

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
July 18, 2015
8:15 am CT**

Mathieu Weill: Going to reconvene. And this is going to be the last sprint towards the relief of the end of these two days. I don't know.

Chris Disspain: So Mathieu, before you start, I know Eberhard has left and I know he spoke to you but he also spoke to me and asked me to object for the (afternoon) on his behalf.

Mathieu Weill: I object. He gave me his proxy.

Chris Disspain: No. He then gave it to me afterwards...

Mathieu Weill: Okay.

Chris Disspain: ...I think you'll find.

Mathieu Weill: So I object to this procedural (fro). I think both proxies cancel each other.

Chris Disspain: Eberhard has been (frothlogit) with his proxy.

Mathieu Weill: That was off the record.

((Crosstalk))

Mathieu Weill: So I was announcing two last items before the coffee break. And I am delighted to say we have found a way to have one settled in the working parties because it was easy. Just as a reminder, the Workstream 2 recommendations will be part, as Chris was saying yesterday, of a transitional article of the bylaws.

And we will provide -- it's actually already in the package of documents -- a revised timeline to explain how the Workstream 2 process is going to take place. And so please do comment if you have comment on this so that once again we can demonstrate and ensure the community that the Workstream 2 items will be treated seriously, will be considered seriously by the Board and that we are in a position to ensure that they move forward in the end.

And so the last item - substantial item that we need to give work party direction about is the Work Party 3 discussion, which we touched briefly upon yesterday. And basically the remaining question for Work Party 3 is is there anything in this package of topics that is Workstream 1. And with that, I move to the Leon for sharing with us what is Workstream 1.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Mathieu. This is Leon. And as discussed yesterday and taken into account the different feedback and opinions that were received from all attendants either remote or present, the issues that would go into Workstream 1 with regards to SO and AC accountability would be to include a wording in our proposal - in our next document so that structural reviews of each SO and AC include reviewing the accountability of those SOs and ACs to their respective constituencies and stakeholders as the case may be.

This would be the only Workstream 1 issue with regards to SO and AC accountability. The rest would remain as a part of our Workstream 2 work. And I will go with you Chris. July let me...

Chris Disspain: I'm just wondering whether that might be a red flag for some of the SOs that the whole community is going to do a review of their accountability when they - they might feel that if there's going to be a review of their accountability they are the ones that should be doing it; not having it done by the whole community.

I'm not sure but I can see politically that it's possible that that would be - that would be uncomfortable for a number of SOs and ACs.

Mathieu Weill: But I think the proposal is that to use the structural reviews as they currently exist and have these reviews as they are currently performed. So by the SO and AC...

Chris Disspain: Oh, I see.

Mathieu Weill: ...(plus) the Structural...

Chris Disspain: Okay.

Mathieu Weill: ...Improvements...

Chris Disspain: Right.

Mathieu Weill: ...Committee include the word accountability as part of their scope.

Chris Disspain: I understand. Okay. Now are we saying accountable to whom? To their members? To the wider world? To whom?

Leon Sanchez: No. We are saying to their respective constituencies and stakeholders as the case may be. Okay.

Chris Disspain: No objection.

Leon Sanchez: No objections.

Mathieu Weill: (I am not seeing) Sam.

Leon Sanchez: No Sam. Do you want to - do you want to give a wildcard (position)?

Sam Eisner: It's not an objection.

Mathieu Weill: I'm sorry Sam. (Unintelligible) sorry.

Sam Eisner: It's not an objection. It's a question. So I have no objection to that proposal. But when you said about the accountability, it's the accountability within the SO or AC itself? Is there a place for the conversation about the - each SO and AC's accountability externally within the ICANN community as well? Is there a place where that's going to be discussed?

Leon Sanchez: No. As Mathieu stated, we are thinking about having the reviews (unintelligible) now to include only accountability measures with the SOs and ACs. And we could have that for Workstream 2 definitely.

Chris Disspain: Sorry Leon. I apologize for coming back but I am actually confused and it may just be the slide. It says perform a complete review on accountability by

each SO and AC as part of Workstream 2. What that implies to me is that Workstream 2 is going to do a review of the accountability of each SO and AC.

Leon Sanchez: That needs to be corrected.

Chris Disspain: Okay.

Leon Sanchez: That will be corrected. Yes.

Chris Disspain: Thanks.

Leon Sanchez: So next slide is...

Mathieu Weill: And is that an objection?

Leon Sanchez: I'm sorry, Alan.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: I don't accept (unintelligible) but questions are welcome.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. And my Adobe - my computer is not quite live yet. At one point there were significant discussions on whether we are accountable to the larger community, which could translate to either the larger community or could evaluate to how much - what extent you do outreach and try to involve the larger community.

Is that to be included in that review or are we looking just at those who are - identify themselves as part of ICANN? I think it makes a big difference.

Mathieu Weill: My recollection of yesterday's discussions on this were that it's within the community that is described by the AC or SO. For instance, the ccTLD managers whether they are members or non-members of the ccNSO or ALAC or the At Large Community as (unintelligible) and everything but also the Internet users as well. That clear? Excellent. Thanks for the clarification.

Leon Sanchez: Okay. So we're good to go with SO and AC accountability.

Mathieu Weill: So this one is good.

Leon Sanchez: And - I'm sorry. Kavouss, you want to say something? You want to say something?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I was not here when you discussed - I don't understand why include words on the structural review for Workstream 1. What is the priority to do that under Workstream 1? It is Workstream 2. You could put some words but the action will be Workstream 2. Why Workstream 1?

Leon Sanchez: Well, it will happen in Workstream 2 as a matter of fact. We're just staying that...

Mathieu Weill: The key - the concern that we heard from the public comment was that we were empowering the community as part of Workstream 1 and there was a need to balance these new powers with accountability of the accountability mechanism. So that's why it's part of Workstream 1. It's really part of...

Kavouss Arasteh: You can do anything under Workstream 1.

Mathieu Weill: No. That's - the only thing we're doing here - we're not creating anything new. We're just using what's already existing but also getting - setting up something that is going to be a continuous improvement mechanism. So it's really a very tiny change. And then there are other issues that will be Workstream 2.

Leon Sanchez: So next slide. Thanks. Next slide is with regard to staff accountability. And here the only thing that we would be thinking of as part of Workstream 1 would be to confirm what we have just heard by Becky and the IRP to (unintelligible) piece to be adjusted so that it will be applicable to ICANN staff as well.

So we've just already heard that. I won't go through that again. That's the only thing that we would be having as Workstream 1 with regards to ICANN staff accountability. The rest would remain as part of Workstream 2. And I see Sam, you have a hand up.

Sam Eisner: A question based on what we were discussing with the IRP today and that there are portions of the work on that that are going to be shifted into Workstream 2. So with this a part of the work that will be within Workstream 1 or does this meet with enough parts of the work that are in Workstream 2?

Leon Sanchez: I'll let Becky respond to that.

Becky Burr: I think I responded yesterday to this issue. I think that the IRP applies today to actions and inactions of ICANN including the staff and Board. So this is not a change in any way. We don't have to do anything.

Leon Sanchez: Thanks Becky. So any objections to...

Mathieu Weill: Well no. It's (over to this).

Leon Sanchez: Okay. Next slide.

((Crosstalk))

Leon Sanchez: Oh, I'm sorry Sebastien, yes.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you. Yes just maybe to - and we haven't (missed) just because that's on the group before but it's not ICANN staff but ICANN staff actions because the (IFP) it's not applicable to the people. It's applicable to what they are doing I guess.

Leon Sanchez: Yes. Maybe we can find some (unintelligible) recording. Thank you. So next slide is with regards to diversity. And as discussed yesterday, we would be taking into account diversity when we create any new structures. So far in Workstream 1 we would be thinking of course on diversity with regards to the panel, the IRP.

And we would be also evaluating whether and how we could address diversity within the community mechanism, Council or whatever you want to call it. And that will be the only thing that would go under Workstream 1. And the rest of the diversity recommendations would fall into Workstream 2. Are there any objections to this? Chris.

Chris Disspain: It's not an objection. But how do we deal with the interim Board for example? You might have to excise that out as not having a requirement.

Leon Sanchez: Yes.

Chris Disspain: So does that - so my question is do you - does everything that is excised actually has to specifically be - the diversity requirement does not apply to this. So it's an opt out rather than an opt in.

Mathieu Weill: Well, for the Board will - it's the diversity requirements already exist. So...

Chris Disspain: For the interim Board.

Mathieu Weill: Yes. But for the interim Board what I heard (Holly) say earlier was that it might be an accessory to explicitly say that the diversity requirements are diminished (for) the interim Board.

Chris Disspain: Right.

Mathieu Weill: Otherwise you're in conflict with the bylaws.

Leon Sanchez: Okay. So having no objections other than the question raised by Chris, I'll go to James for...

((Crosstalk))

Leon Sanchez: I'm sorry. I was - I see Asha.

Asha Hemrajani: Can you hear me?

Leon Sanchez: We do listen to you.

Asha Hemrajani: Can you hear me?

Leon Sanchez: Yes Asha.

Asha Hemrajani: Okay. Thank you. This is Asha Hemrajani. So I only wanted to ask if we could add a definition of diversity being this was mentioned yesterday but in the chat window but there was so much traffic going on, that may have been missed. Is that possible?

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Asha. We discussed this yesterday. And we came to the conclusion that it was practically impossible to define diversity in Workstream 1. So that's why we would be looking at different criteria and different mechanisms to try to achieve diversity as part of our Workstream 2 plan. So I don't think it got much traction the idea of actually defining diversity as Workstream 1.

So next in the queue I have James Gannon.

James Gannon: Okay. So it's almost a direct follow up from that. So I just want to be clear on what we're doing between the split between Workstream 1 and Workstream 2. So my impression, and tell me if I'm right or wrong, in Workstream 1 we're essentially going to put in what's being called aspirational diversity. We're going to say we will try and have diversity. But we're going to work on the specifics and possible enforcement of diversity in Workstream 2. Correct?

Leon Sanchez: That is correct. Yes.

James Gannon: Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Okay. So having no objections, Working Party 3 would continue to work on developing our final document and of course deliver it so we can include it as part of our proposal for our next public comment. So thank you very much.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you very much everyone. And we are not entering in the wrap up phase of this meeting. And to start - we started with the CWG requirements and conditions. And I think it's perfectly fitting that we invite Lise Fuhr to the table. (Yes, just sit here). And go back to this list of requirements and see where we are standing with these conditional requirements.

It's on the screen on the AC room. So Number 1 was the community rights regarding development and consideration of the ICANN budget. This is an item we haven't concluded on and work is in the safe hands of Jordan and Work Party 1 to come back to us with a proposal on Tuesday.

But I think we have clarified the requirements from the CWG as well as moved forward in terms of our own expectations for the budget and the impact that it should have during the discussion yesterday. Were you raising your hand (Anna)? Well, I would suggest I go through the six and then we open a discussion to make sure we're in line about the overall assessments.

ICANN Board, the community rights specifically to a point to remove members and recall the entire Board. I think we - did we have a discussion on that earlier this afternoon or this morning as well by the way?

But I think we've made good progress and recapped the various requirements that once again Jordan and Work Party 1 are taking on for our next call - (part) of calls that we have next week to finalize or it's to be finalized but we've made good progress.

The IANA function review incorporated into the bylaws. We haven't discussed this because it's okay. It's a part of the AOC reviews incorporated into the bylaws. And so that's simply something we're - we are definitely in line with the condition.

Customer Standing Committee incorporated into the bylaws. Well as soon as we get - as the CWG drafts the description of the bylaws, I think that's going to be next. No problem.

Appeals mechanism. Independent review panel made applicable to IANA functions and accessible by TLD managers with the exception of ccTLD delegations and relocations I should add with my Eberhard proxy on.

((Crosstalk))

Mathieu Weill: So that's been our discussion on the IRP. And I think we've made good progress once again into setting up this appeals mechanism. And the fundamental bylaws. So the fact that these mechanisms be incorporated into the fundamental bylaws. Fundamental bylaws is one of the items we haven't really dedicated time on this face-to-face meeting.

But Jordan in the name - in his capacity of Rapporteur of Work Party 1 shared an email of work that was actually conducted by (Itsumi) if I'm not mistaken. And we don't anticipate a lot of contention on this because it's been already quite supporting in the first public comment.

And so those - out of the six we have two - number - the two first item to confirm and finalize next week. But I think we're roughly in line. And Lise, would you like to add something about your overall feeling about the alignment?

Lise Fuhr: Yes. Thank you Mathieu. I've had discussions with Jordan regarding the ICANN budget. And as I said during that session, it's very important that

IANA has its own rules regarding this. And how that's going to be formed, that's also - that's up to you guys.

But I've talked about the specifications with Jordan and now we need to - well consult on the final result with the CWG. So I've tried to give some directions on this.

But I sense we're on a very good track. We all have a lot of work to do. The CWG has to, as you say, make the specifications and we really have to get going on this. So we can't sleep on the laurels or how you say it anymore. We have to get going again.

And from a being part of these discussions, it's been very helpful for me and it's been helpful for us as a group. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Lise. And we really appreciate your time and your presence and openness to discussion within this group. So I have Kavouss and then Cheryl is acting as a proxy for Alan. Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Thank you Mathieu. (Unintelligible). Yes. Thank you Mathieu. I understand that the IFR will be included in the fundamental bylaw as a separate item without any relation whatsoever with (IRR). Am I right or not? So please be clear. So we should not be (include that).

We should be clear whether it has any relation with IRP. That makes them interdependent, which make it quite difficult or which does not have - the reason I'm raising this question is because of the ICG must be quite clear that issue of the IFR was discussed in CCWG and it was decided we properly address in the fundamental bylaw as a separate item without any interdependence or connection to IRP. Please confirm that. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: I think it can be confirmed. Yes. I see nothing and I'm not seeing any doubt in anyone's mind. So let's confirm that for the record so that that can be reported to the ICG. And Alan is next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. It dawned on me that PTI and IANA could use the IFR - could use the IRP to question the results of an IFR. I cringe in thinking about it. The question was just a very simple one. On Number 1 and on budget, is the critical thing for the CWG the ICANN budget or ensuring that IANA is properly funded?

Lise Fuhr: Both. I would say because first we have to ensure that the IANA budget is separate. So it's - it has its own budget. That's number one. The other issue is if the ICANN budget as a whole is vetoed, you don't necessarily want to veto the IANA budget. So you need to have those two issues in mind.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. That's why I asked the question. The issue is protecting the IANA budget. In other words, if we have a veto or not of the ICANN budget, we somehow have to segregate IANA and make sure it's protected. You're not really concerned about ICANN fiscal management. It's IANA that's the focus.

Mathieu Weill: It's going to be related because some of the services are shared. And a big part of the IANA budget even as a subsidiary was going to be shared with some of the functions of ICANN. And Jordan wants...

((Crosstalk))

Jordan Carter: I just - to make a workable protection for the IANA functions does require us to have a little bit of (a bond) to the budget veto process coming from this and my discussion just 20 minutes or so ago. That blowing up the entirety of the

ICANN budget might not be the thing to do. That all seems to be a micro level community scrutiny of the IANA budget specifically.

So I think we can plug that into our proposal and use some of the mechanisms and so on. But for instance, some of the thresholds might be different given the (sensitivity) of the IANA budget maybe there can be a slightly lower threshold for community veto because it needs to be more sensitive and so on.

So what I'm trying to do now - I'm just writing up our conversation that we had. I'm going to send it to Lise for a first review and then I'm going to put it on the WP1 list for us to all see and comment on.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Jordan. Bruce.

Bruce Tonkin: Yes. Just a comment here. I think what I'm hearing with respect to the CWG is what you want is continuity, which isn't - I think that's the same as the whole ICANN budget. I don't see it as any different. As Chris pointed out earlier, the IANA will be a separate entity. It'll have its own budget that'll be published and that they can be clear.

And then I think what you're really just saying is that along with all the other sort of operational functions of ICANN, it's still doing compliance, still doing a whole bunch of stuff. But in a veto process by understand is what you're saying is that if you're vetoing a new budget, you're still supporting that the continued operation of ICANN and it's continued operating mode, you know, whether it's allowed or any other function.

Mathieu Weill: James.

James Gannon: So two points. So Jordan just I'm not sure if I misheard. So I don't believe that I've been in a discussion of a (this) or of the IANA part of the budget. That should be a sacrosanct. So I'm not sure if I misheard that will be (unintelligible) with the IANA budget. I may have misheard. (I'd appreciate) if I have.

Mathieu Weill: Maybe we could - you can respond briefly Jordan. But let's make sure we do not start the discussion that we'll need to have on Tuesday or Thursday on this. Jordan.

Jordan Carter: I was going to say largely the same thing. We have to get something that's workable and gives the CWG comfort. I'm sketching an idea of what that might be. I'm not saying that's going to be the idea, so.

Mathieu Weill: Lise.

Lise Fuhr: And I'd like to repeat I'm not signing off of anything that's going to be signed off by the CWG as a whole. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you.

James Gannon: And my second point that I was...

Mathieu Weill: Oh you have a second point James, go ahead.

James Gannon: Just to briefly comment. And I think we need to be very clear about - we had a discussion about the difference between the IANA budget and whether - no less critical but separate parts of the ICANN budget, which may be under discussion that they may be included in a slightly different mechanism.

So we need to be very clear that we had that discussion that the IANA will be specifically (unintelligible) separate from any other possible reinventing for security and stability.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you James. Kavouss and then we'll probably close (the time).

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. I see a difficulty if we connect IANA budget to the overall budget due to the reason that if the budget is rejected or vetoed under a process of IRP and so on so forth, it might have direct impact on the IANA budget. So like the (unintelligible) it should be separate. Separate the (two).

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Kavouss. That's something we'll take into account obviously. So with that, I would like to thank Lise for her (out and) presence, her guidance but also being here and sharing with us these two days in Paris underground despite the nice summer weather. That's very much appreciated Lise and always a pleasure. And look forward to the upcoming coordination calls that we have together. (What we do). Thank Lise.

And with that, I'm turning to Thomas for a - our item about next steps.

Thomas Rickert: Okay. So we're trying to keep this very brief. There are a few points that we need to touch upon. And for those that consider leaving the room early, we would like to take a picture with all of us to document that we've been here. That's something that you can show to your grandchildren and grand grandchildren. I was there and I made history. I was part of it.

The question is what are we going to communicate to the outside world. So we've been working on a statement on a communique and I will ping pong the ball right back to Mathieu who will briefly introduce the contents thereof.

Mathieu Weill: I would start with the process approach and Becky, do you want to say something?

Becky Burr: I'd like to object for Eberhard.

Mathieu Weill: Yes. Yes. I was about to say that for the record the communicate or statement - the co-Chair statement - it's a co-Chair statement that we're introducing has been drafted during these sessions and in order to incorporate the outcome of our discussions rather than drafting it beforehand.

And it will be circulated to the group in order to leave - I think we left 12, 15 hours last time of response time before it's published. So probably it's going to be published on Monday. Right? I'm looking at (Teresa) in here - be probably on Monday. Okay. So that's the process.

In terms of substance, I don't know if one of the versions that's being ping-ponged lately is sufficiently clean to be shared. But - and I'm opening it myself. There would be obviously a number of information about the fact that we've met a number of participants.

I think we had 76 group members and participants attending in person and an addition 30 joining remotely. So we're breaking the 100 barrier, which is quite amazing.

And what I find amazing is the progress that we've been making despite the size of the group. We note - we would not the participation of several members of the ICANN Board of Directors and GAC representatives as well as external advisors and local stakeholders.

And then moving to some of the key discussions that we've had. Of course we cannot cover everything in this. Probably we owe some feedback to the community about the community model - community empowerment model discussions.

So the proposal that's here is about explaining that we are now working under the assumption that we're going to follow the sole membership model as part of Workstream 1.

And explaining that it's - and that this model the SOs and ACs would collectively participate together as a (versatile) member of ICANN and through this coordination they would be empowered.

And reminding as well that this was part of an effort to investigate also alternative models like the empowered SO/AC membership and the empowered SO/AC designator and providing some information for the community about the documentation that's related to these models as well.

This is to ensure the community that the choice we're making is a documented choice as well as a choice that is a - that has a rationale and was duly considered.

We would also like to note the very useful feedback we've received from GAC members. So acknowledging the 31 submissions we're received, which were intended to clarify the positions of the GAC members with regard to the vision of the role of governments in the post-transition environment.

And highlighting that our discussions were focused on identifying the common requirements such as the role of governments with regards to public

policy and the assertion that the ICANN Board of Directors does not act outside of ICANN's bylaws ensuring - assuring - okay.

So that's (despite you) coming but - and we would also propose to acknowledge that governments and the way they have to work due to their specific nature means that some of the decisions would not be compatible with the timeframe that ends in Dublin.

And as a consequence, we at least agreed to at a minimum work on the basis of an advisory role of the governments in the context of the new community model. That would be our proposals for a very brief summary on this aspect for the community. I see Thomas hand is up. Please Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you Mathieu. I think if you could quickly scroll back to the - yes, I will dictate you three more paragraphs if that's okay. No, I'm joking. Just if you take...

Mathieu Weill: It's too late. I'm not taking jokes anymore.

Thomas Rickert: The first sentence. I don't think it was foreseen during the ICANN meeting that 31 members would submit individual contributions. I leave it up to you the formulation. But basically there was an invitation from the GAC to individual members to give their views and 31 responded. Maybe it's just reformulated in a way that...

((Crosstalk))

Mathieu Weill: ...two things.

Thomas Rickert: Just a single - yes, maybe you make two sentence. That's better. Thank you very much. I will send you the three paragraphs later. Okay. Thanks.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you for being so concise on three paragraphs Thomas. It's very much appreciated. So that - Kavouss, your hand was up. Kavouss and Olga.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes. Under the sole community members or sole members, would you also indicate that under certain circumstances and for certain topics there may be a need to have this community forum or community council. It was mentioned and it should be good to mention that.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: ...that was discussed today that it's certain that...

Mathieu Weill: You would like to see a mention of the fact that in this model the community - that decisions will be - before decisions are made, there would be a community forum where the different parts of the community would exchange views before making decisions.

I'm seeing a lot of nodding and I think it's a very useful addition. So definitely take the suggestion onboard. And I see (Hillary)'s acknowledging the - that she's going to add this in the draft. I now have Olga and then Alan.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you (sir). Could you show the next paragraph please? There is a sentence that says the group agreed to move forward but reserving at the minimum the GAC advisory role in the context of Workstream 1. We don't agree with that sentence. We think we don't have a common ground of acceptance of such a role.

Mathieu Weill: So you would rather we remove it?

Olga Cavalli: That's my suggestion. I don't know if other colleagues agree with that.

Mathieu Weill: Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Well yes, very briefly. I have not heard anyone speaking against preserving the advisory role. There are some that want something in addition to the advisory role or that want - Petter indicated that there might be a tradeoff at a later stage of voting rights against advisory roles. But I think it would be a good signal to the outside world that the governments are acknowledging they're keeping their advisory role to the GAC.

They can advise on public policy matters this new mechanism at a minimum. Right. And whether there's going to be change is up for discussion. So we keep the door open. That's the message that's in there as well.

And I heard you asking for flexibility for not being diminished and that's what we tried to capture here. In fact it's - the mandate is broadened insofar as advice will be accepted for the community mechanism.

Mathieu Weill: Alan, if you were not about to speak to that, I would request your permission to go to Pedro first.

Pedro de Silva: The thing is that for certain governments the minimum is not the (advisory role). They are unsatisfied with the advisory role - want something more. The minimum for them would be to have more than that. So I think we don't agree with the sentence that they agreed to reserve at the minimum the...

Thomas Rickert: So would something that would say that at least in the context of Workstream 1 the group agreed to move forward with an advisory role of the GAC both to the Board and the community mechanism?

Pedro de Silva: No, you're not sure. Not sure. I think we - you said we have until Monday? That right?

Thomas Rickert: Well...

Pedro de Silva: To...

Thomas Rickert: ...we'll have probably 12 hours after this meeting...

Pedro de Silva: Okay.

Thomas Rickert: ...probably a little more. It's nighttime. I don't know. Up till noon tomorrow local. When are you - did you have something about - okay, 2359 UTC on Sunday could be practical. So that leaves a little bit of time to suggested amendments.

Pedro de Silva: Okay.

Thomas Rickert: Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: ...I told this morning - this is (from) what I'm saying. I don't have our (talk about the GAC and I said that). GAC maintain its current role as enforce

advisory capacity and will participate - we should not be excluded from any other rights that given to other SO/AC within the new concept of the sole community advisory. We don't want that. We just remain advisory. We do not participate in any activity of change of bylaw entity.

So it should be maintained that we would like to retain the current role that we have as it is and any other actions that other SO and AC will be authorized to perform within the new arrangement. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Something about retaining the role is important too. So Olga, then Paul.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Chair. The - what I would like to say is that this document will go to the general public - to the whole world not present in this room. We all know what we discuss here but if you read the document, you give the impression that there is an agreement and (unintelligible). It is not. So that's the point.

Mathieu Weill: Another (detach) to this sentence actually. I'm willing to - anything that is not getting immediate approval here I think we should avoid in a statement anyway. That's not the point. So Paul, is that okay with you?

Paul Rosenzweig: I just was - just in response to what Kavouss said. I don't think there's agreement that GAC both main its current role and if it chooses to gain a role as a voting member within the new single member model.

I - my own view -- I don't know who else I speak for -- is that the GAC can maintain its current role and I will have no objection. Or it can join the new group and be subject to all the same rules as everybody - all the SOs and ACs. And I will have no objection. And that's up to it. But it cannot have both. Cannot have its cake and eat it too.

And I understand that that is not consistent with what some of the governments in the room say. But I do also think that in general that formulation is what the majority of the people in the room have adhered to. And certainly the overwhelming majority have adhered to the view that it would be appropriate to guarantee the GAC gets continued advisory role with respect to the Board. I didn't hear anybody object to that going forward.

Mathieu Weill: All right. So we're moving this sentence away. Avri. No, Alan. Alan. I'm overseeing (Al on) this. Sorry.

Alan Greenberg: Since you intervened 17 people between me and my hand, just for the record, I don't agree with what Paul just said. I don't think it's - certainly it's not - I do not - I am not part of the overwhelming majority that believes what he said.

In any case, that's not why I put my hand up. And I'm not even sure I remember why I put my hand up now.

Mathieu Weill: Hold on.

Alan Greenberg: Ah, yes. Yes. I now do remember. About 20 minutes ago you said we should add a statement in on someone's suggestion that we will have a community council or forum. I would suggest we not use the word council or forum, both of which have very specific meanings with ICANN. And try to pick a new word, which conveys the same meaning.

It's not going to be an open forum on a Thursday and it's not going to be a council as in part of an SO. So if we can avoid those words, we may not miss that expectation.

Mathieu Weill: Thanks. I think (Mary) confirms. And, you know, in (center) the professional - European Professional Association For ccTLD Managers we do jamborees. Anyway. Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. Boy Scouts do jamborees too I hear. Avri Doria speaking. I want to agree with Paul completely on the either/or situation. So maybe it's not the overwhelming but I definitely want to agree with that.

But I - also in terms of the council, I pretty much agree with Alan except that - I had this feeling that the model that we're taking sort of obviates the council, forum, (widget), whatever we've got there that it really needs to be reviewed now that we've taken up the - that particular model. So I think it's probably worth saying that that idea needs further...

Mathieu Weill: Okay. But I will not that this discussion is now closed. Jordan. Okay. Thank you Jordan. That was very efficient. And I note a question from (Holly) in the chat about the document with which we would like to produce information about the SO/AC models.

I suppose this was the slides provided in advance of this meeting to compare the three models. And I see nodding from (Mary) so that's for the record. Okay.

And so (we're) action item is going to be to circulate an updated version of this document by tonight and give you until 2359 UTC on Sunday to comment and then the co-Chairs will publish the statement with the support of ICANN communication. Back to you Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Yes. And I'm going to keep this very brief. In terms of next steps, as you know, we have a public comment period coming up. For that public comment

period to be opened, we need the next version of the report and we need to have consensus.

Right. So we will make sure that we schedule the discussions in the next couple of telephone conference in such a way that we can have two readings as to our agreed decision making methodology to get consensus on all areas of our work.

We will have a package to go out to the community that does not include any alternatives but it's going to have one proposal - one cohesive proposal for the community to review.

Had you asked me yesterday morning when I woke up whether I would be confident to make this statement, I would have said no. But I'm always confident but I think what we should try to remember as we go home, sure there are some wrinkles to be smoothed out, right. We're not yet there.

But we have address all the components of what is needed. We have clear instructions on how to move forward with most of them. There are some remaining issues for some of them. But if you remember, we used the analogy of accountability architecture.

And if you use that, then maybe the - we didn't know - we knew what rooms we would want in that building; one the IRP, one for the community powers. But what was missing until today was confirmation of the foundation that everything should be based on.

And the breakthrough for me in this meeting was that now we have had two readings on the community mechanism, i.e., the foundation. So we - I think this is great. And all of you have done an awesome job in contributing very

high quality being constructive in the give and take and coming up with a solution.

And let's keep up this momentum in the spirit of solution oriented working efforts in the next couple of days. And I think we will be good to go to keep up the idea of showing that the multi stakeholder model works.

I think I should leave it there. In the statement you've heard what we've achieved. I think I don't need to repeat that. If you go through the agenda, I would see again what topics we've been working on. All this has been very impressive. And some of the discussions I only vaguely remember because it seems so far apart because this meeting has been so long.

But I would like to conclude before we come to the picture by saying thank you to our excellent staff. So let's give them a round of applause; to the technical folks that made us hear each other and made us be heard by the rest of the remote participants and vice versa. Let's thank (Xplane) for supporting us.

Let's thank (Willie), (Lee) and (Yon) for being the expert advisors that are working so hard sitting with us here and giving excellent advice. And let's give a big hand to the remote participants. It's so hard to stay on the phone for such a long time also. And thanks to all of you. And now we're going to take a picture, right.

Woman: Thanks to you co-Chairs. Great job. Great job.

Thomas Rickert: And finally I think the breakthrough that we achieved was achieved with the great help of (Rosemary) and (Holly), so. Okay. This meeting is now

adjourned and let's have a picture. I think we should take it here. Right?
Where do you want it? (Hillary).

Woman: (Hillary), do you have instructions for us?

Thomas Rickert: Where do we take the picture?

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: Here? Okay. All right. Let's...

((Crosstalk))

END