. And then we'll hand over at this point. And with that I will now turn to Leon for any other business. I think Leon, you had a couple of - at least one item you wanted to share.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you, Mathieu. Yes, that is right and that is with regards to our slide to - let's see, NTIA letter by (unintelligible), which we received on May 6. We have drafted an answer for a letter and I don't know staff if you have it available? It would be created through - displayed in the (unintelligible).

So basically what this letters says is that we are expecting to conclude our second draft by the end of July, open it for public comment, and having this public - (unintelligible) public comment period by the end of December. So we can incorporate the (unintelligible) - the different comments received in the second public comment period.

And then have it sent for the chartering organization for the (unintelligible) review and hopefully (unintelligible) and approved by our meeting in Dublin.

And of course, we are also talking about some implementation issues and the way we would be moving forward and the expected timeline that we can foresee at this stage.

And we would be asking or suggesting to the NTIA to extend the IANA function contract to at least December 2016 based on the assessment that we have done.

And of course, we are also stressing that these (unintelligible) is based on a best case scenario and, of course, this could change if - for example, we find out that after the second public comment period we don't have a final proposal.

It would, of course, out of the timeline. So at this point I would like to call for any (unintelligible) that we send these letters that you have in your screen as a reply to (unintelligible) and the NTIA of course with regards to the letter we received on May 6 in which they asked for feedback as to which was the timeline and set a timeline and - of course, a suggestion on extension for the IANA contract for - in other the constituents to finalize some place.

Mathieu Weill: Okay, so I see Kavouss' hand is up. Kavouss

Kavouss Arasteh: I don't think that ccWG should (unintelligible) NTIA to extent contract for one year or any time. It just should mention that (unintelligible) to them or to NTIA but not take this (unintelligible) responsibility back to ccWG off the extension of one year or more or at least one year. This is a very technical issue. We just say when we are ready, that's all.

Leave it to them to decide one year, just one year, and not (unintelligible). We should avoid to get into something which is not our duty. Our duty is not to

talk about the regulations of the extension. We should say that where we are (unintelligible) and limit them to decide. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Kavouss, for this point you are making. And it seems like the fair suggestion so we will be amending this - we'll be amending this draft letter that we've provide the timeline for us to achieve the different goals that we need to (unintelligible) their work.

And then we'll leave it up to the NTIA to type whether they can - or contract to a certain date or not. Any other comments with regards to the letter? Okay, I see no other comments. Greg, do you have a hand up?

Greg Shatan: Yes, I'm not sure exactly whether this letter is - you know, considered good to go. I think there may be a couple of things that - the second paragraph is one long runoff, I think it's - that's some clarity problems.

And the second to the bottom paragraph, if Congressional review is passed - just kind of the wrong usage. I don't often describe Congressional activities, maybe somebody in our group who does that more often can substitute - have clearer language.

But that said, you know, I don't want to sit here and wordsmith the thing to death. It just seems to maybe need a little bit of fine-tuning. I think overall the message is appropriate though. Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Greg. yes, you are right, I think we can call for a hand here. Not only for (unintelligible) but also for someone who (unintelligible) Congressional processes so I would like to maybe - Steve DelBianco to hand off with (unintelligible) and wordsmithing the final versions of this.

So yes, to Mathieu's point, out of native Washington Congress speaker. So Steve, we - I see that you are agreed to this and we will, of course, continue this draft as we have so far so you can help us with the final version (unintelligible) to the NTIA.

And I believe that Mathieu has another issue in any of the business so Mathieu, would you like to raise it?

Mathieu Weill: Yes, thank you, Leon. Mathieu (unintelligible) speaking. This is related to the discussion that we started quite late actually on the ongoing public comment period regarding the next (unintelligible) and structural reviews that ICANN is planning.

You may have noticed I - I mean we were informed about this public comment by an email circulated last week on the list by (Alex). And I suggested some very blunt ways of answering this. And that triggered a debate within our group.

So the key - the question - the suggestion I was about to make in this AOB would be maybe one thing we can do - because the deadline is July 2 for this public comment, would be to capture these exchanges we've had on the list and sort of recap them as a contribution to the public comment showing that there's - there are diverse views within our group about how to proceed with the upcoming reviews and structural - within ICANN in light of our upcoming recommendations.

So that would be the suggestion that I would make that - if the group agrees we would sort of pass on the exchange of email to the - to this group so that they can benefit from this exchange of views while asserting their next step.

So if there's no objection to that I would happily take the action item to do just a cover letter and then send the exchange of email to the organizers of this public comment.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Mathieu. I see no objection so I guess you're good to go. Okay, so are there any other business that wants to raise at this point? Steve, I see your hand up? Steve (unintelligible) in Singapore.

Steve DelBianco: Yes, thank you, Leon. Hope you can hear me. I typed this in the chat earlier but I'm curious if we have a plan in place for reviewing, assessing, and responding to the questions posed by the board just before the Buenos Aires session.

I apologize if I missed the discussion on this but I think we need to develop a plan for considering and responding to those questions or at least incorporating them into our follow on work. Any further detail on that would be helpful. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Steve. And I believe Mathieu has the answer for that so Mathieu?

Mathieu Weill: Yes, Steve. Thank you. We did not formally assess how we would respond and how we would treat this.

However, I would note that number one, our - many of these questions are already taken onboard while we discuss the model and those questions have been transferred to - certainly part of the package of things of external independent council can rely on to test the various model. And I suspect many of these questions were related to that.

It was suggested informally that maybe it could be useful that if (Sam) as the ccWG's task liaison could maybe started looking at this questions and based on her understanding of the ccWG model at this point - point out the most relevant one (unintelligible) work plus maybe try your first step of answering the question. And that would certainly be helpful for work party one and work party two to proceed.

I would be, however, reluctant to go into an extensive review of the questions because I think - as (unintelligible) was saying, we need to be very focused right now and I'm - I would avoid getting into too much of a systematic approach. And probably if some of these questions remain after our public comment number two then we can certainly dive deeper. That would be my proposed approach.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Mathieu. I hope that answers your question, (Steve). And I see you're answering on the chat box. Okay. So are there any other business - anybody wants us to raise at this point?

Okay, having no other business to raise are no - Mathieu, do you want to do a couple of final remarks on our call today?

Mathieu Weill: What I can say is that we are aware of the amount of work that's ahead of us and very limited time we have available to make the Paris meeting successful. We really want to stay focused on priorities. Unfortunately we have a significant amount of requirements.

I'm glad we didn't spend time on the models this time - and worked on organizing the rest of the work because I think there's - it's also part of our proposals, which are very important and the model itself is the way to implement some of the requirements.

And I think it's also showing that there's a lot few have in common. I'm also glad we can initiate the bylaws drafting processes, at least test it because our timeline for that is also very, very short. And I would like to say very clearly that we are not putting anything under the (unintelligible). There's going to be a number of good discussions we need to have in Paris.

Our goal as co-chairs right now is to make sure this discussion takes place on the basis of informed papers that we all have read and so that we can make those discussions in a reasonably informed manner for our group to proceed. So that's the - to us, a very, very important. I see Kavouss raised their hand. Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: No, no, that was old hand, sorry.

Mathieu Weill: All right, thank you Kavouss. Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you very much, Mathieu, Tijani speaking. While I understand very well the importance of those issues or (unintelligible) exit draft to be discussed and to be, perhaps, clear and very soon I don't see how we can say that we don't have to focus on the model because we have now a new proposal of the model but without the detail.

And it - as I said in Buenos Aires, it is apparently acceptable but we need to say it because everything is in the details at the end. So at least we need the legal advisor to come up with something very clear, very detailed of this model so that we can discuss it clearly and accept it or perhaps modify it. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you, (unintelligible). I think you made the point much better than I did. But that's - that was my intent. We need to have this discussion but based on very clear information. It's an important discussion that we will need to have.

And I think with that we can close this meeting ten minutes extra sleep for some of you. I don't think it's going to make much difference but still it's valuable.

And thank you very much for the constructive exchanges or (unintelligible) this meeting. And we look forward to talking to you next Tuesday. Thanks everyone. And thanks, Leon, for chairing this call while on vacation and at night.

Woman: Good night everybody.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much everyone, always a pleasure. Bye-bye.

END