ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
July 6, 2015
8:00am CT

Jordan Carter: My name is Jordan Carter from (unintelligible). Thank you for attending this call, whether it's morning, noon or night for you. As you can see from the agenda, we've got one (unintelligible) today which is to discuss the version 2 public report content that has been prepared on the incorporation of the (OC) reviews with the ICANN bylaws with Steve, Avri and others.

Aside with that, we'll finish up at the end with a brief update on volunteers and what we'll do by next call on the 8th of July and on the 10th of July. So first is review of the agenda.

Are there any other items that people feel we need to discuss today? I don't see any hands up. In that case, we'll get right on to it. We can add a few other things to capture in any other business slots at the end of the meeting. It's my expectation that this call will not take over the 90 minutes allotted. There was a contingency in case there was a lot on the list in terms of debate, but let's see how we go.

In terms of the first, Item Number 2 on our agenda, I'd ask to start to please load the document that was circulated with the agenda into the screen. Then

I'm going to ask (Steve DelBianco) to introduce the content as well as a draft. So Steve and Avri, it's up to you, between you, if you'd like to do the intro.

Which of you would like to begin?

Steve DelBianco: This is Steve. And Avri, please jump in at any point. Jordan is right. It should not take 60 minutes. This was one of the more straightforward assignments coming out of our first draft which produced and allowed the comment and update our draft, reflect the public comment. We'll go back later on and explain in the public comment tool the changes that we made.

I said it should be straightforward. There is one element of discussion -- we'll save that for the end of our particular session -- and that's the discussion about a composed reaffirmation of review speed.

So to dive right in, the red text is text that I added. I explained a lot of this on the call we had a week ago. The red text I added here is to give content because this section -- Section 6.2 -- is going to be circulated as a stand-alone section, both to members of our CCWG for their approval and later to be given to attorneys from either side so that they could prepare bylaw changes -- trying to adjust the microphone. I hope that's better.

So the idea here is that the red text is contacts so that is somebody handed this small document for Section 6.2, it will be apparent where this fits into the greater scheme of things and why it is that the affirmation of commitment is something we want to bring into the bylaws; that we try to explain how it's cancelable by other parties; it's a bilateral agreement; and as such, it's the next target for elimination, once you eliminate the bilateral agreement of the IANA contract.

The blue text on the screen was added by my partner in crime Avri Doria, which you did this weekend. And Avri gives the excellent comment there that, "If, in fact, the AOC has reviews that are underway at the time that we bring these reviews into the bylaws, we've got to be sure that they don't overlap or conflict with each other." And that's a broader topic; it's not part of this bylaw change, but the broader topic of whether the CCWG should recommend that, for instance, the ATRT review begin now under the affirmation or does it wait several months and begin once we have the ATRT brought into the bylaws?

That's not necessarily something we have to decide here and now, but I wanted to make sure that you know that that is on the agenda as well. So I think you all have...

Avri Doria: Can I jump in a second on that one? This is Avri speaking. And you did invite me to jump in.

I would not want to characterize that sentence there as implied in any way that I think we should delay the ATRT to review that is supposed to start in 2016. I just wanted to make sure that that implication wasn't there; that my point in writing is the way I wrote it is that any reviews that are ongoing in their own cycle. Because at the moment we really - I mean yes, we have a goal on when we're going to finish, but we don't know when we're going to finish. So we should be prepping for -- in my view -- ATRT to now and things should run on their own schedule and then we just have to adjust later.

So I really want to make sure that there is no implication in what I wrote that says we should reconsider starting reviews now. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Avri.

At the bottom of this Page 1 is additional text where we explained the way in which we are improving or enhancing the ability of these reviews to serve their intended purposes. Again, the red text is what I added. The blue text Avri had added. This is not bylaws text. This is explanatory text so the folks understand the kinds of changes we made.

One topic is: How were the review team members selected, and we'll get to that in a minute. It's probably better to examine that once we make our way all the way through the document.

So if you'll proceed to Page 2, there is a small discussion on implementation of routines from previous review. This is in response to several public comments who were concerned that we didn't require the board to implement every recommendation that came out of a review team. In the public comment tool, we explained that there are legitimate reasons that the board may not implement every single recommendation that comes out of a review team such as whether it's implementable as written or whether the costs are a concern. In those cases, the board may decide not to implement.

If they decided not to implement, we wanted to note to everyone that any aggrieved party or the community itself could file for reconsideration or an IRP process in order to challenge the decision not to implement, to challenge the decision of implementability or costs. And that has been subject to the process that we have for reconsideration for the independent review panel themselves, and we can reverse that decision or affirm it in that case.

Avri and I - at least it's our read, that the CCWG did not want a hard code of requirement, that every single recommendation coming out of a review team -- and there are four different review teams coming over from the affirmation -- that every single recommendation must be implemented by the board.

This would be a good time to let us know that any CCWG members differ from that, but that's been the view expressed all along.

Alan Greenberg, your hand is up.

Alan Greenburg: Thank you. My hand went up with respect to Avri's original comment on ATRT 3. Just for the record, it doesn't really alter it.

My understanding is that the board and staff de facto are doing closer to what we're recommending in the future than has been done in the past. ATRT 2 started 3 years after the start of ATRT 1, you know, essentially giving only 2 years for implementation. I thought, based on (Larissa's) presentation at the last meet in Buenos Aires, that they were planning to do ATRT 3 starting not in 2016 as would have been but 2017, which essentially is a little closer to what we're recommending; that would be to start it when the recommendations are handed in and given 3 full years for implementation.

I may have misread what she said, but that was my understanding. If, indeed, I'm correct, then ATRT 3 is not due to start this coming year, and we should not be doing the prep. As I said, I may have understood.

With respect to the question you just asked, my only thought is: Do we want to mention -- and we probably don't need to -- that the third alternative is they're implementing the intent of the recommendation but using different methodology. I suspect it really falls within the broader categories we're already covering there, but I just wanted to mention that.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Alan. Avri?

Avri Doria: Hi. To respond to Alan's point: Yes, I believe that some in the staff are trying to push the ATRT 3 out by a year. I personally consider that somewhat illegitimate. I also happen - I just believe, let's say, that the MPAA really does expect that it is starting in 2016 unless we negotiate something different with them. You'll notice one of the blue edits in this is I am not in agreement with the end-to-beginning timing as opposed to beginning-to-beginning timing, that the three-year gap is supposed to be beginning-to-beginning.

I don't think we're there yet insofar as Alan saying we have decided that we are doing beginning-to-beginning scheduling, because I'm certainly not there yet.

Alan Greenburg: Just for the record, in that case I think we're way overdue on the next Whois. I don't remember when it started, but I'm sure it's all...

Avri Doria: That's true and that's a problem.

Steve DelBianco: All right. It may not be a problem for how we write the new bylaws, but it might be a problem nonetheless.

Jonathan Zuck?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, thanks. Jonathan Zuck for the transcript. Just to clarify, I guess I'll come in and agree with Avri about the state of affairs. There is a proposal by staff to push out some of the reviews that is currently up for public comment. And the public comment period has been extended. The two proposed CCWG comments on that proposal, and my understanding of our processes at ICANN is that absent some consensus in the public comments that the reviews would probably go on as scheduled and not be changed according to the plan made by the staff, although I'm not sure exactly how that would work.

I agree with Avri that it's not a decision that has been made. That said, I wonder if we need to schedule a conversation and maybe a subcommittee of the CCWG and maybe it's not a work party 1, that's why I didn't want to just interject, Jordan. I feel like the volunteer burnout issue is very real, and I feel like this issue and the likelihood of some overlap and conflict and the fact that the implementation is still going on for ATRT 2 suggests that moving some things out does make sense. So I disagree with Avri on that, although I know that Avri's point is about the level of preparation and research and the gathering of materials that could happen in a kind of non-obtrusive way.

I continue to be concerned about the notion of using review teams as the motivation to implement old recommendations and would love to find an alternative to that. I feel like there is an opportunity here to get this cleaned up through the accountability process that I think is on a deadline. We should seriously consider the staff proposal to move things out in order to have a clean transition.

Avri, I know you disagree, but I wonder if it's something the CCWG should focus on with its own call or a little working group or something like that, a subgroup, because it remains an open issue.

Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Jonathan. Avri and Alan, you're in queue. But let's please have a very abbreviation discussion on the scheduling of the affirmation reviews that are already in the affirmation of commitments that's not relevant to the bylaws text on the how the reviews will be folded into the bylaws in the future. It's certainly important and I appreciate all of you weighing in, but it doesn't affect the task in front of us and the document you have in front of you.

Go ahead, Avri, and then Alan.

Avri Doria: Yes, Steve. Thank you very much for that comment. In fact, that's the reason I wrote the thing as I did stating that it was an implementation detail to these outlets later. We just need to be careful later that we're doing it. It wasn't until you brought up the whole open comment period on pushing things out that I bothered to speak at all. I was willing to just leave it as an implementation detail. I would like to just - while we're on the subject maybe even mention ATRT in their recommendation at all.

Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Alan?

Alan Greenberg: No. I lowered my hand at this point, for the record. My understanding is ATRT 3 was not in the list of ones they said would start in 2016 if we made no changes as if the philosophical change was already made, but I don't know that for a fact. I think we're going down a rabbit hole of talking what is should be today.

Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Okay, thanks, Alan.

All right, folks. Let's get back to the document. We get to the first part of the chapeau, which applies to all four of the reviews. The first one in here is: I wonder whether our text is clear enough -- this is on Page 2 of 8, if you're following along with me, it would be the proposed bylaws -- on an annual report on the state of improvement the transparent being an accountability

where ICANN is response to create an annual report that details the status of the station and all reviews that bind in the section.

That will help review teams who would have had the burden of looking back to see what's been implemented and what hasn't. It should (unintelligible) to ICANN and staff on an annual basis as opposed to every three or every five years as planned in this one.

I think it's a great idea. I still support the idea. The question is: Is this language specific enough that the lawyers for either side can turn them into bylaws language that stick with a degree of specificity that ICANN already has in the bylaws for the structural review? I note that it is not very specific text. It is of this nature of broad requirements for reports and recommendations.

Is there anyone who feels we need to tighten this language or is it good the way it is? I'll take a queue on that.

Jonathan, your hand is up?

Jonathan Zuck: Sorry, old hand.

Steve DelBianco: All right. So let's go to Page 3. As we move down, Page 3 is more of the chapeau, which applies to all the reviews. And you'll see in the center right here -- on the center of Page 3 -- is this discussion that Avri and I have been going back and forth on, and Alan, (Greg Eberhart), a number of you have weighed in on the discussion of how specific we want to be at specifying the number of people in a review team and where they come from, the decision-making method and whether voting is ever required, consensus cannot be found.

I'm going your indulgence that we come back to that after we finish the rest of this document, because that's really the meat of the discussion. Most of the rest of this document should be a slam dunk, but we'll come back to this discussion.

I want to remind everyone that when we put out our public comment on May the 3rd, we did not specify exactly how this team was compromised. In other words, we adopted the affirmation of commitments language, which has no specific requirements for the quantify of review team members from each AC and SO. Instead, it left it all to the GACs and ICANN board chair to select a candidate. We have turned that upside down to say that the GAC and the board chair do not select a candidate, the ACNSOs do.

In keeping with what Avri had on Page 1, we believe the community should drive part of it, but we still have to decide whether we want to put constrains on the quantify of people in there to assure diversity, to assure representation of some of the subgroups that live in the incredibly detailed GNSO constituencies. Please indulge me, and we'll come back to that.

On Page 3, we have this discussion on to facilitate transparency and openness, we want the review teams to have access to ICANN's internal documents. That's new done in the affirmation of commitment. Now the board, in its comments to us, was very concerned about sensitive or confidential personnel information that, while they would be willing to share with a review team, would not want it to be relayed to the general public.

So what I put in the red text there was a statement to the effect that we would agree not to disclose sensitive or confidential information. I don't think we want to simply rely upon ICANN's general counsel to indicate what they

think is confidential. That raises a little bit of a concern because I don't know how it is we would determine what is confidential, but enough to take a queue on this one.

Do we want to add the red text for the board request or leave it unsaid as to what is confidential? Any thoughts on that? Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I think if you're going to say review teams get access to confidential information, I think you have to have something like that. I mean you have to have it in practice, whether you can be silent here and not have someone file a review request because the staff (unintelligible) to say they must keep something confidential is the question.

I'm not sure whether we need it but we simply (unintelligible). I don't know where that's coming from. I hope it's not from me. I would even have gone farther and said...

Steve DelBianco: Are you (unintelligible)?

Alan Greenberg: Steve, I can't hear you. I don't know about anyone else.

Steve DelBianco: All right, Alan. Are you mowing your lawn at this point?

Alan Greenberg: No. I have one more thing to say. I would have gone further, in fact, and said that there may be some things which the whole review team will not be made privy to but will be released to a subset of review teams, you know, the chairs or something like that. There are certainly examples where by making something available to 30 people or 25 people, you're making it available for the world regardless.

Steve DelBianco: All right. Okay. Thank you. And then go to Jordan. Let's keep in mind that there are independent documents transparency requests that happen outside of the review. This is only with respect to documents access that occurs within a review team.

Jordan?

Jordan Carter: Thanks, Steve. I support the wording that you've got there as appropriate to consult a community in our second public comment report and to prepare bylaws as well. I think there may be things that need to get raised confidentially in the course of one of these reviews; that is, given what the reviews are reviewing and their overall impression. I don't think that it's the case that this will be creating a (unintelligible) back.

I think it's okay for confidential information to be shared confidentially to help share the point or to help demonstrate why the change is being proposed or not proposed. That's all fine. It seems to make sense to me. And will get pushed backed to the community if people don't like it.

Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Jordan.

Even if the community likes it, it may that ICANN's lawyers or our lawyers will come back and say: Well, what do you mean by should not be an ICANN full discretion? Do we have to lay a process or how confidentiality is determined? So it opens a little Pandora's Box, but I appreciate your support for the draft language there.

Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes. Hi. Thanks. Avri speaking. I mean in ATRT, too, we already discussed where the situation was where we did get some confidential information where a subgroup did help form people that basically said we were willing to hear it but not discuss anything but the outcomes that came of our discussions on it and why we'd (unintelligible) an (MNDA). As it were, we did take a verbal (MDA) on those issue, and I don't think any of us have discussed them, even to the point of saying what the issue necessarily was.

So I think that - yes, I think we need some mechanism. I don't know that we need to go in more detail. I was tempted to add words to this saying something like what I just blathered but it's more precisely. I think we might, you know, want to take that one step further and say in cases where information does need to be kept confidential.

This last time, it (wasn't) a discussion between the staff and the ATRT on the demand for information. We came up with mutually the way to do it. So that's why not at their full discretion is reasonable that it's there; it needs to be in cooperation with the review team. Perhaps we do need another sentence there.

Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Avri. The situation that you made us aware of -- the actual example -- would have been accommodated in this text. I realize it was a subteam and not the entire review team, but it did capture the issue of an agreement. It doesn't have to be in writing, but if it was an agreement, it was not in ICANN's discretion. We could say that the red text is pretty close to what has happened before, but you're right, we may need more language on that.

The next paragraph gets to the notion of the draft output of the review. That posts the review conclusions as well as the recommendations have to be published for public comment and that we will consider public comment and amend the review as we determine appropriate.

On this particular paragraph, one of the public comments or if the government abstains, the very team to say the review teams' reports and recommendations should indicate the degree of consensus and should indicate how they have decided to respond to public comments. Our text here doesn't say all that.

Yet if it's an understanding that we have in terms of moving to a culture of accountability, do folks think we should add a requirement in the chapeau that the review team recommendations and reports should indicate the degree of consensus and that the review team should publish a response to the public comments? I'll take a queue on that. Again, this is if the government abstains.

Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I guess I feel that you have to give the review team a little bit of flexibility on this. Time constraints coupled with the difficulty sometimes of responding specifically to comments by comments make that really, really difficult. I think it's mandatory that all comments must be taken into account and discussed. Whether we can give feedback on them one-by-one I think is a little bit problematic, and I'd give a little bit of (unintelligible).

Steve DelBianco: Alan, you say that - I think I would agree with you that we could add a line that our report should indicate the degree of consensus achieved but that we would not necessarily add a line that we had to publish a response to every single public comment. I would put myself in agreement with you on that. Any other hands on that specific?

Alan, would you think the bylaws should be specific to indicate that the report include the degree of consensus?

Alan Greenburg: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. Got it. Any others on this?

All right. I think we conclude to give Spain the consensus point but not the point on responding to each and every public comment, and I can add that. Thank you.

Let's go to the next page. This gets to the very first review: The ATRT, the accountability transparency review, two of which have already happened. Alan and Avri have been very experienced on working on both of those. The first change we made was this A through E list used to say that this review particular attention should be paid to.

And there was a comment from the ALAC that suggested that that was limiting and that we should make a more flexible indication that the topics may include but not must include. So we changed the wording to "issues that may merit attention that review includes" and that's to make it abundantly clear this is not a requirement; that this and only this list needs to be in there.

We also made a change in red that the review team shall assess the extent to which prior review recommendations have been implemented. If you recall from the AOC itself, the ATRT team had the unenviable task of checking on all four review team previous recommendation. It was a number of public commenters who thought that that was too high a bar.

I believe that what we're trying to do here is to say that each review team assesses the extent to which the previous review teams' recommendations have been implemented. And even that task should be made much easier because of the transparency - sorry, the accountability and transparency report that ICANN would have to publish once a year.

You recall, we covered that in the previous chapeau because if ICANN has to publish a status report on the implementation of previous review teams, that makes it much easier for the review team to catalog which has been implemented and which has not, even though it may decide to differ from the interpretation the staff has.

The next one is a brand new requirement that...

Alan Greenberg: Steve, it's Alan. In the red text, it says to the extent to which prior review recommendations. Given that this is the first review, do we need to qualify that we're talking about accountability and transparency review as opposed to all review recommendations?

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Alan. On the remainder of the four reviews, we use the same language to say "prior review recommendations" implying that it was the review in this subsection.

Alan Greenburg: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: You're the lawyer here. If you think we need more specific language, we'd be happy to do that.

Alan Greenburg: Yes. The only reason is in the past the ATRT did have that requirement.

Steve DelBianco: Right and I noted that earlier. We're looking to relieve some of that burden. So it might say "this subsection" or "this review." Help me come up with a word on that and send it to me offline. But I think we all understand what the intent is.

Alan Greenburg: Yes. Okay. Thank you. I'll look at it.

Steve DelBianco: It's repeated for each of the next three reviews. So probably want to make it consistent if we can.

Okay. The next paragraph on Page 4 is the idea that the ATRT has a special new responsibility to recommend a termination of the other three reviews including the ATRT, and it can recommend additional reviews. It gives some degree of flexibility and permanence to the idea of these reviews so that in the future, for instance, the Whois review might go away or be replaced by a review of directory service.

As such, there were several public comments that indicated concerns that an ATRT could simply terminate and there would be no opportunity for public comment. I don't want it to make two observations on that and we did so in the earlier section.

The recommendation to terminate or start a new review, first of all, goes out for public comment. Second, if the board accepts or denies, that decision is subject to review and challenge. Third, if they were to eliminate or add a review, it becomes an addition to the bylaws. When they get added to the bylaws, they are also subject to community challenge for a bylaws change.

So there are three opportunities for the community to get in the way of a review team deciding to terminate a review or start a brand new review. I feel

like with those three opportunities for the community to comment on so we have enough safeguard here and that we can leave this text as is. I'm happy to take a queue on that. Does anybody differ?

Great. Thank you.

Now we get to the topic of - Avri added the blue text that the review team should complete its review within one year, so putting a (shot clock) block on the review team.

Avri, I'd like to turn it over to you to explain the thinking behind that. There is no such requirement in the current affirmation of commitments in this one part of our public document in May.

Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. This is Avri speaking. Actually, on the ATRT, and this is one of the ambiguity - on the HRT, rather, is one of the ambiguities that perhaps comes up in the reading of the AOC, it gives a very specific deadline of one year later for the first ATRT. I have and I think others perhaps have taken that to include a one-year period on that.

One reason that I would argue for it -- whether there historically or not, though, I believe it's there historically already -- is that a review like accountability and transparency can be infinite in scope. It can continue to dig and dig and dig. Confining it within a year and having a strict schedule of repetition both keeps it bounded and allows you to allow the periodic checks. So this is why I accompany this with some of the other recommendations I may (glow) about it, you know, the beginning-to-beginning nature of this review.

Also, the fact that we've seen frequently -- and this is a normal organizational tendency -- a lot of the things don't get done until the last year anyhow. This is a personal bet whether it's three years or five years, I'd bet we still waited until the last year to get most things done. I'm not arguing against the new five-year cycle that we're recommending instead of the current three.

Basically, if it's bounding the time of an ATRT review, I think is what was originally recommended. And I think that we made a good idea because of the indefinitely large nature of the subject.

Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. Thanks, Avri. Alan?

Alan Greenburg: Thank you. I support the current wording. I'll note ATRT, too, in fact, decided, largely due to pressure from both the chair and the NCIA to complete by December 31st, even though we didn't start until, if I remember correctly, mid-March. So this gives more time than ATRT 2 had. If it starts late, then it ends late. I'm a little concerned about is the word "initiation" defined? Like with PDP is initiation when we start talking about it or when we actually sit down to work? So that we may want to go back and look and see whether that definition is clear.

But I'm happy with one year. I'll note the Whois review team took about a year-and-a-half to do its work, whether that was an issue of the vast amount of work to do for the first one or if it was something else, I don't know.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks, Alan. I see no other names in the queue. I should just add this is a new requirement.

Are there any objections to the inclusion of the blue text on the one-year goal? Are there any objections? You can speak up if you're only on the bridge.

Alan Greenburg: It's Alan. My only not objection but question is: Do we define "initiation" or leave it undefined? Leaving it undefined is fine. If we defined it somewhere as prior to when the review team actually meets, I find that problematic.

Steve DelBianco: Avri, since you wrote the original text, do you have a way to solve Alan's problem on the word "initiation"? We're not going to define "initiation."

Alan Greenburg: If it's not defined, I have no problem.

Avri Doria: I would not define "initiation." I'm more than willing to suggest changing it to, you know, from when (unintelligible). And you're talking about, oh, this initiation. Yes, from the selection -- the final selection -- of the members so I can replace initiation from one year from the final selection of the members.

Alan Greenburg: May I suggest the one-word change to change "initiation" to "convenes"?

Avri Doria: Sure thing. Works for me.

Steve DelBianco: So within one year of convene? Okay?

Alan Greenburg: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Great. Thank you.

Next line gets to the issue of how frequently they occur. Avri indicated no problem with the idea of five every five years. But on all four of the reviews,

we published identical lines in all cases. We said: Periodic review should be conducted no less frequently than every five years measured from the date the board receive the final report of the prior review team. So we were measuring the five year no less frequently. It can be more frequently, right? We can do it every year if we wanted to and we had volunteers. But you can't let more than five years pass from when you handed the board the last ATRT. So when you'll need to begin the next one. They're all worded the same.

Avri in blue text is suggesting changing the beginning date from when they should go.

Now Greg I saw your hand pop up and down, and I'm very sorry that I've missed that. If you want to get back in on a previous topic, Greg, let me know. I don't see your hand popping back up.

So, Avri, if you wish to explain your view on changing the (shot clock) on the five-year delay. Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay. Partly it has to do with various comments we've gotten about some things being too far apart and five years being too late. Perhaps I should have changed it in the chapeau text that I propose to just there or I should at least have changed the chapeau text to include the clause "unless they're supplied elsewhere" because then I was going ahead and specifying elsewhere. So at least that change I should have made but I didn't make.

Again, it's in the nature of the accountability review. Effectively, this redefined five years, at least in my mind, can mean six years or more. Now by limiting it to a year, you know, okay, we're limiting it to six years from start-to-start. I actually think our whole five years from when the report is given is actually a mistake. I think that we see that in some of the comments. I don't

think we got any comments saying five years is too quick so that we would want to stretch it further.

I do think we've got quite a few concerns about stretching things out too long. Again, in terms of looking at all of them, while I think all of the special subject ones are interesting, but their interest is in the sense more ephemeral; different subjects will be needed for the review at different points in ICANN's history; that's why we're changing, you know, putting in the ability to cancel and initiate new AOC type reviews.

I think that the ATRT has a - it's almost a pacemaker of the reviews. It's the one that comes and says: Are reviews being treated properly? Are they, in general, being both done and implemented and everything as the community thinks they should be? So it really provides the rhythm and the true accountability of the whole process.

So that's why I think stretching to five years is problematic, but I'm willing to go along with that personally. I think that the community seems willing to go along with that, even if there was some concern. But I think stretching it longer by doing an end-to-beginning scheduling puts in another year that we just should not be doing at this point.

Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: So, Avri, to make it clear: This is a change that would say that - you mentioned the five years from beginning-to-beginning as opposed to end-to-beginning. I'll take it that you believe that if we made that change here, we'd make it for all four reviews, so that the five years is really five years. And in keeping with the previous, we could say the word "what's convened" instead of initiated because initiated is undefined...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. I take it - and that's what I would rather get. I would rather get everybody's view on the general part that all four reviews should be five years measured from beginning-to-beginning rather than from end...

Avri Doria: That wasn't the recommendation I was making, but I'm fine with that recommendation.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. To keep them consistent and to keep them simple would be my goal here.

Alan?

Alan Greenburg: Thank you. I tend to support Avri. The five plus one is essentially doubling what we have practiced until now. I think that's a big excessive. I would even support putting language in, but it may be becoming too complex to say they should typically be three years from the submission or four years from convening but could be extended to five or something like that.

Since an ATRT can recommend the abolishment of future ATRTs, presumably you can also recommend a change in timing, which a far less onerous change. In any case, user-only bylaws and bylaws can be changed. I would support what Avri is saying: Convening to convening the five year.

Steve DelBianco: Right. And to make it clear we would probably change the word to "convene." So periodically you shall be convened, no less frequently than it be five years measured from the date the previous review was convened.

Alan Greenburg: That sounds actually clear.

Steve DelBianco: Okay. Anyone else on the queue on this?

All right. Seeing not, are there objections to changing all four reviews so they go from beginning-to-beginning with a five year, same text to convene-to-convene. Any objections? Great.

Seeing none, let's move onto the next page, which will be Page 5. Only a few things on here. This is the security facility resiliency. I see no changes on this page. The only one we would have is to change to the text we just made on the five-year cycle.

The next page is promoting consumer trust competition and consumer choice. This is the review of new GCLVs. This particular review hasn't been conducted yet. The first one is scheduled to begin later this year. Now there were a couple of public comments that explained concerns that the first line of each of these reviews is the commitment. It start with the word "ICANN will (ensure)" that as it expands that it will adequately address. That is a commitment.

And that commitment in all five cases - four cases was supposed to make its way to the core values of paragraph 107. In this particular case of the business constituency, they pointed out that most of the last sentence was left out of the core values text. That public comment has been turned over, but I imaging that's work party 2. So I'll look for your help, staff, and your help, Jordan, to be sure that the work party in charge of the core values picks up the malicious abuse issues and sovereignty concerns and a right to protection. Because we need to bring all of that over from the affirmation, not just the first three words.

Any comments on that? It's not a change to our section. It's only a change to a different section.

Great. Thank you.

Alan Greenburg: Steve, I had my...

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead, Al.

Alan Greenburg: My only concern is -- and maybe it's completely - something that will never happen -- if we ever get to the point where we can actually do rounds a lot more frequently; doing it a year after each batch may be onerous. I'm not sure we're - I think we're maybe so far away from that we don't need to worry about it.

Steve DelBianco: Yes. Alan, I explained it in some of the reaction to public comments where the word "batched" definitely threw some people. I used that word deliberately because there is, at least in discussion earlier at ICANN, of having new TLD window be open continuously, make a row from continuously. This one-year thing doesn't really apply anymore. And then you just end up with an every five-year review of the continuously open window of new gTLD applications.

But, if, in fact, we do them in batch rounds because we publish a brand new guidebook and do an open window that closes after a period of time, then that batch creates the one year trigger review.

Alan Greenburg: Well, my concern is we do something in between. Instead of saying contiguous saying we receive applications in the month of January every year.

At that point, they're batched but they're annual. That's the scenario that I worry about our wording for.

Steve DelBianco: Do you have a solution? We could take this requirement out and just say "every five years," but I have a feeling there are plenty of ICANN stakeholders who believe that after a new guidebook and a new round is closed, the year after they're in operation is the perfect time to review, not only the consumer trust and choice in competition but how well the evaluation and application process works.

Alan Greenburg: In other places, we use "should" as the softer word than "shall." We may want to consider that here.

Steve DelBianco: All right. Jordan Carter?

Jordan Carter: We don't need to solve that problem here. We know the current tempo of these rounds. If it goes continuous, we can fix the bylaws. I think it stands fine as it is for this purpose for this consultation.

Steve DelBianco: All right. Thank you, Jordan. No other comments on this page.

Let's go to the very next page, which is the review of Whois and directory services. I note that we changed the title to say "Whois/directory services" to make it clear, because we don't think this has to apply only to the Whois service. Nonetheless, the board of directors wrote us expressing concern that it would be not clear to lock in Whois.

Well, I think that we've replied to the board in our public comment tool explaining that it says "Whois/directory services" and leave it at that.

A line that was added, I believe by Avri or (Matthew Sheers) is the third paragraph down. It says that existing policy includes the requirements of legal constraints regarding privacy as defined by the OECD in two particular years. There was a public comment that we got from the IPC saying that OECD guidelines do not have the (force) of law. So they are not legal constraints.

So, Avri, if you're prepared to respond to that here, please do so. Otherwise, we should take it offline and do it with a very specific targeted e-mail discussion as to whether this is really worded properly.

Avri or Greg, do either of you want to weigh in on that?

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Yes. It was several of us that ended up putting it in. I don't remember who actually wrote the final. It might have been me but it was on behalf of a group. It was from - as I said, it was in the previous version.

I think that we are not stating that this is binding. It is just part of the body of international expectations that many of our countries, et cetera, have agreed to and that we should be taking into consideration. So I have no problem re-wording it if need be to indicate "by the way, this is not legally binding on any particular country unless, of course, they signed a treaty on it." I would need to go back and check to what degree any of the OECD things have ended up being accepted as binding, have been taken in by any of the governments. I'm willing to argue that it's not binding. I don't think anyone argued that we should take it out. Re-wording it to give wiggle room for those that are concerned about too much privacy is fine with me.

Steve DelBianco: So it potentially could be worded "existing policy includes guidelines regarding privacy as defined by OECD." So we'd take out all of the

requirements of legal constraints and say "guidelines regarding privacy." Potentially that. Think about that for a minute. I'll let Greg...

Avri Doria: Essentially that might be softer than I'm happy with, but let's talk about it in a smaller group if we need to.

Steve DelBianco: All right. Greg, go ahead, please.

Greg Shatan: It's Greg. I apologize that I'm not all that familiar with this with our comment. I note first that the sentence actually doesn't hang together grammatically. I guess the question is whether by doing this we're somehow binding ICANN to the OECD privacy principles without any substantive review of those principles or discussion of those. They are not global principles. They're, as I understand is, more aligned with the EU principles, which is not necessarily a bad thing or a good thing.

It seems like we're kind of sneaking in a privacy - what could become or be considered an ICANN privacy commitment without any real discussion or review. I'm looking at this. I tend to be concerned. It seems to me that this needs something that needs further discussion rather than just kind of coming in here in the avalanche of things that have kind of been added in that were not in AOC, unless I'm missing something in the AOC, but I don't think so.

Steve DelBianco: It's not, Greg. I mean I think it's a little unfair to call this an avalanche. These were first discussed in March. They were published in May. The IPC gave a very well-argued concern about the word "legal constraints" that I've reflected that here in the hopes of taking the words "legal constraints" out.

So this is the time for us to discuss this. There was only, I believe, one public comment. I'll go back and check on that. The public comment was well-argued by the IPC.

Taking it out or changing it to softening it are things we probably need to discuss and probably in a subgroup if we hope to get to the meaty issue in front of us on the composition of the team.

Alan is next in the queue. Alan, I don't think we're going to resolve this right now. We probably need to go back and forth on the language for this. I'm also curious about what it means when it says "such existing policies." The existing policy, I think, refers to existing policy at ICANN, not existing policy in the actual OECD country. This is a statement to say that ICANN's policy should include guidelines from the OECD. That is a new position. It's not in the affirmation, but it is something we did publish in May.

Greg, I should give you a chance to come back on that, if you wish, and then Alan. Greg?

Greg Shatan: Yes. Whether or not the full implications of this are contemplated by all parties, I think looking at it now it seems to be - as you say, it's imposing a new requirement which I don't believe has been - and it's stating it as if it were existing policy, which seems a little bit odd if it's not, in fact, existing policy.

So if we're attempting to impose a policy that has not been fully reviewed as the ICANN policy and then calling it existing policy, whether this was published in March or in 1776, I don't care. I think it looks like something that is being kind of - that really is a significant change and really needs to be properly examined.

We're essentially adding an entire external document which, unless this has been a commitment of ICANN up to this point, could be a significant change in ICANN's approach to privacy. By kind of putting it in here and only in relationship to - through affirmation of commitment's review, essentially saying that his now is what ICANN is committing to and, in fact, already had committed to because it's existing policy.

It seems rather tortured to me at best. I'm not going to ascribe any - I'm sure this is all done in good faith. Nonetheless, I think while it's fairly modest on the page, it's quite revolutionary in practice. Maybe that wasn't fully recognized by all parties. I think that before we impose significant privacy policy on ICANN that it needs to be dealt with in more than just a sentence and a bylaws change like this. This is not a small deal. This is a big deal.

Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Everything in here is subject to applicable laws -- that's verbatim -- the first sentence of the paragraph above. If there are applicable laws guaranteeing privacy of individuals, those laws are respected by ICANN or may create (labor), registrar identification requirements. We certainly have applicable laws. But the OECD guidelines probably don't rise to the level of laws.

So I think we're going to have to go to a subgroup on this or we will not get our talking done. I already know who is in the subgroup. If anyone who wants to be but as a minimum will include Avri, Greg, and Alan.

Alan, you're next in the queue. Let's keep it short, and we'll get back to the other topics.

Alan Greenburg: I will keep it very short. I think we're going down a rat hole here of trying to discuss the substance as has been pointed out to me several times. This is just for another document going out for public comment. It's not the final version.

All I wanted to say, however, was I think the current working is problematic because the previous paragraph starts with ICANN commits to enforcing its existing policy and then wraps us into it. So that, I think, it problematic, and I think it could be fixed by using the word "consideration of the guidelines" or something like that.

Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: All right. Avri, we'll need you to come back. The words "such existing policy" does create a concern because if it isn't policy, that sentence suggests that it must suddenly be policy. And that's not something I think we can do in a bylaws adoption, bringing things over from the affirmation.

Let's find another way to phrase it so that it becomes a consideration, that the guidelines become a consideration as opposed to implying that suddenly the OECD guidelines are and always have been ICANN policy, because I don't think we can make that claim. I think it's Greg and Alan that pointed it out. We'll have to cover this in another section.

The very last page is the actual IANA Functions Review. And I will confess not knowing enough about the IFR and I'm very reticent to have at it and change any of the text that came over from the CWG.

We need more help from folks like Avri who's been part of both teams. And there are probably others of you on the call who were part of the CWG to

ensure that we have the right words here because this is going to become a fundamental bylaw.

So with some of the changes we made in terms of how you measure the five-year cycle from beginning to beginning for instance the idea of access to the document all of those chapeaus that we've discussed would apply to the IANA function review as well.

And I want to be sure that we make the CWG happy with how we've reflected their work.

Is there anyone who can help do an outreach? And Jordan I agree. I hope that it does reflect what they need.

And Avri, thank you for that Avri. Could you just do a double check to see if there are any changes that would like to see in that particular page? Thank you.

So let's - Avri you're in the queue but and then we'll go back to the section on review team. Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes sure. I mean I am certainly willing to do it. I'll take the paragraph back to the CWG because the report is obviously already out and so that won't change.

But as the person that was the editor on the IFR in the CWG I'm fairly confident that we are meeting those requirements. But I will double check.

Steve DelBianco: Okay thanks Avri. I'm relieved that we're - that you're confident. That means we're close. Okay great. All righty so folks if you go back to the first page on

the chapeau for how we do teams and I should have said second page, it is actually Page 3 on the all review Chapeau options for consideration Page 3 where it says Options for Consideration.

The affirmation reviews were silenced on how many folks were available from each AC and SO. And we've had a robust debate about how to accommodate diversity as well as the need to pick up the fact that in places like the GNSO we have the multiple constituencies comprising the Commercial Stakeholders Group and the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group.

And those constituencies have sufficiently different interest that members of those constituencies often ought to be participants on a review team.

And we have to account for the fact that if we (slatted) a review team with lots of people from a GNSO would that suddenly bias the way that the review team comes up with its recommendations?

And this may be a review team of very general ICANN matters such as ATRT or security and stability. So let's consider these two options for consideration.

And we may not be able to conclude the discussion on this call but it would be good to sort out where we are.

The red text was from me where I indicated that multiple volunteers could come from each AC or SO. And that could cover individual stakeholder groups and constituencies.

And then I wrote that if in fact we did a consensus call on a reporter recommendation that we would try to equalize the voting among the participating ACs and SOs.

And that equalized voting would then be the community powered voting between each of the ACs and SOs. So that was my proposal.

Avri came up with a proposal in blue. I know Greg and Alan and others have commented on it all in various email messages for the past two days.

Let's go to Avri first and then Alan.

Avri Doria: Hi, Avri speaking. Yes so the point that at first I was willing, you know, I had agreed with Steve on the five from each. And, you know, that reflected a number that perhaps wasn't too big although it does start getting big for some of these review teams.

But that once we started to have the discussion and at first I should explain my let's not be so GNSO centric and that comment has to do, and perhaps it's because I'm not participating in this as a member from the GNSO or some - a larger AOC, ATRT type of perspective that we need to look at the GNSO is very visible in its subdivision. Other groups aren't necessarily as visible in there.

But once you start talking to them about it you start to see the regionalization come out. You start to see that the multilingual aspects of people within the group, you know, demanding their stakeholder rights even if they haven't been constructed into what the GNSO calls a constituency.

So taking a sort of high level view and say that we cannot mirror that the number of people that are on these things to one group.

So there is the possibility of basically, and I think that this is the one that Steve suggested of normalizing votes. And so it's like it doesn't matter how many people you have. You know, you get three votes and you subdivide them up into tenths any way you want to.

And the normalization of voting is okay. But I think it emphasizes the voting a little too much.

And we have been developing these two processing started developing in some of the AOC reviews before.

But we certainly developed for these two CWG and CCWG processes sort of a way of working with participants those that really wanted to participate, participating and are trying to reach consensus on that but also meeting a backstop of members that we could go to if we couldn't reach a consensus.

And also I admit using a computer science method that anything you can't solve easily at one level of extraction just add another.

One of the things we lost in - and this sounds perhaps a little strange in not having the chair, the two chairs or the CEO and chair of GAC do it is that making sure that we've got distribution, making sure we've got a full skill set, making sure that we've got proper diversity in the member's group the core group that are actually responsible for doing the work.

And that's truly the different between the members and the participants. The participants all get to participate. It's the members that are really responsible for at the end of the day making sure that there's a recommendation, making sure that there's some sort of finality to the process.

So that was one of the reasons to say how do you keep diversity? How do you allow all the constituencies that want to participate and be - want members to basically put members forward and yet still have the constituency and the stakeholder group for the ACs that - sorry, basically the ACs and the SOs be the ones that are determining who sits on that?

So basically replacing the function that was held in the AOC practice of the chair and the vice chair doing it with the chair of the participating ACs and SOs being the ones that take the hundreds candidates and tear it down to a maximum of 21.

And the reason I put participating stakeholder groups is because I'm not absolutely sure -- and we've seen this before -- that every AC SO wants to participate in every review. And so that was that.

So coming up with a fixed number that was small, that was determined by that ACs the SOs themselves but was also shaped for diversity and skill set is the reason I offered it the way I did. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thanks Avri. I want to note that the sentence above the options is, "the group must be as diverse as possible." That is new. That is not an affirmation of commitment. It says nothing about diversity there.

It may be a practice that the board and GAC share about endeavors to fulfill. And it was added as we brought over the review team to the - into the bylaws. So that diversity requirement is above there.

And there are ways to meet the diversity requirement. And you and I are debating the red versus blue text to get there.

All right this discussion has to end at 22 minutes past the hour so we have 12 more minutes. Alan Greenberg and then Greg.

Alan Greenberg: First a question. What pages is the diversity statement on?

Steve DelBianco: It's on Page 2 Alan at the very top of the Page 2...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Steve DelBianco: ...you'll see the black X.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, got it.

Steve DelBianco: The group must be diverse (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Okay thank you. I find putting diversity before expertise and willingness to work is really problematic. That's I'll just go on the record and I'm not going to go any further on that.

I'll point there's another phase that we've eliminated. And that is the determining or even privately determining as I believe was the case in the last review how many from each AC SO.

So there was already a filter, a triage done even before applications were accepted in the previous reviews. And, you know, that has interesting applications.

For instance I don't believe At-Large participated in the SSR review. I may be wrong but I don't think we did. And if we didn't that was with our agreement, It wasn't, you know, something that we said we had to.

I believe the GNSO is the only group that has ever had participation in line with their organization. For instance the At-Large has only had one or two members on each review even though we have five natural, you know, subdivisions.

So I think it is really problematic to say anything near five for each AC SO. I'd like to see it much, much lower. The participant concept may well solve the problem.

There's typically a lot of travel involved in some of these reviews. And I don't want to see membership being, you know, a token presence to reward people. And it comes close to that if we put diversity first and not have a reasonable restriction on the number.

So I have a real problem with five. I would much prefer to see a much lower number and then some level of triage and the, you know, Greg's suggestion the chairs that may be problematic because every chair may be, you know, have to defend to the death their particular group. But I think we have some work to do on this one.

Steve DelBianco: Alan I would (unintelligible) my proposal was not limited. Avri's proposal is a three per review, three per AC SO. So with - five isn't even on the table there. Are you suggesting that as a third alternative?

Alan Greenberg: Five was in a document that was sent out on email I believe. It may not have been a document to their actual document but I think there was - I think there was a statement saying they should have the same number of seats as they have votes in the nominal community council.

Steve DelBianco: All right, let's go to Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks I'll try to keep it brief since I haven't been all that brief in the email list. But I do take the point the expertise and willingness to work I think need to be paramount in this.

And I have no interest in bloating these teams. It was really the suggestion that we follow the community council which itself is, you know, up for discussion as a model that piques my interest.

I think that if we - if you look back at what I think has been kind of 222, 111 or something like that but as you say it has not been rigidly defined in the past and there's been at least room for groups to either, you know, have more or less people.

I just think that the, you know, to the extent that if we are really trying to be representative of stakeholder entities or stakeholder groups with a small S and a small G we can't kid ourselves and say that, you know, having a seat for the Commercial Stakeholder Group really, you know, brings in the voices that need to be brought in if that's what we're trying to do.

If we're not trying to be representative and if we're trying to put together a team that is going to try to, you know, in turn create a broadly representative process through interviews, through other contacts and the like then my concerns, you know, are significantly lessened.

But a lot of this, you know, has to do with whether what we're trying to create is a representative group or not.

And if we are not trying to create a representative group per se although obviously can't be, you know, just nine GAC members or something -- and I'm not picking the GAC for any reason particularly - that then I think that we need to kind of focus on what our goals are here.

And if our goals are representation by origin then we need to however you define that then we have one set of principles we need to deal with.

Frankly we may be better off either keeping things loose as they were up to this point or being more specifically not attempting to kind of, you know, create a House of Representatives. Because if there is then we have to, you know, revisit the whole issue of what does representation mean?

And maybe we - I do believe we need to revisit that with regards to community council. I don't necessarily think we need to revisit it or visit it at all with regards to the AOC or, you know, what were the AOC Review Team.

And I, you know, do take Alan's point that in the past, you know, that these have worked because or haven't worked to the extent that people have been willing to work and have had the necessary expertise and not because they came from some particular note of the ICANN universe. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Greg this is Steve. I do want to note the fact that the affirmation allowed the board, chair and the GAC chair to choose the applicants from the community who were on the Review Teams.

So they played the role of sorting it out. It wasn't as if we all worked it out together in a - with a Kumbaya fashion.

Our proposal is no longer have the board and GAC chair select the applicants for the teams. And instead we allow this to be like a cross community working group where the communities themselves specify the people involved.

When we do that I think we're going to have to account for the fact that if we get a lot of volunteers on an issue that's vital to the interest of the GNSO a lot of volunteers with tremendous expertise and perhaps even a bit of diversity are we going to turn them away or accommodate them without turning the voting into something that's lopsided?

And that is why I propose an open process like a Cross Community Working Group but one that could not be swamped by participants from one group. That's the red text. I don't think that leaving it silent is the status quo because the status quo involves the GAC and the board chair making the call. They're not there to make the call. That's not an option on the table right now.

You want to bring it back we can discuss that but it's not part of this. Greg your hand is still up. Did you want to come back on that?

Greg Shatan: Just briefly I, you know, I would not propose necessarily bringing back the board chair, GAC chair concept. But I do think that if we have issues with the CCWG methodology for the same reason again, you know, to the extent that's solved through participants being freely allowed in addition to members that's one thing.

I am only a participant in the Accountability Group as is Jonathan so as both of us come from the IPC but with different backgrounds.

In any case how we do this I think, you know, still implicates, you know, issues of representation. And maybe there is no easy answer to that. So, not

sure I have a magic answer other than the sorting hat which unfortunately is only fictional. Thanks.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Greg. Thomas I noticed Thomas Schneider what you put in the chat is that some GAC members signaled in Buenos Aires that they would want the GAC to continue to have a role in the selection of the Review Team.

In the public comments that we have received Thomas a couple of governments indicated the GAC wanted to participate in the review teams. And to that we would answer well of course the GAC is included among the ACs and the SOs that would participate.

So they would be among those who could join. But our current proposal is no longer to have the GAC and the board pick the people that get selected.

If that's something that the GAC wants Thomas let us know and if the GAC members feel that way they should quickly let us know since that wasn't reflected in the public comment.

I think Jordan's right, we're probably going to have to bring this back for further discussion. But I'm hard-pressed to know what to change in the document. It's as if the red and the blue text is still there for consideration but we haven't figured out the will of this subgroup on WP1 let alone the will of the whole CCWG.

So we'll cut off the discussion here and I will turn the meeting back over to Jordan because he wants to cover some all other business.

So thanks everyone.

Jordan Carter: Thank you Steve and all. I think it's a shame that we didn't get to this early enough to resolve it but that's the way it floats so that's where we are.

And the only other thing I need to cover with you all before the cutoff of this call in about ten minutes is just the status of our work.

And I sent a few emails looking for volunteers. And that has led to people volunteering which is really encouraging.

And so we've had the discussion already in terms of the powers, the AOC incorporation that Steve and Avri have led so we've work through that one.

And we've got a mix of volunteers looking at the balance of power of votes and the community mechanisms to whether that's a council or a vote counting mechanism.

And that's Greg and Alan volunteered for both of those things and Robin volunteered for balance the power of votes.

And we've got Jonathan who's volunteered to look at the community power on budget and strategic planning. We've got no hands up in particular for the rest of those community powers.

I can do the bylaws one but I can't do them for our calls this week. I can only do them for the call on next week. And in terms of removal of (unintelligible) directory for recall is the whole ICANN board is going to have volunteers.

So I do have an email in my inbox from Keith Drazek offering to help. And I know that Matthew Shears had promised to help.

So really that the questions is whether anyone on the call today wants to volunteer for any remaining gaps? And Alan you're volunteering for the removal of individual board members so thank you to that.

And does anyone else want to pick up any other pieces of work? And I'll let you mull on that just as I talk about the next call agendas that we've got which Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I'll restate something I said and was told it was not never going to happen but I'll say it anyway. I personally don't think removing all the board members is a necessary requirement because by being able to remove them one by one we have the net equivalent effect. And it gives us some level of specificity but I am told that would never be accepted so I'll withdraw the statement but I wanted to remind people of it.

Jordan Carter: But I think the problem is Alan that it received strong endorsement in the public comments and so we're not really in the mode of removing...

Alan Greenberg: I...

Jordan Carter: (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I understand.

Jordan Carter: Yes. And so (Robin) so can I be really clear here folks. There are no email lists. There is nothing other than your will to work together and make this work happen.

So (Robin) is isn't the case of adding you to a group. And I can - I haven't seen any discussion. I don't expect to be involved in these discussions by email.

I do expect things to pop back up on to the list. So that all I can do in terms of creating these groups is list your names besides these things as I circulate the list to people who volunteered.

So (Robin), Alan and Greg I (unintelligible) I hope that you are now underway already with some of the discussion about how to review the text. Because when you go to consider our list of calls which we've got in front of us and I'm just trying to find (Adam)'s email.

And I'm apologizing but I've managed to (unintelligible) yes.

So the call that we've got on Wednesday was intended I think to look at the community powers in some detail.

But that relies on people having done the work. So and Alan, (Robin) so I've now managed to lose the email.

Steve DelBianco: Greg?

Jordan Carter: I'm having a (unintelligible) at the moment which is not helping at all.

And we have the call on Wednesday and we have a call on Friday, and we have a call on Monday so we've got three calls to deal with all the community powers and the issues of the community mechanism stuff.

So I don't mind which order we do them in and it does require content to be circulated, preferably 24 hours and if not at least 12 hours before the call.

And so really it's a case of how far have people got with the work. Avri I see that your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes my hand was still up from the discussion on board members. And all I wanted to do is add the caution that for those working on it we had both the issues on getting rid of the full.

And we also have to answer and respond to various issues that came out on why it was using the individuals doesn't make them responsive to the wrong kind of things that some comments came out with. And that was all I wanted to bring up that we had to deal with the issues dealing with both of them. Thanks.

Jordan Carter: Thanks Avri. The - we have to deal with all of the issues that come up in the public comment. So Alan and Greg, (Robin) do you think you might be in a position to present some updated text for us on Wednesday about the G&A mechanism about the voting and whether it's a council or just a voting mechanism?

Alan Greenberg: We can try.

Greg Shatan: I agree with Alan in that sense.

Alan Greenberg: Jordan is it just the two of us on that one or is it (Robin) also?

Jordan Carter: It's (Robin) as well.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I would suggest perhaps we can get together for an hour or so at least an hour or so on a Skype call or something like that.

I think that may be more productive to try to kick off things we can easily agree on and that fit the comments than trying to do it only an email. But we can...

Jordan Carter: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: ...we'll arrange that among ourselves.

Jordan Carter: Okay. That would be really good. So if - so in that case we'll close this call by scheduling for the Wednesday call which is Wednesday 1800 Hours UTC that discussion.

And then on Friday the 10th of July at 1900 UTC we'll deal with the first set of community powers, the work that Jonathan has volunteered to do, and hopefully a (voluntal)/volunteer and Matthew and Keith to do - Matthew or Keith to do the recalling the whole ICANN board.

And so we'll do - we'll call the original board members and budget and strategic plan and recalling the whole ICANN board. And then maybe on Friday's call we can do - sorry I skipped a call. That was Friday's call.

Maybe on Mondays call we can then do the bylaws and then before the Paris (unintelligible).

So just to remind again what you're doing is presenting a document hopefully that looks a little bit like the one that Steve has worked through with us today.

And I see Keith is typing to volunteer to deal with the ICANN board one. And thank you. And Alan your hand is up.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. If I could just as (Robin) and Greg I've got to run out for a few hours now if perhaps one of you can put an email of suggesting some times to talk tomorrow.

And I would get - we should all try to do our homework and look at the comments before then. Thank you.

Jordan Carter: Fantastic thanks. And if that sort of work becomes a (unintelligible) we do have that Monday call actually working with the (unintelligible) there is.

And I don't think we can do anything after that so we shouldn't treated as such. But to me it feels like some of the more tricky items will be dealt with this week.

So I think on that note we'll close this call. Thanks to you all for your participation and I'll circulate just in about six hours an updated list of volunteers for the record. Thanks everyone.

Alan Greenberg: And thank you Jordan for pushing us along.

END