

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer  
July 21, 2015  
2:00 pm CT**

Coordinator: Excuse me, your recording has started. You may proceed.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is Thomas Rickert, one of the co-chairs of the ccWG and I'd like to welcome you all to this Call 43 on the 21 of July, 2015. As usual we would like to start with the roll call so Grace has already collected some names of those on the phone bridge only.

Can I please ask whether there are more participants that are on in the Adobe room but only on the phone bridge because we would like to add those to the roll call. There don't seem to be any. Then I'd like to ask you whether there are any updates to statements of interest. There don't seem to be any.

So we can delve straight into the second agenda time, which is brief recap of the Paris meeting. And we would like to take the opportunity as co-chairs to, again, thank all of you for the very collaborative spirit in which we could conduct this two-day very intense working session.

And we've really achieved a breakthrough by deciding on a community mechanism that is now refined a new reference model for the second report.

And I think this is a great achievement and that's - I guess part of the collegial approach that all of you took. It's due to the excellent support we got from our legal advisors. It's been due to the excellent preparation and support through our (unintelligible).

And not least because all of you have been willing to listen, we've exchanged thoughts, the pros and cons of all the various models on the table. And ultimately we could have two readings during the two-day convention in Paris and decide on the new reference model. So that has been great.

As you will remember, we've also (unintelligible) to touch upon all other relevant path of our work. Certainly we have not been able to reach agreement on all niceties but we think it's safe to say that we're on track, that the assessments in terms of time we have made can be fulfilled so that actually we can now proceed finalizing our report and having our part of the pre-requisite for the IANA transition to take place, ready for approval by the chartering organizations in Dublin.

So again, thanks and kudos to all of you who made this possible. And we would like to capture what we achieved in Paris in the communiqué, which we started discussing while we were all together or while some of you have been with us remotely.

We've given this a little bit more time and we would now like to give you the opportunity to further comment on the draft communiqué that you already saw on the list and that some of you have already responded to.

Are there any questions or comments on the communiqué? And for those who are not speaking can I please ask you to mute your microphones? I'm sorry, the communiqué has been published - I'm sorry, we wanted to give you the opportunity to speak to you none the less.

Izumi? Please.

Izumi Okutani: Hi, I hope you can hear me.

Thomas Rickert: Yes, Izumi. You're hard to hear. Can I ask the technical support to mute the line that is causing the acoustic signal, please? Thank you very much. Izumi, can you please continue?

Izumi Okutani: Sure, yes. While there seems to be some confusion while - understanding about possible position on the numbers community on the (unintelligible). So I just wanted to clarify that we do support the communiqué that is put forward by the chairs.

And we very much support the fact that we go for - we move forward with a senior member model. And we don't have the intention to push forward the designator's model, which may be the impression that we may have given to some members of the ccWG.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much, Izumi, that's actually a very helpful clarification, which goes back to some communication that has been going on on the list as well as between individuals off list.

As you well remember, the ASOs had offered other legal advice that they had asked for. And that spoke to an empowered designator model. And that was perceived by some as the intention or maybe the - at least keeping open a

discussion about a new reference model. And therefore we appreciate the fact that we can now set the record set and note that ASO has also confirmed to support the new reference model, i.e. the sole membership model. Thank you very much for that, Izumi. And next in line is Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, good time. I - there was a little bit confused by Izumi's statement but you clarified. It says push forward designative model, we don't push forward anything. We push forward the community mechanism as a sole members. Is that right?

Thomas Rickert: Yes, I can confirm. And Izumi has clarified this. I think nonetheless the legal advice offered by Izumi is still very helpful, not least in the light of the latest remarks made by Larry Strickland who asked us to properly document all the various options on the table.

And this document and the communication that it kicked off clearly indicates or helps us evidence that our group has done a very thorough job in reviewing the various options on the table.

But now we are all aligned that sole membership model, which we've agreed on in Paris, is our new reference model to be proposed to the community with the second public comment - with the second report that we're going to put out for public comment.

Okay. Thank you very much for this. I don't see any additional hands up, which I think allows us to move to the next item on the agenda. And I have to consult my own notes to see who's going to chair that party of the call. And that is actually Mathieu. Thank you very much.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you, Thomas. This is Mathieu Weill speaking. Hello everyone, I hope you had safe trips home for most of you and maybe to other meetings for us - some of you. This agenda item is about our planning and you have a document on screen in the (unintelligible) room right now with most of the key dates that we need to all be aware of.

July is going to be our most urgent focus obviously but we'd also like to start thinking about August, September, and October. But starting with July and this document has been provided by Grace and so you'll get more details with her maybe later.

We have this call today, another ccWG call on Thursday where most of our work is going to focus on the review of sections of the public commentary board.

There is a number of calls planned for Work Party 1, Work Party 2, and Work Party 3 to produce those documents. An important aspect to keep in mind is that we will submit the - an interim draft to our independent council for legal review over this - over the week - the upcoming weekend so that we can freeze the Public Comment 2 document on the 28th after the call that is planned at 12:00 UTC in order to have communications finalized the formatting but also kick start the translations.

And on the 31st we will launch the public comment period, which will last until the 8 of September. So those are the key dates for July. August is going to be a key period for outreach so we anticipate webinars.

We anticipate dedicated sessions to various groups including probably the ICANN board, including Larry Strickland, including the advisors. And we

will have to work very fast in September and this is not fully fleshed - planned at this point.

So that's the kind of deadlines we're talking about right now. And I see Grace's hand was raised first. So Grace, do you want to add anything?

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you, Mathieu. This is Grace for the record. So I just wanted to make two small comments. I know that a few of you were upset about the delivery of the document right before the call. And I just wanted to note that we will do our very best to get you documents as soon as possible.

But especially in the next two weeks with the intensity of the drafting and the new documents that are coming we ask that you please be patient with us in getting you the draft. We'll do our best to get them in advance of the call.

And the second point I wanted to make is that for the month of August, as Mathieu mentioned, we'll be focusing on a lot of outreach and engagement with the group. And for that we'd like to start an outreach tracking, you know, page or table on the wiki. And we would like your contributions to that.

So if you're doing any outreach or if you plan to use the slides for your own community webinars or for your own engagement in other circles please be sure to let us know on the list and we'll make sure to sort of track and show how much engagement the ccWG is doing beyond the group itself. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you, Grace. Before I turn to Kavouss I see Robin's question regarding Dublin. Last meeting we've confirmed that our plan is to have a meeting on the Friday before Dublin, full day meeting and a meeting on the Thursday -

the day of the ICANN board meeting, the close of the Dublin meeting so that everyone can make travel plans. We'll add this into the project plan.

And then I'm now moving to Kavouss although unless it's an old hand, Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, could you kindly confirm instead of Friday or Thursday the dates? Which day we would have the ccWG before the ICANN - the ICANN is start 18 to 22 if I'm correct? So what date do you have ccWG exactly?

And after the ICANN meeting, the 22nd, do you have additional meeting if on the 23rd or not? Just please kindly talk about the date because we have to reserve our flights and for us it is difficult to change the flight because we have to pay penalty.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you, Kavouss, you're right to stress this. I don't want to make mistakes and taking dates out of my mind too quickly. I think it's the Friday, October 16 and the Thursday is the 22nd.

But we will put that into an email with the - all the dates so that everyone has the information, even those who are not attending this call. Thank you for stressing this.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I have two more comments. One comment is that you remember previously you had difficulties with the translation and we had to extend the one week or ten days. Perhaps we should request to ICANN if possible make every effort that all translation in all - whatever official language, six or seven, I don't know.

I know six, maybe more, will be available in order that we maintain the deadline as appropriate and not to be obliged to extend that.

The second point is that we request - and in fact, appeal to the NTIA (unintelligible) Larry if they have any comments. We would be very happy to receive comments before we publish our document for public comment. Moreover, we have observing that ICANN board actively participate.

We have seven board members in the last meeting. We have taken all the recommendation into account. If they have a further comment they would like to - we freely express before we go to the public comments in order to have - to the extent possible a clean document for public comments. These are the two requests. They are not obliged to do that, that is a request.

And it is in the interest of the public if they provide all the comments. We do not expect to receive the last minute comments and so on so forth. Will be difficult to manage that, thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you very much, Kavouss. And I will turn to Grace or (Hilary) for an update on the translation because ICANN has been working on a strategy to increase - I mean reduce the delay between the publication of the public comment and the translations.

So Grace, your hand is up.

Grace Abuhamad: Yes, thank you. So, (unintelligible), you may be happy to hear this but since the release of the last draft and a few other drafts that the staff has been working on, including the CWG drafts, we've been working on an internal process to sort of speed up the translations. And that's not an easy task.



As you know, it's a long document and there are lots of edits coming from different community members at all times. So we're working on that. It's a long process but we hope that it will work. And the ccWG's draft is the test bed for it.

But if it does work we will have spearheaded something quite amazing for these - to the group. And we're talking - we have a call with them everyday for an hour and we go through the translations. We go through the edits. We go through the drafts. So we have updated drafts daily.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you, Grace. And regarding your second point, (unintelligible), that's a useful addition and we are - we'll do what we can to see whether we get any feedback from anyone but including the NTIA.

And I think with that I would like to just add one small point, which is about the bylaw drafting. As you know, we are going to try an iterative approach on the bylaw drafting on block by block. And we've agreed in Paris to launch one first block with the AOC review incorporation.

So that will take place in - should take place in parallel but not with the same deadline obviously. We have a little more leeway than mid-October for that.

But we need to kick start this process very early on so we'll - should have an action item for the chairs to kick start this process with the AOC review incorporation.

And with that I think I will turn back to Thomas for the core of this call, which he is going to be reviewing a number of items that we will need for our report. Unless Kavouss you have an extra point to add?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, just a small point that why experience in other international organizations. We have always the difficulty of some translation of some verbs from English to French. And because the text usually in English and sometimes the translation of shall into French and into Spanish is get to some difficulty in bylaws.

We have several earlier - we are talking about shall, which is (unintelligible) correct translation in French and in Spanish. And we should be very careful not to translate it something, which could mean should in French and shall in English.

It should be very careful of these things and that is very important for the non-speaking English people that they know what are the obligations and so on so forth. Resolve that tension of the translator to take this of this issue, thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you. And I think Grace as well as Alice will be able to convey this to the translators due to their perfect French so that we'll - should be part of the checkpoints.

And with that I'm turning back to you, Thomas, for the review of the various sections of the report.

Thomas Rickert: Yes, thank you very much, Mathieu. And during this section we're going to look at a couple of the documents to ensure that our group is aligned. And the first document that we're going to take a look at would be updated on graphics produced by (unintelligible).

This is going to take a second to be uploaded in the Adobe room. I would recommend everyone takes a look at these slides. It's a slide deck that

basically captures all aspects of our work. Since we are familiar with most parts and since the latest addition is the new reference model, i.e. the sole membership model, we would like to take a look at particularly that section.

And that is the slide that you see in front of you, which we think quite nicely helps visualize what changes we're going to make to the organization's structure of ICANN or let's put it the other way around, towards a demonstrate how little will change and that hopefully helps our messaging with the community and helps take away some of the fears that might be - that we are really putting the organization upside down.

So on the left-hand section of that document, you see the current situation where we have the ICANN board and you have the different SOs and ACs, which form ICANN's community.

At the moment there is no possibility other than what we already have and since we have it already it's not in here since the usual interaction between SOs and ACs when it comes through policy making or exchanging thoughts on other areas of ICANN such as strategic plans and budget and stuff like that, which already currently the ICANN board shares with the community to get feedback on.

In the proposed new scenario which you think - at which you find on the right-hand side of that slide, you now see the ICANN board and there is a bidirectional arrow. I hope that's the correct English word for it, which shows that we are introducing interaction between the board and the community.

And in this case, the community is (unintelligible) the empowered community and will underscore that to show the importance of that term. As you will remember, the absence of the historic relationship with the US government

and the power resting that the US government had is now put at the fingertips of the community, which is why the community is now empowered.

And the SOs and ACs in the community, they are now sort of enshrined or put together their working together to exercise the six community powers and these are exercise visa vie the board. And the SOs and ACs are the sole member of ICANN that's a description that you find at the right-hand side of the screen. And they're acting as the sole member.

And we hope that this makes sufficiently clear that of the SOs and ACs we currently have maintained their current setups. So we're not making any changes to them. We're just allowing for them to join the exercise, the powers that - our group as well as the community has confirmed to be vital and necessary to enhance ICANN's accountability substantially.

I think I should pause here and open it up for comments or questions from you. Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, Thomas, I think anyone of us are familiar with this. But we are talking with public and some of the public may see this for the first time. And they will ask what is this AC and what is this SO? Is there somewhere that is mentioned AC is advisory committee, X, Y, Z? And SO is supporting organizing, X, Y, Z? Or - and so on and so forth? This is number one.

Number two, when we're talking about power the people at the first time say what do you mean by power? Is there somewhere that we are talking about to power? There are six powers that we have mentioned. (Unintelligible) somewhere otherwise from the very beginning the people - they may see what are these powers.

I have been doing the last two and a half days talking with many people and there are many people that are eagerly and keenly looking for this document. The discussion that I had with them - some of them are not very familiar with all the details but they would like to see the document.

If you want your document to be quite clear and crystal clear and self-explanatory perhaps we should try to explain that somewhere either in the footnote or something that we have four AC advisory committees. These are advisory committees. And we have three SO supporting organizations and these are supporting organizations. And we have six power, these are the six powers. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, (unintelligible). I guess that's a valuable reminder that we need to make sure to take everybody with us who's seeing this. As I mentioned earlier, this particular slide will not be presented to any targeted group in isolation.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi everyone, just checking that the audio still works.

Mathieu Weill: It's working, Grace, but I can't hear Thomas.

Woman: Yes.

Grace Abuhamad: So I think we lost Thomas.

Mathieu Weill: Okay, this is Mathieu Weill speaking. I suggest we keep this conversation going while we try to get back to Thomas. And I think Thomas was disconnected. So Kavouss I think your points were well taken and certainly were some enhancements to the slide. So we will carry that back to explain for enhancing the slides.

Are there any other comments on the way to present the sole member model?  
Or suggestions for ways to make things easy to understand for the rest of the  
community? Yes, Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, Mathieu, I had the (unintelligible) some people are (unintelligible) doing  
in Paris and so on (unintelligible) group of people and they all appreciate it  
and so on and so forth. When we say sole member I had to explain to people  
some five to ten minutes very briefly who (unintelligible) when we talk about  
sole member we make across (unintelligible) so on.

Otherwise, many people that were not in Paris, they may not know what is  
sole member is. And the further - very beginning they will be misled by that  
and they distract from further reading and so on. We have encourage the  
people to read the whole thing.

So I suggest that in addition to we're talking about AC advisory, the  
committee, and then put (unintelligible) GAC and (unintelligible) and then  
SO, supporting organization, (unintelligible).

When we come to the sole member we say that sea section so on and so of the  
report they know because you have explained the three team models. At least  
we should refer the people to that, that would help a lot from the very  
beginning.

In my view, my personal view, this is an opening of the document and is very,  
very important. It's provide an image of the whole document. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you, Kavouss. You are right to stress this and I would also like to react  
to Sam's comment about the relationship with - that the board has selected

from the community. That's another of the slides about the four building blocks where this appears. And it is correct to say that we'll need to assess the overall presentation to make sure we have all the key information captured in this.

For instance, I think there would be value also explaining that the exercise of the powers will come through a phase of discussion with the community before the SOs or the ACs get to vote.

And that's an item of further work, which I personally would see much value in displaying graphically so that there is a clear focus and emphasis on the way the discussions will take place and that it's not going to be all about voting. But there will always be a phase of discussion before, that I think was an important aspect of our discussions in Paris.

So with that I think we have captured your feedback usefully. It's not last time that we can come back to this. I think we'll attempt to - by the next meeting on Thursday have an updated version and probably more comprehensive so that we can work on the basis of the wider version. And I'll fully be able to circulate it in advance so everyone can review it.

And so that - I don't know if we've got Thomas back with us but the next item to review is the section that will be quite upfront into the report about how - whether or not we are fulfilling the requirements of the NTIA on the one side and the CWG dependencies or conditionalities on the other side.

So we have assembled a draft section for that part of the report, which is basically structured into NTIA requirements first, CWG conditionalities second.

With regards to NTIA requirements, we suggest you use a table to look criteria by criteria, what are the key proposals that we are putting forward to address the criteria as well as the relevant stress tests that we are using to check whether this criteria will still be met when confronted with contingencies.

So with regards to the support and enhancement of the multistakeholder model, we are obviously building on the multistakeholder approach. The sole member community model is by definition - the sole member is multistakeholder himself so that's, I think, testimony of the way we've been following that criteria.

And we have a number of stress tests regarding capture, rogue voting, some of the NTIA's which means some of the questions raised by (Larry Strickland) in his blog have been translated into stress tests, which relates to the potential for capture. And that's what we have in this criteria.

Regarding the main - maintaining the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet DNS, the powers - there's been a lot of discussion regarding the powers about budget and strategy plan veto, director removal of board recall that were related to security, stability, and continuity of operations.

And we've - we've come up with proposals that include mechanisms to guarantee this continuity, whether it's the caretaker board - the interim board on the recall or the continuing to budget for the budget plan. And a number of stress tests have always - also been designed to address this as you can see. And that's an initial draft so I would expect a stress test working party to review that in details.



Regarding the meeting the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of the INS services, that criteria is more specific to the CWG and obviously the other communities. But what's worth mentioning is that our proposals address the needs of the CWG stewardship.

And we have also accommodated some of the requests from the numbering community as well as ccTLD community to ensure we don't have interference between their own processes and the IR people for instance.

The openness of the Internet, I think the enhancements we're providing to the mission and core values of ICANN are significantly driven by that criteria to avoid mission creep, to avoid content regulation. And that's described in a section that we'll be discussing later about the mission and core values.

And regarding the need not to accept a proposal that we place at NTIA with the government led or intergovernmental organization, obviously the proposals that we're putting forward is the proposal of mutual accountability between the board, which is selected by the community and the community itself.

And both the board - the SOs and ACs are accountable through the structural reviews. The community has specific limited number of powers of other board decisions.

And the proposal includes a possibility for the government to be recognized as stakeholders, especially in the role with regards to public policy but there is no capture possible in this model. And that's why we can - I think, valuably argue that we're meeting the requirement.

And regarding the CWG stewardship, we've discussed - we've crosschecked in Paris but the proposal would - this part of the report would relate to the various sections of the powers and - including budget, boards, influence on the board composition, and others in order to explain the reader where he can find how we are addressing the CWG requirements.

And with that I think we'd like to hear from you whether you see anything to add, comment, or change in this draft. I am noted - a comment by Rosemary about a diagram to show that the appointment power is the only one - this was a past comment on the diagram. So (unintelligible)?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, in one point - with respect to your comments whether it appears anywhere or just for this conversation you referred the issue meets the needs (unintelligible) of the global customers and partners of (unintelligible) service. You referred to the CWG.

I think we should not forget that we have two other communities that are very important and one community is the parameters and the other community is that the numbers. And this communities are supporting the naming community.

So all three are important in order to satisfy the global customer and partner of NTIA, not only naming so we should not forget these two other important community that (ICG) will consider in its proposals to the NTIA take into account the combined proposal. We should not forget that.

And one thing that I see in fact what you have quoted from a Stress Test 18. You have quoted government in ICANN - government advisory committee amend their operating procedures. You have not asked them to amend in the sense that it is they may wish in the future if necessary to amend that.

What you put in here, it means - it seems that you ask them to amend from the very beginning they do not expect to amend anything. They (unintelligible) 18 as it is today although the objective by GAC still does not say that they should amend this.

It says they consider if they want to amend their operating principles to go from consensus to the majority. The way you put it here gives this impression that you want - that the consensus will be changed to the majority, which is not the case. In Stress Test 18 we have not proposed that. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you very much, (unintelligible). Fully agree with you on the need to rewrite the part about the meets - meeting the needs of the customers and partners of IANA, that's - that includes beyond the naming community.

And regarding Stress Test 18 I think it was a copy and paste of the part of the report regarding Stress Test 18 so we'll share that feedback with the stress test working party to ensure consistency.

And the next is Pedro?

Pedro Ivo Silva: Yes, hello. Can you hear me okay?

Mathieu Weill: Yes, very good, Pedro. Please.

Pedro Ivo Silva: Yes, thank you, happy to talk to all of you after the productive things in Paris. Maybe I haven't quite understood the purpose of this Section 1 NTIA requirements but that's why I would like to seek clarification.

Actually, well, I think Stress Test 18 is a - as you all know and could receive from the discussion in Paris, quite a sensitive issue. I think we haven't reached any agreement whatsoever whether the proposed bylaw changes will happen or not.

And also we haven't reached any agreement, at least to my understanding, that the Stress Test 18 should be seen as a condition to meet the requirement of - fit the requirement of not accepting a proposal that reflects NTIA with the government or (unintelligible) government organization.

So I would like to know exactly what this section is intended to actually show and especially given the fact that we haven't reached agreement on these essential aspects of Stress Test 18. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you, Pedro. I think this is not intended to imply that Stress Test 18 is a requirement but rather that Stress Test 18 demonstrates that is part of the demonstrations that the proposal does not - in this case, infringe on the criteria which is that the NTIA role is not replaced by a government led solution.

However, as I said, we need - it's a matter of consistency which the stress test section of the report and I'm happy to delay any incorporation in this summary section until we have reach agreement on the stress test section noting that the definition of the stress test itself has been present for a while and a discussion we had was more focused on whether or not we did a particular proposed bylaw change associated to it.

So I think we'll - we need to ensure we have consistency across the report on this. And so that's - meanwhile I think it's sort of a racket around Stress Test 18 as we finalize this conversation in this section obviously, not in the stress test working party's part.

So - and I see Tijani's next. Please, Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, Mathieu. Do you hear me? Do you hear me, Mathieu?

Mathieu Weill: Yes, please.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. So Tijani speaking. The first bullet point, which is to support and enhance the (unintelligible) or the model and the last condition, which is not having a government or intergovernmental organization leading the organization, defines very well what kind of - what kind of organization we will have and we need to have. Those are the conditions of the NTIA.

So with those two points we can say that any mention of private sector led should be removed because now we need it to be multistakeholder led, private sector led. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you, Tijani. I will defer this conversation - my reading is that not with the government led so I'm not seeing an NTIA criteria that says it shouldn't be private sector led. So that's probably for another discussion to take on.

Kavouss, you're next.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, let me share with you what is my understanding of this section. In ICG what we did, we had the five criteria of NTIA. Whenever we wanted to check - in fact, not check, to assess the proposal of any of the three operating community there were assessors for people to assess.

And they put across that section or Bullet Point 1 of NTIA met or not met. Here, what you do, you took ccWG as a general assessors assessing the NTIA and the proposal.

Is it necessary that we put this section? Or we should limit once we receive the final proposals after the comments and then before sending that to ICANN and then to ICANN NTIA we put or we define or establish some group of people in the ccWG to assess but not making this pre-assessment.

We excluding more or less the community because we biasing the community by our assessment. I suggest that we do not make any assessment with respect to whether or not the criteria of NTIA has been or have been met at this stage. Rather, we leave it to the next stage once we receive the proposals or public comments and put them together.

Then we go through the entire commented proposal and to see whether we are able to declare that the criteria of NTIA have been met.

At this stage it is too early and premature to make such assessment by ccWG in the public comments. In fact, we prevent the public to properly comment because we biasing their ideas, saying that, yes, this has been met or this has not been met.

I don't think that is quite necessary so I suggest that we reconsider the necessity of putting this sections if you want to put in a public comment document. We do not mention and that would be at the second stage. If you look at the ccWG there is not any assessment of that.

This assessment was put to the ICG to that and since the ccWG is separate from ICG at the end we may assess ourselves or may not assess. So I think it

is a little bit risky to go through these, in particular some of the ideas, some of the issues as mentioned by Pedro are quite sensitive and may have not the purposes that we need to achieve, maybe having an unintended consequence.

So are you sure that you want - that you put this? Who's idea is that that we try to see whether or not the criteria of NTIA are met at this stage? Are we defending our proposal without public comment or not? Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: So Kavouss I think - so the idea is basically coming from a request that we've received essentially by (Larry Strickland) himself that our report documents how we are meeting or not meeting the NTIA proposals.

And so I think there is an expectation set and that includes - for instance, I know in the ccTLD community a number of people on the council or in the community are actually asking - okay, but are you sure you're meeting the NTIA criteria?

Can we - can you provide your rationale about this? That is the reason why we think it's important for us to have this section in the report, making clear that we'll be asking whether people are in line with this assessment, see differently.

But I believe for many it is going to be one of the key aspects of the report that we'll focus on to check whether we're in line, either with NTIA or with the CWG stewardship.

So that's - that was the reason behind this. So I don't think we should - we have to push the discussion to the end right now. But certainly we should definitely consider when we close the report whether to include it or not. And

there's a lot to synchronize with other parts of the report so probably it's not the right moment to delve into the various items.

But we'll keep this discussion on the list to check whether this traction for that publication, which in my own view and with the views that we've shared with the co-chairs that is something that's expected by - at least the NTIA but also others.

Any other questions on this? And then if not I think we'll move to a more substantial discussions with the next item. And for that I will get back to Thomas for resuming his chairing.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much, Mathieu. And thank you very much for stepping in while I was disconnected. Took me a while to realize I was holding a monologue without any feedback. But finally I got around to note when you made your comments in the chat.

We're now going to continue the substantive discussion that we initiated in Paris on some of the areas that still need some refinement. So we're going to move on to discuss the work between Paris and today done by Becky and her team.

And we're going to structure that in a way that Becky is kindly asked to show the latest updates to the mission commitment and core values, particularly pointing out those changes that have been made since we spoke and those changes that were responsive to the issues that we could not resolve while we were together in Paris.



We will open it up for comments and ideally confirmation from this group so that we can hopefully take stock and reach agreement provisionally during this call and then confirm the findings of this call during the next call.

So without any further ado I'd like to give the floor to Becky to show us through the changes that were made.

Becky Burr: Thank you. I'm going to - we had a very good Working Party 2 call this morning. And I think we've made some substantial changes that may help us achieve some consensus.

There are two issues, one particularly open issue, which is the issue of addressing human rights, specifically in the mission statement and core values and commitments.

And I have provided in the document that was sent out a while ago a brief explanation that basically says the group has really two sets of views, both of which are pretty firmly held.

One group of participants feels strongly that ICANN's bylaws should include an affirmative commitment for ICANN to understand the human rights action - impact of its action and inactions.

The other perspective in the group is that because we have ported it from the Articles of the Corporation the affirmative obligation to comply with international law. That, in fact, is an affirmative commitment to comply with fundamental human rights with respect to ICANN's activities.

That is a little bit different than saying that ICANN must have an affirmative commitment to understand the human right's impact of its actions and inactions because it requires it. It seems a little more deliberate and upfront.

There is some expert papers in ICANN's - in documents relating to ICANN. This one in the CM arbitration that basically says what you use the term international law, this is the canonical reference is Article 38 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, which specifically lists a requirement that components that are international conventions and general principles of law recognized by civilized nations.

So within the fundamental human rights treaties, that is in there. So that is Issue 1 for discussion. And then I'd like to go to the second issue, which is the private sector led language that appears in two places.

The first is in Paragraph 5 of the core values - no, of the commitment. And there were a number of objections to the use of the term private sector. Largely based on the notion that in that (Mondeal) and probably in other places for example, that there was references to private sector, civil society, the technical community, the - and academia.

So although this language has clearly always been used to refer more broadly to non-governmental organizations, we proposed to put this language in here clarifying that we are not just talking about commercial stakeholders in terms of the leadership here.

That comes up again in Article - or Section 7 of the core values where we would again, once again, explain that private sector means - includes business stakeholders, civil society, the technical community and academia.

Also in Section 7, with respect to the caveat on matters that are within ICANN's vision and consistent with its bylaws, this was a source of significant objection by members of the GAC on concern that it - (administer) potentially diminish the power that they have right now.

On further up the selection, we decided - we kind of concluded that the issue here is not dually taking into account the public policy in place of government. ICANN should clearly dually take into account the public policy (unintelligible) and public authorities.

But really the need for a very clear statement that ICANN - it is a statement of fact that ICANN has no authority to act or restrain from acting in response to advice from an advisory committee where that would require ICANN to exceed its mission or violate the bylaws.

And then we have added over the advisory committee has not, and there's a very important not missing from that, explained the specific reasons for its advice.

So what we would do is take that offending section out of the mission, commitments and core values all together. And add language to the (shapo) of Article 11, which applies to all advisory committees equally that says the language in red at the right.

So I don't know which one is going to be easier to talk to. But let's start with the human rights issue first. Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. This is Avri speaking. So in terms of the issue of a bylaws commitment to human rights and to impact analysis, first of all I want to

mention that it responds to two comments and as was discussed in Paris, bears on our global accountability.

And I argue that the current reference to international laws and covenants is not adequate. The units - the United States is a signatory to the various human rights covenants. As such, it is a human right's duty bearer.

This is one of the backstops that it provides to ICANN committing ICANN as well. When we transition, this human rights duty bearer backstop is lost, as the duty bearer status of ICANN is dependent on the relationship to the US government.

The duty is weakened, and thus it needs to be added to the bylaws as part of Work Stream 1 to maintain the status quo. In Resolution 17-4, the UN Human Rights Council in 2011, it produced guiding principles on business and human rights. And this was approved.

This is called the Protect, Respect and (Revenue) framework. If ICANN does not (unintelligible) these responsibilities in the bylaws, it leaves the task of being a duty bearer in the hands of the GAC, as all of the GAC members are also duty bearers.

This strengthens government control over ICANN. By accepting a bylaws responsibility to ensure that ICANN respects human rights obligation, to account for impact on human rights and policy creation, and to adhere to the respect, protect and remedy framework developed by the UN, we keep the issue within the bottom of multistate cold or process context.

And effectively, we place the human rights duty bearing on the US by assuming them into ICANN obligations. So that's basically the threat of reasoning that sort of explains why this needs to be a Work Stream 1 issue.

It's the same as any of the other NTIA backstop issues and is not a Work Stream 2 issue. Certainly Work Stream 2 can then dig further into what this means in all of its respects. But this very simple statement only forces us to pay attention to bear the duty and to do the impact - to understand the impact of our actions. Thanks.

Becky Burr: Thank you. Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, you have - you tried to reply to me in a different language that you exposed - you mentioned. You said that all advisory committee on (ecorp). I do not deal with equality within advisory committees.

What I have heard and I believe that and I learned that (Jack) is the only advisory committee responsible exclusively for public policy issues. And the advice that it provides will be treated different than the recommendation of any other advisory committee.

That is why currently it is mentioned that the board may need to proceed with that advice unless it has an objection to that. And if it has an objection, that objection has some criteria.

And then it should give all reasons for the objection. However, it is not the end of the business. The board need to consult with the GAC and try to find a reasonable solution for that.

That means the advice of the GAC will be maintained. It may be negotiated, but will be maintained. What you are saying is totally different from what is today. It would not be at least properly understood.

You might have some other thing in mind. But what you said, if it is on the paper, would be very, very difficult. GAC at its meeting clearly mentioned they would like to maintain the status that they have today. The advice that they give today.

With advice with the consensus that will be met by the board. If it is not met objective, they should give the reason. And if there is an objection, they have to sit down with GAC and find some conclusion.

You are trying at least or I understood that to change that. It is not appropriate and it is not productive. Thank you.

Becky Burr: Okay, excuse me. First of all, I do believe that you have misunderstood what we are trying to do. And we will explain banning greater detail because I think what we have done actually preserves what the (wine glitch) regarding consultation in its entirety. But I really would like to talk about one subject at a time. So could people try to constrain their comments now to the human rights issue?

And I just wanted to add that one of the approaches that was put on the table is that as part of Work Stream 1, we make a commitment to address this issue in Work Stream 2. And we take the port language that clearly establishes that as a requirement for Work Stream 2.

And in response, others have pointed out that there is a long history of disappointment in ICANN taking on this subject, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. I'm going to go back to the human rights question here. The - this is the first time - I've heard a few discussions about this particular concept, but this call is the first time I heard this duty bearer argument.

So I'll give points for ingenuity. It's not an argument I've heard before and I scuffled to try to figure out exactly what it might mean. So I thank Kavouss for the diversion so that I could do a little more research.

Obviously, not a sufficient amount of research to really understand the argument, but based on what I can read at first blush in a few minutes, I disagree with it as an argument.

In support of this reason to try to get this language into this version of the bylaws at this time. In any case, if this argument is to be taken seriously, it would need to be analyzed by counsel to see whether it makes sense or not.

As far as I can tell, states are duty bearers. ICANN's a private corporation. Nothing in the NTIA contract makes it a duty bearer. The individual states and the GAC being duty bearers does not somehow make the ICANN more government led in the absence of the NTIA contract.

So to me the justification falls apart. I'd rather go back to discussing other reasons, but, you know, you can certainly, you know, explore that further. I'm not going to dismiss anything out of hand, especially based on, you know, what I just said.

But that's my initial first blush reaction to the justification to this new justification for it. I think this is a complex, nuanced situation. Clearly it's,

you know, within ICANN a moving target as we get into an argument just today about why it should be here.

And there are organizations that haven't even yet taken formal status within or around ICANN that are beginning to look at the issue. I think it's an issue that is incredibly important. It deserves attention. It deserves study. It deserves discussion.

It also deserves not being dealt with in this kind of highly rushed phase. This is not the kick the can or punt the ball down the field or anything like that. I'd like to get started right away in a different group on a, you know, appropriate timeframe to look into this fully and understand what it means to deal with this issue and all of the kind of secondary issues that come along with dealing with a complex, nuanced global issue. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Greg. This is Thomas. We've heard a couple of arguments, both speaking in favor as well as raising cautions with us - for us to move forward with the human rights issues, Work Stream 1.

I think we have a few takeaways already. And both in this call as well as in Paris, as well as in the work - the Party 1 call earlier today, everyone confirmed that the human rights issue is an important one.

We - that it needs to be worked on. I think everybody agrees that it shouldn't just be lip service, but that it should be operationalized in what ICANN is doing.

The only difference that we're having is whether this is a Work Stream 1 or a Work Stream 2 task for the group to take on. And I would suggest that we again, take a look at the definitions of the two work streams.



And let me just refresh your memory on that. Work Stream 1 is focused on mechanisms (in hunt) in ICANN's accountability that must be in place or committed to within the timeframe of the IANA (unintelligible).

Work Stream 2 is focused on addressing accountability topics for which a timeline for developing solutions and full implementation may extend beyond the IANA (unintelligible) transition.

Now if we take those definitions, I can't help the feeling that maybe some of us were afraid that we are taking on too much in Work Stream 1, i.e. prior to the transition.

Read this as a commitment or a requirement for us to complete our work on human rights. That maybe I could suggest that there is some middle ground, adding to what's been exchanged in the chat already.

If we have the reference to international law already, and if there is agreement inside our group that human rights are encompassed by this definition, might not need extra explicit reference in the bylaws.

But add to our package a commitment to work on let's say a gap analysis where human rights are already followed and where the missing bits are. That would allow for us to deem the human rights issue indirectly being mentioned in the bylaws.

I guess that is Avri's concern. At the same time, we do not have to deliver on that holistically. It can start in Work Stream 1. And I understand that there might be volunteers in our group who would be willing to take on that task. But we could extend our work on that beyond the transition.

Now as we speak, I would certainly not dis-encourage you to make your points. But maybe you can let me and the group know whether what I have just outlined might be a suitable compromise to bridge the gap between the two (unintelligible).

Greg I think that might be an old hand that's raised. So let me move to David and I'm more than happy to get back to you Greg in case it's a new hand.

David McAuley: Thank you Thomas. It's David for the record. And we - as Becky mentioned, this was a fairly interesting discussion this morning. And Avri, for whom I have agreed to respect and I were on different positions, and I think I still am.

Now with respect to your request that we try and find a middle ground, I think that would be sensible. But I do have to say that one of my concerns was that what the concept of human rights needed and why I thought it should go to Work Stream 2 is that it was so important.

And it will take space and time to understand what we mean when we say about - when we talk about human rights in relation to coordinating the DNS. And it's possible in managing a DNS system that some human rights bump up against each other and become in conflict. And I think that's a concern that we need to be very careful about.

And then the other reason I was giving this morning was that Secretary Strickland did tell us in Buenos Aires to stick to our knitting and get Work Stream 1 done. If we can find the language that you suggest, then that may be the way forward.

But it would depend very much on the language, and so I thank you for that comment. But I just want to note, this is a very serious concern. The concept of course is fundamental and important. But it's so important that I think it just needs care to work this out so it doesn't have any unintended consequence.

With respect to Avri's duty bearer argument, I agree with Greg. It's inventive. And I'll certainly give it some consideration. I do think it would be wise for us to have the lawyers look at it. Thanks Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks David, Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you Thomas. Do you hear me?

Thomas Rickert: Yes we can hear you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay thank you. So I think that perhaps I was speaking about human rights, but I don't think we have to all really specific. I just wanted to (unintelligible) examples (unintelligible) to how ICANN should do to stick to the human rights policy.

Any existing submission. But we are involved existing (unintelligible). We don't have to (introduce) this content of the - any kind of content. We are here about a number and a (lead). So how ICANN can speak - how ICANN can exist its mission in respect to human rights. But what are the pieces where ICANN should do something .Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much Tijani. I was about to close the queue after Robin, now Kavouss has raised his hand. So it's Robin and Kavouss could keep it brief

please. I would like to take stock and then move on to the next discussion, Robin.

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

Thomas Rickert: Yes we can.

Robin Gross: Okay, so I just wanted to propose sort of a compromise here. We just simply have a commitment in the bylaws to fundamental human rights principles in ICANN policy development and operations.

There's some restrictive words there like fundamental when it comes to human rights, principles as opposed to obligation. And I think I would add this as sort of an additional sentence to the one that Becky's already included because I think that this can help to clarify that we do mean within international laws that we are talking about fundamental human rights here.

So I think that I could offer that maybe as a compromise that we could agree just for Work Stream 1 to just have the commitments to fundamental human rights principles in ICANN policy development and operations.

Just have that much of the bylaws in Work Stream 1. And then in Work Stream 2, yes we can sort out the details and what we specifically mean about that. But I think it's important to get that commitment in the bylaws. And that's what we're doing in Work Stream 1. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Robin, Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, more or less the same that proposals with some slight nuances and differences, it will be a mistake that in the bylaw that (unintelligible). We must refer to that as a fundamental important issue.

We should do - have some language. However, we should (listen to the defer) detail and implementation and various aspects of that will be the subject of the (TCA) discussion. And in the study it should be worked out in Work Stream 2.

So managing what we want as reference to the details of our approaching Work Stream 2. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Kavouss. And I'm afraid we won't be able to conclude the discussion on that topic during today's call. I think we can sense that the idea of everyone is to further look into this.

I can also sense that there is a willingness to commit to work on the issue. I think we still have divergence on what exactly the proposed language means. So that causes some uncertainty as to what language can be used.

But I do think all of those that have made suggestions as a compromise, I think we will have to work further and think harder on how we can capture this idea of commitment.

A language that makes this commitment ensure that this important topic is not being put on the back burner. I personally think that we can make it a commitment under Work Stream 1, which is not to be completed - concluded prior to the transition.

So I think we need to leave it here in the interest of time. So I would now like to call for comments and suggestions with respect to the GAC advise issues that Becky has outlined at the beginning of our discussion. Becky would you like to add to that? Becky your hand is raised...

Becky Burr: I apologize. I was on mute. Since it there seems to be some misunderstanding about what this language is intended to do, I just want to go through it one more time.

So the proposal that we discussed this morning is that we delete entirely the as tending language in Core Value Number - now was Core Value 11, now Core Value Number 7.

So that on matters that are within ICANN's position be consistent with its bylaws. That language has completely gone away. And then the beginning of Article - the general provision of Article 11, which talks about advisory committee says that the board may create more advisory committees in addition to those set forth in the bylaws.

And who they can consist of. And their reporting requirements. We proposed to add a one sentence statement of fact I believe that applies to all advisory committees. It does not single the GAC out.

And unless you believe that the GAC has the authority to compel ICANN to act in violation of its bylaws, it does not change anything. And it just simply says ICANN shall have no authority to act or refrain from acting in response to advice from an advisory committee where such advice would require ICANN to exceed its mission or violate these bylaws or where the committee has not explained the specific reasons for its advice.

Now I do think this is something that we worked very, very, very hard to take the GAC's concerns onboard and to find a satisfactory solution that addressed all of the concerns of all of the community.

And I'm, you know, I think one question is am I mistaken or do we have consensus that ICANN has no ability - no power to act in violation of its bylaws no matter what anybody says to it.

Thomas Rickert: Sorry, I was on mute. Thanks Becky for clarifying this again. Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I now understand but I don't think that the issue is a violation of the bylaw by ICANN (unintelligible) advisory committee. The violation of bylaw by ICANN board in any case, whether it is advisory committee or support organization is not - I don't understand why we associate that with advisory committee.

Either we say that the ICANN's board action in relation is the advice received from advisory committee. Should we include (unintelligible) with the bylaws? That is something we can support.

But I don't want to make a reference to the existing situations of the public policy issues relating to the GAC advice that has been properly and separately treated currently and make no change to that one.

However, still I have difficulty why only violation of the bylaw in relation with the advice of advisory committee? Why not with this relation to everything? Any recommendation from everything. Why only advice the committee? Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Kavouss. Finn made a comment in the chat that the GAC will discuss the suggestion. I think that since this primarily an issue that effects government, I would suggest that we leave this for the time being.

I have not heard any other concerns, rather those that have been expressed - other than those that have been expressed by Kavouss. And Kavouss would certainly join the discussion at the GAC.

So my suggestion to you would be that for the time being, we keep the updated language presented by Becky as our current proposal. And wait for the GAC to get back to us or individual government to get back to us should they have concerns.

Certainly if other members or participants of this group want to raise concerns, by all means, please do so. I would encourage you to do that on the mailing list.

But since we only had one participant that raised concern, let's work with this language as our current language to go into the report. Until such time when we hear otherwise.

Okay, any - Becky, would you like to make any concluding remarks on this subject or shall...

((Crosstalk))

Becky Burr: No, I think that's fine. I think we can move on.



Thomas Rickert: Excellent. Thanks so much. Thanks Becky and to the whole group for the hard work in the meantime in the (talk). Now Jordan will present to us the initial work that has been done by Work Part Number 2. So over to you.

Jordan Carter: Thanks Thomas and Work Party Number 1 in my case, but that's all right. I think the...

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: I apologize.

Jordan Carter: It may take some time. Okay everyone, as you'll recall at the meeting in Paris we said we recognize we got to have time to talk about the standard bylaws and (been) some bylaws changes.

And I earnestly put the documents on the list with an encouragement for discussion. There was precisely no discussion of this. And so what I've done on the documents (unintelligible) which was circulated about an hour before the call is accept all the changes that were in the document that did go out for a request for feedback.

But made a couple of changes. So I'm going to assume that that text is pretty stable. And I'm just going to talk now about the changes here in the one in front of you.

So if you scroll down to the second page, in both Section 3.2 and 5.4 we had never quite gotten around to specifying the thresholds and numbers would refer to the thresholds, which would be so much require the entire board.

But I've replaced that in Clause 3 by just saying it would be a three quarter votes in favor. And that's actually cross referenced somewhere else in draft text I've seen today.

So it's almost the same threshold. I think when we (unintelligible) of the whole board, we said three quarters of all the votes available in the mechanism. And so that's just something to note.

I thought it was slightly (tied) to have the same requirement of the board and for the community, anybody in favor of these - in favor of these changes to fundamental bylaws. So that's one change.

The next one, if you scroll down to Page 3, it wasn't clear to me that adding in the separation review or adding in the PTI was actually desired or required by the CCW - by the CWG stewardship proposal.

So in this version I've taken them back out. And I think, I don't mind whether they're there or not personally. I think that we should be guided as to whether they're there or not by the CWG.

And then the last changes are just editorial. And on the bottom of Page 4 I've made a consistent call about three quarters of votes in favor to approve the change.

So these are pretty limited changes to the document. The text has been pretty stable for a while. And Thomas, back to you - I'm sorry, I can't remember what you said, I think it was Thomas of how you handle any call.

Otherwise, I think we should take this as a (second read) and more whatever reading number it is for this (ten minutes) of bylaw stuff.

Thomas Rickert: Yes thanks Jordyn. And actually I'm going to continue to help facilitate this discussion as the queue is forming. Let me just throw in that Jordyn is right when he said that this has been quite stable for a while.

We are now in the phase where we really do need to make progress and get closure on the various aspects. So if there are things that you inevitably need to see changed, please do speak up.

It's just, if it's things that you would like to improve but that you could still live with, I would suggest that we leave the language as it is and maybe take that offline.

Now let's move to the queue. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Just a small point, but we need to be consistent with how things are expressed in the bylaws. And for instance it's not two thirds, it's 66%. And in fact it's more than 66. So the, you know, the three quarters should be more than 75%. Nothing major, but we need to make sure we're consistent. That's all.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Alan. Sharon.

Sharon Flanagan: Thanks. On the comment Jordyn just made about the separation review and the post-transition IANA, speaking as an advisor to CWG, I think both of those things should be contemplated. So I would actually revert back to how it was before.

Certainly, you know, the separation is really part in parcel of the IANA function review, but I think it's worth calling it out. And then on PTI, you

know, obviously PTI is not created within ICANN in the sense that the bylaws don't create PTI.

PTI will have a separate legal existence. But there will be implementing aspects of PTI that will - because ICANN will be the sole member of PTI, there will be implementation that will need to be reflected in the bylaws as fundamental bylaws. So I think it's worth referencing that as well.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Sharon. I suggest we take note of that point. As you do know, we have our lawyers as well as the CWG, you know, which is partially (unintelligible) and ICANN legal review the bylaws. So let's ensure that the packages such as (cohesive). Sebastian is next.

Sebastian Bachollet: So thank you. So this is Sebastian Bachollet. My concern is that with a threshold we put today, we don't know yet how the community will be formed in 75% of (unintelligible) just when - and just one issue for example.

It will be difficult if not impossible to reach or to not reach. And I don't know if it's the right time to decide about that. I would like to compare that with what we think the (unintelligible) organization will be to be sure that the number we put, it's physical.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks so much Sebastian. Can I ask, Jordan to maybe give an answer to that or attempt an answer on that?

Jordan Carter: Well I think that we do need at some point to just crystalize on all of these thresholds, making sure the language is clear for all of the thresholds and all of the powers.

And making sure that it's manageable. So I kind of agree with Sebastian that we need just to do that. That's all.

Thomas Rickert: Excellent. I would suggest that we close this point by confirming in the notes that we'll need to make sure that the bylaw language to be drafted needs to be consistent following Alan's point.

That we need to make sure that we have the references in there that are required to make it legally proper. And in response to Sharon's point and that we also make sure that we properly test what we're doing here in response to Sebastian's point.

So what these caveats, take note of I suggest we - the close of this discussion, keep the language with the need to double check it at a later stage and move to the next topic. And back over to you Jordyn.

Jordan Carter: That's - okay, that's fine with me. Are you handing it back over to me for the next topic?

Thomas Rickert: Yes.

Jordan Carter: Right, okay. So we're running a bit late, and that means that this is good news. Community mechanism is sole member model. And there is some draft text that has been prepared by (unintelligible).

And I thought it was reasonable given that Alan hadn't seen it yet, as far as I knew. And that Working Party 1 had not discussed it to actually put on the agenda for the WP1 call tomorrow. And then for discussion at the CCWG call on the 23rd.

So people who want to attend the first discussion, they should attend the WP1 call in 22 ½ hours or so. And then we'll talk about it on this call on whatever the 23rd is, Thursday or Friday.

I hope that's okay. I didn't seem resort to put draft text on the whole CCWG. And then try and work through this with about an hour on us because of the time I went to sleep.

Thomas Rickert: Okay, thank you very much Jordyn. I don't see any hands up, which is also good news and allows us to move on to the next topic. And for that to be handed, I would like to hand it over to Leon.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Thomas. This is Leon. And our next agenda topic is instructions to legal counsel.

((Crosstalk))

Leon Sanchez: So we received some...

((Crosstalk))

Leon Sanchez: And I believe the...

((Crosstalk))

Leon Sanchez: I'm sorry for that. Give me a second. Thank you for waiting. I'm sorry for that. So we received some from (unintelligible) and he surely made it clear in the beginning of our call that this input was only meant as a help to us in case we needed to further explore different options.

So far we have agreed that the single membership, a very (sole) member model is the right for us to continue discussing. So I don't think there's a need to further reference the (error) memorandum at this stage.

But of course we have assuming case anyone wants to make any questions or comments. And another important point with regards to some instructions to legal counsel is that we would be expecting the lawyers to review our draft documents from July 24 to 27.

And what I mean by draft documents is those draft, finalized draft documents that we will be sending to them. We wouldn't expect them to review all the drafts that are being circulated within the list because this would of course create a massive load of work for them and would also might lead into confusion at some point.

So we would kindly ask the lawyers to please wait for these three finalized versions of the draft so you can go ahead and review them as I said, from 24 to 27th of July.

And after that we will be of course needing to have your input on the finalized versions of each of the documents that we would be pulling in for our second public comment period.

So I see that we have a response from the lawyers to the input (Aron) since it has been clearly stated by (unintelligible) of this input. I don't think we should spend any more time on reviewing this memorandum by our lawyers.

And now that we have our instructions clear for our legal counsel I would like to open the floor maybe for the lawyers if you need any clarification. Holly or

Rosemary do you need some kind of clarification as to when would you be expected to jump in. Holly I see your hand up.

Holly Gregory: Thank you. I think the instructions are very clear. We look forward to receiving a draft of the next round of the proposal sometime on Friday. And then we will put all of our (unintelligible) getting quick reviews that we have something back to you on Monday.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much for that Holly. So I would now turn back to Mathieu for any other business, Mathieu.

Mathieu Weill: Sorry, coming off mute. Are there any other business to introduce? Maybe I should say that we've had a coordination call with the ICG chairs this morning European Time, so earlier today.

And we are confirming that the two public comment periods will be aligned. So starting on the same day, ending on the same day. And we will be coordinating the engagements Webinars as well as meeting with the various groups so that we avoid any conflict.

So the both support staff are working together to facilitate this. And we are keeping each other informed of our progress. Are there any other items to address in the AOB? I'm seeing none.

Avri Doria: Wait a sec.

Mathieu Weill: Yes Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes, I wanted to check one thing about our meetings. I wanted to check whether the Thursday meeting we've got conflicts with the GNSO Council



meeting and whether that's okay with us? I know it means I'll have to be in one place or the other, but.

Mathieu Weill: Okay, I'm probably not the best person to know whether that conflicts with the GNSO meeting. But probably...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I was putting everything in my schedule, and they seem to be in the same place. So I may have made a mistake, but I want to raise that alert because that affects several of us.

Mathieu Weill: Grace, could you answer?

Grace Abuhamad: Hi, this is Grace. Yes, so the GNSO Council meeting overlaps by one hour. So the GNSO Council meeting starts at 11 UTC and runs to 13 UTC. And our call starts at 12 UTC and runs till 14 UTC. So there's an hour overlap.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Grace. And while you're at it Grace, can you refresh our memory with the ICANN's that are planned to be on the agenda for the meeting on Thursday?

The type of - there's going to be a lot of review - draft sections of the public comment. I think there will be individual board member removal, as well as recall of the board. Other sections that are planned, Grace.

Grace Abuhamad: Yes, those two sections in addition would likely have the Section 4 on the appeals mechanisms. And Section 5 on the new accountability requirements or essentially the outcome of Work Party 3.

((Crosstalk))

Grace Abuhamad: The final review of the stress test based on stress test work parties results and group there.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Grace. James your hand is up.

James Gannon: Hi, James Gannon. A number of us said it in the chat portion just to put it out formally on the call, if possible we should really look at rescheduling the CCWG meeting to remove that conflict with GNSO Council. We have a number of councilors who are active in the working group and also a number of participants and members are active in the GNSO and will be following the council meeting regardless of whether they're councilors or not.

So it would be - it would have a large (unintelligible) on the GNSO's participation in that meeting. So I'd like to formally request that if possible, we reschedule that meeting for an hour later to remove the conflict.

Mathieu Weill: Okay. Are there any objections to moving the meeting by one hour later?  
Alan?

Alan Greenberg: That would cause a conflict for me for the last hour. I don't know how many others.

Mathieu Weill: Yes it's - yes I'm afraid there's some form of number of people concerned. And our friends from the other side of the world, including New Zealand and Australia certainly do mind an hour later, Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I think you could not satisfy everybody.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: And that is fact.

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: So we're taking on an input in. And we'll confer with staff to see whether there's any possibility to find a compromise on this. And get back to (the race) very quickly, probably in less than 12 hours to check whether there is a slight shift or not.

And Alan the conflict happens because we've added this meeting on the Thursday, quite on the way to the Paris meeting. So that was not - that was an additional meeting and not a regular meeting from the CCWG because we are in the finalization stage obviously.

Okay, I think that concludes we have reached the end of our call. Alan I guess that's an old hand?

Alan Greenberg: It is.

Mathieu Weill: Okay thank you. So you will have notice. We spent a significant amount of time on (drafts) of the report. We're not over yet, but I think we've made good progress and we've had substantial discussions on useful parts of the report.

The calls in the work parties are really critical for us to manage our deadline and get drafts that are high quality, like the ones that we've been presented with tonight.

So really commend everyone that's involved in the work parties, including obviously (directors), but also encourage everyone to review and also be patient when obviously we struggle with providing the documents way in advance due to the importance of the work that's needed to edit them to a level of quality that is useful for us to consider.

So be patient but at the same time I look forward to your continued implication. And I - with that I think we can close this call with a little bit of advance. Thank you very much for your engagement and comments.

Thank you for staff for providing outstanding support as usual. And I look forward to talking to all of you on Thursday at a time that is yet to be confirmed. Thanks everyone and bye.

Woman: Good bye.

Man: Bye all.

Woman: Bye.

Coordinator: And that concludes today's conference. Thank you all for participating. You may now disconnect.

END