

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer  
August 18, 2015  
2:00 pm CT**

Coordinator: The recordings are started.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much. Then, I think we can start this meeting. My name is Thomas Rickert. I'm one of three co-chairs of the CCWG, and I would like to welcome all of you to this 49th call of the CCWG. So, good morning, good evening, good afternoon everyone. At time, I'm the only co-chair on this call. (Leon Sanchez) might join later. He's been held up at a court hearing. So, hopefully he will be able to join a little bit later, which is why we're going to change the sequence of our discussion slightly. Leon was supposed to lead on agenda item number three, which is related to the human rights working party. So, we're going to put that further down on the list -- hoping that he will be able to make it in time. Otherwise, I'm going to share that section of the agenda as well.

First of all, let us do a roll call. As usual, we will do the roll call from the Adobe room. I would like to ask those who are only on the phone bridge to make themselves heard so that we can add them to the list of individuals that are on this call. So, I see (unintelligible) is only on the phone line. So, he will

be added to the list of participants. And, if there are any further individuals on the phone bridge please let us know and we will add you.

If you have any updates to your statements of interest, please let us know. Just as a reminder, there's no issue with having an interest just that the interests have to be declared. So, there don't seem to be any, which allows us to move straight to the second item on the agenda, which is the update on the Public Comment Review Tool.

As you remember, we have discussed that we would conclude our work analyzing the public comments and giving detailed feedback to those that took the trouble of writing comments during the first public comment period and aggregate all of that in a report. Feedback on that was due by the end of today -- 2359 UTC. So far, I think we're only missing two sections from the respective work parties. So, should you have any further feedback on the Public Comment Review Tool, please check with us or the respective (repertoire) so that this can be amended.

After this day has expired, we're going to give it a few more hours for staff to compile the individual parts of the report, do some proofreading, and then we do plan to issue the report -- publish it in less than 24 hours. So, (Becky) just corrected me that there's only one section missing. So, I think this is very good news. We are well on track with what we had announced. Are there any comments on the Public Comment Review Tool? Kavouss please.

Kavouss Arasteh: Comment one, PC1. Am I right? Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Yes, we're discussing Public Comment Period Number 1, correct. This is the report that has been in the process of being aggregated where our group

reports back to the commenters of the Public Comment Period Number 1 so that the commenters see what this group made out of their contributions.

Okay, and I would like to encourage all of you to spread the word about this report that we're going to issue in a little bit more than 24 hours because I think this shows the accountability of our group to the rest of the community. You know, no single comment was lost. We've addressed all of them. And, I think this is a very great - very good piece of work to show that we are taking community input very seriously. And, that a lot of comments that were made, made its way into our updated report. And also, the support that we got gave our group direction -- that we should build on some very substantial parts of our first report.

So, with that, I think we can move to the fourth item on the agenda. As you will remember, we will save the third item hoping that Leon will be able to join us a little bit later in the call. The idea of the fourth item on the agenda -- which we provisionally called (Resilient) Analysis of the Community Mechanism -- is an idea that was born a few weeks back. You will remember that I was making a tongue and cheek comment, tagging this work the "Devil's Advocate Group." But the idea actually is to take a look at the community mechanism in particular that we're now suggesting because what we're hearing is that there are a lot of questions. There are some concerns maybe in the making about whether this mechanism -- once it is installed and deployed -- could actually have unintended side effects or unintended consequences.

In line with (block post) issued by (Larry Strickling) -- who asked us to be very diligent in documenting the work that we've done -- we thought it would be a good point in time to start working on exactly that task -- i.e. to do something which is not stress testing -- I will clarify that a little bit more in a

moment -- but actually to do an impact or resilience analysis of the changes that we are proposing -- the changes that may be caused by the new reference model -- i.e. the single membership model.

Let's not confuse this with the notion of stress test because the stress tests which was designed -- as you all know -- are also a requirement established by the US government. So, the US government has asked us that we, in the course of our work, look at certain contingencies and look at these scenarios that compose contingencies on ICANN and see whether these real life scenarios or hypothetical scenarios would actually do harm. And, they would only do harm if the accountability system that we are working on is not sufficiently addressing the contingencies.

So, the stress test working party has done great work in identifying and thinking through scenarios that could impose danger or harm to ICANN. Now, with this specific piece of work -- i.e. the resilience analysis -- we would look at this very mechanism and see - let's say whether it can be gained or whether its composition can lead to unintended side effects.

Having said that, I think that we are in good shape. I think there has been a lot of thinking while we've analyzed, or as a consequence of analyzing the first public comment report and addressing concerns that were raised. But, we might be a little but short on actually documenting all of our thinking with respect to countering efficiently the danger of destabilizing ICANN. I'll give you one example. There has been the concern of risk imposed by members having statutory rights that could be exercised or members actually engaging in derivative lawsuits. We saw that, we listened to that concern, and we addressed it by using an alternative mechanism that would remove that contingency.

So, I think that should be enough of an introduction. I would very much like to open it up for your feedback on this proposed work -- whether you think it's a good idea to think more about potential risk and writing up why we think these risks are sufficient to the US. I'm not sure whether Kavouss's hand is an old hand or new hand. So Kavouss if it's a new hand, please do speak up.

Kavouss Arasteh: Dear Thomas, dear colleagues. In the first step, we should not over emphasize or under emphasize any item or any issues. From the very beginning I as a participant was not happy and comfortable with some of the stress tests, in particular a Stress Test 18 and core value (unintelligible) 12, 13, and 31. We should avoid any tendency to place sole emphasis on the role of any of the community -- business, nongovernmental, and so on and so forth -- and (monitorizing) the government. It is not appropriate. Otherwise, (the democratic, inclusive,) and transparency is not expected.

It seems that some of the people are totally influenced by the requirement of a specific entity pushing for this (unintelligible). We have seen the representative of that entity somewhere else (about two years ago) emphasized that (unintelligible) vital and fundamental. But, by that, we have not (observed the) neutrality and impartiality. This is something very, very important and we should not be commanded or subordinated by any entity.

As I mentioned some time ago, all members of the CCWG must sign a letter conflict of interests in order to show that they are not influenced and biased by any entity whatsoever. The Stress Test 18 -- core values...

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: Kavouss sorry. Can I ask that...

Kavouss Arasteh: I'm very sorry to raise it again. That is a very important issue. If you want to make it as a public comment, I don't see that is appropriate. As a participant, I have raised it more than ten times and I have been (unintelligible) and even on time the chair...

((Crosstalk))

Kavouss Arasteh: Incorrectly. This is an important issue and that is a concern that must be addressed. We should not be guided by a specific entity at all. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Kavouss thank you. And sorry, I tried to interject because let me be very clear. This exercise is not discussing stress tests. This is not about stress tests and particularly - can you please mute your microphones when not speaking please? This is not about stress tests in general and it is not about stress tests in particular with respect to stress test Number 18.

The concern that you raised is entirely unrelated. This piece of work is intended to look at the mechanism and unintended side effects or unplanned consequences or impact that it might have on ICANN's stability. Because some have voiced concerns already, that by introducing the single membership model, this might lead to a decivilization of ICANN. I think it would be worthwhile engaging in the exercise of validating that our assessment that this is not the case is actually true.

So, sorry (John). You've been patiently waiting. But, I just wanted to set the record straight after Kavouss's intervention -- to maybe be a little bit more specific on what the idea of this exercise was. Over to you now.

John, we can't hear you. So, maybe you are on mute?

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: Actually, I have you first, but let's hear Olga first. Perfect, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Thomas. I just wanted to support what Kavouss said. I may be misunderstood this part of the conversation. I thought that we were talking about the importance of stress tests. What we haven't seen reflected in the draft document for a comment is - the comments made by several comments about that we should - would like that stress test 18 to be taken out of the document or just marked as not acceptable by several countries. I just wanted to mention that and apologies if I -- also like Kavouss -- misunderstood the purpose of this exercise. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Olga. Let's go to Jordan now and after that, I'm more than happy to shed some light on that.

Jordan Carter: Thanks Thomas. Can you hear me?

Thomas Rickert: Yes, we can hear you all right.

Jordan Carter: Great, thanks. Good morning everyone. A while ago, I was asking questions about the stress tests and the question I was asking was we've done a good job of analyzing how ICANN's accountability would look without the (entire) contract in the stress testing process but we hadn't tested our own proposed solution against the various circumstances it might encounter. So, I thought that would be a different phase of stress testing. But, if we're going to call it resilience analysis, I think that's a good term and I think it's important what we do. Because, we do have to document and show that we have and (unintelligible) that we've tested it and tried it (from a range perspective, tested against these) scenarios where it might be (unintelligible).

So, I think this is important work for us to do and I support us doing it. And, I'm certainly not prepared to lead it at all, but I will help as much as I can. So, thanks for making the proposal, Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Jordan. Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Thomas, Steve DelBianco. And Thomas, when you bring up this risk analysis, I wanted to draw everyone's attention to the fact that ICANN's board and legal department prepared a list of 156 questions that were titled Impact Analysis Questions. I put a link to it in the chat. A number of you will remember that we first encountered it when we arrived at the Buenos Aires meeting and had been through that document to draw from its certain stress tests.

But, that impact analysis gets to what Thomas is speaking of. In that document, there are a series of very pointed questions that ask us whether we've considered, for instance, how was the impact -- Number 7 -- how is the impact of security, stability, and resiliency incorporated into actions taken through the Community Empowerment Models? You see a question phrased that way doesn't amount to a scenario or stress test where you assess the before and after accountability mechanisms. Instead, it's a rather pointed question and it usually reveals an underlying suspicion that something about our solution is going to create an unintended consequence or an impact that ought to be mitigated in some other way.

Those questions, we need to address perhaps many of them but probably not all of them, once we've made the significant shift away from each (ACNSO) becoming a member to the new model of the community as a single statutory member, because I think that eliminates a lot of potential mischief that could



be brought by each individual member having statutory rights. So, there are multiple sources. It's not just (Larry Strickling)'s blog which has nine questions, but there's 156 questions that came at us from the board and legal department. We do have to stir those into a pot and figure out how to respond to them. Although, Thomas is right. They do not amount to scenario based stress testing such as we've already done in the document. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much. (Unintelligible) is doing a (unintelligible) on that, in support of what Steve just said. Now, there were two points that I think I should try to respond to briefly. I think the comment made by (Hogar) was a little bit earlier than actually Olga's question so that we go to (Hogar). And he asked me in the chat whether I could elaborate a little bit more on who is arguing that the single membership model is destabilizing ICANN and in what terms.

I think, (Hogar), the idea or the answer to that would be that I heard several individuals and wouldn't even be able to tell who that was that said that nobody has seen the new system live and running. And, nobody therefore knows how it would actually play out in practice because this is new. There seems to be some fear or anxiety to move from something which has been perceived by some as being stable to a new system that has not been stress tested if you wish. I think that we should be forward thinking and go through day-to-day scenarios that we could think of and maybe play - toy around a little bit how the interplay of exercising community powers -- filing RP's against them, injecting (unintelligible) on top of that -- would play out and actually document different scenarios and actually ensure or document that the (unintelligible) can't be gained by individual parties in contrast to what we tried to achieve.

I think that Steve's point -- making reference to the questions that have asked by the board -- is a very good one. Because, I think that the board is one of those - individual board members. Maybe I shouldn't do a catch all for all of them. But, I think that at least some of the board members clearly indicated with the type of questions they asked that they want to make absolutely sure that if such change is administered to ICANN, that we better know for sure that no unintended side effect can occur.

With respect to Olga's point, Olga, we have discussed the question of stress test 18 in length on numerous occasions. And, there has been the wish by some to get it removed. But, that wish did not get sufficient traction to actually remove it from the project -- if you wish. At the same time, this stress test Number 18 has been tagged a requirement by the US government. And talking merely from a co-chair perspective, our charter requires us to make sure that we follow NCIA requirements and make the transition happen.

So, I think if you have strong feelings about this not being included, please do file a public comment making yourself heard. I think we could also add a minority statement to the report if you wanted to. But you know, I think we've treated this item as we've dealt with other questions that made its way into this report. I think we try to be as fair as possible.

Okay, are there any further comments or ideas with respect to the resilience analysis? I think that's an old hand, right? Please do take it down if it's an old hand. Since there doesn't seem to be any opposition to engaging in this activity, I think it would now be the time for us to allocate the task. And, maybe the group can come up with suggestions as to where to take up that piece of work.

Kavouss Arasteh: Thomas, it is a new hand. It is not old hand.

Thomas Rickert: Okay. Then, go ahead Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yeah. Those people who mention that the sole membership could decivilize the operation of ICANN, I don't know who they are -- if the ICANN board is different. Perhaps some people misunderstood the situation or some people are totally against empowering community to exercise accountability. If we want to exercise accountability, we have three models. One of the models are (unintelligible) that is not possible to exercise two of the powers -- (unintelligible). The other was membership, which (unintelligible) would be membership.

Then, in order to act collectively for some things requires collective approach, such as the call of the board members, they have to have some sort of agreement among themselves, which called unincorporated association, which was (unintelligible). That has left us only one - the sole membership. So, (unintelligible) who are saying that this may destabilize ICANN; they are considered to be against any type of any sort of accountability? That is another issue. But, I don't think that we could think that sole membership is - could result in any disability. Sole membership is the only way that you can exercise all six or seven powers by the community.

So, I don't think we should take it as destabilizing. We just take it as a comment that people behind that don't like any accountability. That's all, and nothing else. That is as clear as possible. That is the best understanding I could put based on my experience.

Secondly, you said that you did something based on the US requirements or US government requirements. Supposed that (unintelligible) tomorrow decides that tomorrow they don't want (unintelligible) or they want to exclude

(unintelligible), do you reply to that saying that yes you want to meet that? That question should (unintelligible). I think the issue that the transition should not result that any government or any group of government or any (unintelligible) should control the (unintelligible). But, marginalizing one of the community we don't agree, even if it is a requirement of a particular country. And I don't think that (unintelligible) or anyone in the group should put an emphasis that this is a requirement. The requirement is not reasonable. It is not justified. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Kavouss. Now, you mentioned a couple of points. I just want to respond to them very briefly. If the US government established new requirements which they make condition for the transition to take place, it would certainly be our duty to react to that and bring it in front of this very group to discuss. That's one thing.

Whether it is good enough for us to not document further because we think that our proposal is convincing, I'm not too sure. I think that what we've done is a great piece of work. But at the same time, I think that it is a piece of work that deserves being explained as good as we can. I think I'm not the only one who has discussed this with third party on public or private occasion. And, those addressees -- if you wish -- did not necessarily understand how the interplay between the IRP -- the community power, the single membership model -- would be. So, all the facts might be clear for us and we might have an appropriate answer to what happens if the board takes a decision that is vetoed by the community and which was based on (unintelligible) or just to name three components that could be part of that interaction. So, that might be clear to us but might not be obvious to third party.

While I remain to be confident that our system is well thought out, I think it would be a worthwhile exercise being a little bit more forthcoming and

thinking through and writing down, and maybe even visualizing, some of the scenarios to evidence that what we have thought of is robust and resilient enough not to destabilize ICANN.

But I take your concern, Kavouss, seriously. So, I would encourage others sharing Kavouss's concern, to make themselves heard. So, if the vast majority of this group was of the opinion that this is a moot exercise, I would be glad to try to dump more work on you. But, this was discussed with co-chairs in preparation for this meeting as well as (unintelligible), and was deemed to be a valuable exercise to make our proposal even more promising in terms of success.

Unless there is more opposition, I think we should try to move on with this. And, maybe I can ask whether there are any volunteers that would be interested in joining this effort?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thomas, Cheryl -- just to be clear. This will be running under the existing Stress Test Working Party. So, any volunteers may join the Stress Test Working Party. The Stress Test Working Party is (unintelligible) from the original work area (unintelligible) for original mandate. So, feel free to volunteer. If you're already a member of the Stress Test Working Party you are, by default we assume, likely to be involved.

Thomas Rickert: So, thanks very much Cheryl for that clarification. So now that your group has volunteered, you've taken on the trouble of what I'm telling you, which would certainly rightfully perceived as (unintelligible) to embark on that piece of work. Thanks so much for indicating your willingness to do that. So, please to reach out to Cheryl if you do want to join this exercise. I think the next step -- maybe between this and next week -- to come up with a couple of questions that would prioritize in working on in response to this task.

So, I think with that we can end this agenda item. Thanks very much to everyone for this interesting discussion. I think we can then move back to agenda item Number 3. Luckily, Leon has been able to join us in the meantime. So, over to you Leon.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Thomas. Hello everyone, and apologies for joining in late, but we're back on track. And now, we're going to agenda item Number 3. We are going to give you a couple of updates on the Human Rights Work Party. The last call we agreed that (Nigel) had happily accepted and of course - that he had accepted to draft initial high level wording to be included in the bylaws with regards to human rights. And, I believe that we haven't got an initial wording at this stage. But, we are continuing the discussions I think in the list.

So, I have a proposed agenda for the Human Rights subgroup that hasn't been circulated before. So, this is the first time that everyone has a look at this document. This is of course just a suggestion and we can adjust as needed. And, according to the different views and needs from the subgroup working on Human Rights.

The proposed agenda that I tried to get approval of the subgroup to take forward is on the week of August 17 -- that is this week -- we should be able to finalize the initial high level wording by (Nigel). This would put us in a position to begin discussing this high level wording and then to have a couple calls later in the further weeks. The week of August 24, we would be having our first call to discuss this initial high level wording provided by (Nigel). And then, we would continue the discussion on the week of August 31, hoping to finalize our discussions by September the 7th, in which case we would have hopefully the last version of our high level wording on Human

Rights. And then, we would be able to circulate this to the CCWG, hoping that the CCWG would be able to review and hopefully approve this high level wording on our call of the week of September 14. This would of course, keep us on track to include whatever wording is agreed in the draft of the bylaws that would be put forward when we finalize our second public comment period.

So, (unintelligible) as I said a proposed agenda -- an initial proposed agenda. We can adjust as necessary. Maybe we will be needing to hold two calls per week or maybe we will be needing to hopefully make it shorter and we will be able to finalize this in the stand of maybe two calls. And then, maybe keep things moving forward. So this is, as I said, the initial proposal. And, I see a couple of hands up already. I see Greg Shatan and (David McCully). So Greg could you please...

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Greg Shatan for the record. I'm not entirely clear what you mean when you say the high level wording, but at the very end it seemed like you said that the high level wording you're referring to is merely the bylaws amendment itself. If that's the case, then it's my opinion at least that this agenda only sets out half the task at best, that this working group or subgroup needs to attend to in order to meet the work that's in front of it.

If, when you're talking about high level wording, you're talking about a high level discussion and explanation of what particular bylaws amendment would mean, then I think you've covered the work that we need to do. But, if you're only talking about throwing 10 or 20 words together that are going to go into the bylaws but not talking about creating any type of explanatory material or discussion or rationale or grounding or foundation or framework for what these words mean -- how they're going to be interpreted, what they're - where this is going -- then, I think the agenda is incomplete. And, I think the work of

the group would be incomplete. And, I don't think there would be any basis for the group to be able to accept or reject any bylaws language because its interpretation would be entirely open to some later judgement.

The bylaws are not a place to put Post-It notes. There needs to be an understanding. It does not have to be encyclopedic or exhaustive. It can be -- as you say -- high level. But, it needs to exist. It can't just be a decision on a bylaws amendment without any discussion. We've put exhaustive work into discussing and stress testing so many other pieces of our work. This is at least as important as any of the other work we've done and it deserves the same treatment. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Greg. You are right. I didn't mean to set apart or put aside all the reasoning and the rationale for us to come up to this high level wording. Of course this should be part of the work that the subgroup would be covering. I mean, the final objective is to have both parts of the puzzle together. And yes, this agenda would include that discussion and drafting that rationale and whole analysis made by the subgroup so that the CCWG as a whole can in fact evaluate and then hopefully approve what we have come up to the subgroup with regards to Human Rights. So yes, it will definitely need to include this kind of discussion and of course documentation for review and approval by the CCWG. I hope that clears the point and answers your question, Greg.

Next on the queue I have Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: ...comment to the group (unintelligible). I normally would not say anyone is (unintelligible). This is not up to me to judge. I have some difficulty with (unintelligible). On one hand I agree with the high level (unintelligible). On the other hand he wants to add (unintelligible). Where we have to put that



(unintelligible)? ICANN bylaws is not the place for any (unintelligible) invented as bylaws (unintelligible) constitution or convention or charter or whatever you call it. I don't think that we can put any (unintelligible) notes. (Unintelligible) notes that directly refer to (unintelligible) is going to (unintelligible). And we know that the (unintelligible), not (unintelligible) but many.

If you go to any of those (unintelligible), you may be hostage to many, many difficulties that you cannot (unintelligible). I have no problem aiding the discussions (unintelligible). We have all of these things. But in the bylaws we should remain (unintelligible), we should remain very general, and we should not go to the detail. Therefore, in that case, there is some sort of (unintelligible). Thank you.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much, Kavouss. I think that Greg has already cleared that he didn't mean to put any explanatory notes into the bylaws. But that's a product of the work that we will be doing in the subgroup. So, we should be able to build a document that not only entails the high level wording that we would be in fact including into the bylaws -- which as you said must be a high level general declaration, etc. But, it would also be accompanied by an explanatory note in the document, but not to get into the bylaws. I don't know if that clears up your concern. I think we all agree that we don't need to add a lot of wording into the bylaws, but rather just a high level declaration and general statement on taking care of Human Rights.

Next in the queue I have (Neal Sinover).

Niels ten Oever: Hello. This is (Neal Sinover) for the record. I think Greg's proposal might not be a bad idea. But, this might not need to be able... as an elaborate exercise which can then further be discussed how they will be implemented in work

stream two. I would say that for work stream one, where we need to find high level language, we do not need a very elaborate research on what it means because there's already a very broad understanding over the 50 years that we've been working on Human Rights.

So, it would be great that we need some explanatory text. I don't think it needs to be a very elaborate research or stress test because there are already proper standards and work being done across community working parties...

Leon Sanchez: You're breaking up Niels.

Niels ten Oever: ...to see how...

Leon Sanchez: Niels, I'm sorry but your last words broke very badly. So, we -- or at least I wasn't able to finish listening to you. Could you please repeat the last sentence that you said?

Niels ten Oever: Sorry. The last sentence was that since we have 50 years of experience with Human Rights, we do not need to have a very elaborate exercise to see how we could - how it would work that might believe to work streams - to the cross community working party to specifically design. We could simply refer to practices as they are being laid out in the (unintelligible).

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Niels. I think this is exactly the kind of discussion that we need to hold in the subgroup. So, of course this point is going to be taken into account. I definitely encourage you to join the calls of the subgroup because yes, we are in front of a task that does need a lot of work ahead. But still, we need to discuss widely how we're going to take care of it.

Next on the queue I have Tijani. Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you very much Leon, Tijani speaking. Do you...Leon do you...

Leon Sanchez: Yes, we do listen to you Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay, thank you very much. So, I agree with Greg. I don't think Greg is asking for (unintelligible) of how it will be done, but only to - we need to discuss to understand, to have a common ground about what kind of Human Rights can match with the mission of ICANN. This is the point where we haven't common ground before and (unintelligible) before we write anything in the bylaws we need to have this understanding -- this common understanding. And, this is what Greg was asking for -- I think. Thank you very much.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Tijani. Okay so, I see no other hands raised at this point. So, I will circulate the proposed agenda with the amendments and adjustments proposed by Greg, which I agree with them. And of course, if the subgroup approves this agenda, then we'll continue our work and hopefully reach to a happy ending in this issue.

So, having no more comments or requests with regards to the Human Rights subgroup, I will turn back to Thomas for the next agenda item.

Thomas Rickert: Sorry. I had to unmute myself. Can I be heard?

Leon Sanchez: Yes, we do listen to you Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Okay. So now my Adobe Room has conveniently crashed. I think the last open item is actually the AOB. And, do we have any AOB to discuss?

Leon Sanchez: I might just mention, Thomas, on any other business.

Thomas Rickert: Yes.

Leon Sanchez: That there were some comments on the bylaw matrix that I sent to the group. I already replied to some comments. And as some have noted, there are in fact some inaccuracies along the matrix. These inaccuracies will need to be taken care of. I will make sure that the CWG co-chairs and legal counsel, which I believe are still - are also on this call -- are aware of these inaccuracies so they can be fixed. And, let's remember that this matrix is the working document for the CWG. We will be, of course, having our own matrix when the time comes. And, it's just to give us an idea of what the CWG is up to in their task of drafting bylaws. But this should of course be in line with our proposal too.

Thank you for raising the different concerns on inaccuracies that have been spotted. And, we will be working on fixing those inaccuracies so we can have the CWG's bylaw matrix adjusted as needed. Thank you.

Holly Gregory: Leon, if I may. This is Holly Gregory. I can't raise my hand because I'm only on the phone. We'd appreciate it greatly, if you're seeing inaccuracies that you send them to us as soon as possible -- preferably in one collected email.

Leon Sanchez: Excellent Holly. We will do that.

Holly Gregory: Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Leon, and Kavouss, I guess that's a new hand?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, a new hand. Two things -- first with respect to the matrix that Leon mentioned. Thank you very much for the preparation of that. During the

discussion, there was one point raised by Jordan saying that the appearance of the term (unintelligible) is not correct and it was (unintelligible) rejection of veto. But, I would like to draw your attention -- attention of everybody -- to Section 4, Number 300, that in one area you use the word approve (unintelligible) to the fundamental bylaw instead of rejection and veto. Whether it has been done purposely or not, I don't know. But, just to draw your attention that the word approve is (unintelligible).

This was not the reason I asked the question (unintelligible). I am asking that in addition to the problem in the table that I have raised before in the call and I talked to Thomas personally, and he promised that he would take action. There are many, many inconsistencies in various parts of the proposal. I tried to link them -- one after the other -- in consistencies. The reason is that the section has been written by different people. When they put them together, they are not consistent. They are not consistent in many cases.

I'll give you one example. One time we talk about empowering community and we have five areas. In some parts of the document we have six areas. In some parts of the document we have seven areas. So, the people that don't know whether there are seven areas, five areas, or six areas. It should be consistent. In some of the areas we have combined some of the powers, such as budget and (unintelligible). In some other area, we have not done that (unintelligible) bylaw. We should not save the modification or changes to the standard bylaw and changes to the (unintelligible) bylaw.

So, in some area we the group them and in some area we do not group them. So, these are the things that are really confusing and misleading the reader. So if Thomas is taking this also, that some - two or three people look at the entire report to see the inconsistencies listed in various parts (unintelligible) definition, it would be very, very helpful. There are more than 10 to 12 areas.

I don't know how (unintelligible). For me, it takes a lot of time to prepare a table of all of these inconsistencies. But, I can give some examples.

But, I just wanted to ask you, Thomas, before the meeting you said that you have raised it. But you raised the table. You correct the table, yes. The table should compare the initial bylaw and initial core value with what we proposed. But other inconsistencies, how you are going to work to improve that, how you are going to revise that -- because that is - people are asking questions. That is something of any other business I want to know what you intend to do.

And then, when you said you want to correct the table -- when is it available to the public? Because the public may totally be confused with the current table. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Kavouss. And just to be fully transparent to everyone, there has been an email communication and a face-to-face discussion between myself and Kavouss. Kavouss had mentioned a few areas where he thought there were inconsistencies. I had promised that we would go through the report again, specifically looking at the areas that he mentioned. I guess this is not a group exercise because it would be too cumbersome for everyone to go through individual points. We've seen one point that was previously discussed where Kavouss mentioned the work approval might be wrong in the context of fundamental bylaws and actually there's a correct term to be used in that sense because the fundamental bylaws do need to be approved by the community mechanism.

So, I was asking for -- and I do encourage the whole group -- that if you spot inconsistencies in the report, please do send them to us. We will validate and rectify if need be. In terms of timing, we had prioritized the work on the Public Comment Review Tool. But after that is published, we will do another

run through the report and try to spot potential inconsistencies and we will pick up the points mentioned by Kavouss, as we would other points mentioned by other individuals in this group.

So, thanks for raising that. I don't see any further hands raised, which allows us to move to the last agenda item. This is actually a quite quick call, but I know that some teams do have more calls to make. So, the group is not particularly idling, but everybody has more work to be done between today and the end of the Public Comment Period, which certainly is going to be a very busy time for the whole group.

So thanks everyone for what I think was a very fruitful discussion. Let's take away two or three messages that we are going to publish in the Public Comment Review Tool in about 24 hours. Please do spread the news about that. We will hear more from the Human Rights Working Party, particularly (unintelligible) so that everybody is clear that we need delivery of the work product by roughly mid-September so that we can adequately make sure that it makes its way into the final report.

We will start the work on the resilience analysis. If you do have scenarios that you would like the group to look at, please do send them in and join the stress test working party that is going to take on that job. With that, I think we can end this call. Thanks everyone and have a great day. Talk to you next time. Bye, bye.

Woman 1: Thanks everyone, bye.

END