

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer  
October 7, 2015  
3:00 pm CT**

Becky Burr: Hello everyone.

Greg Shatan: Hello.

Becky Burr: Hello. Greg. I've heard your dulcet tones so frequently.

Greg Shatan: It's getting to be a habit.

Becky Burr: Getting to be a habit.

Carlos Raul Gutiérrez: Hello, this is Carlos. I'm on the bridge.

Becky Burr: Who is that that's on the bridge?

Carlos Raul Gutiérrez: Carlos Gutiérrez, Becky. Hello. I don't have Adobe. I'm driving.  
Thank you.

Becky Burr: Okay, so just interrupt me if you need to get in the queue.

Carlos Raul Gutiérrez: Thank you.

Becky Burr: All right, we have 11 people on the line. I think that we should go ahead and get started. What I wanted to do today is run through the issues that we identified in our last two calls for briefing. We had some volunteers to work on these issues, the briefing issues, with regard to the principles.

We also talked on our last call about issues related to the - the IRP. And I think that there was a consensus that we were quite close on the IRP and that, you know, we should really be focusing on the issues that were perhaps required more thinking about what the issues were, what the areas of convergence and disagreement were and what options were which largely focused on principles.

I probably forgot to say the call - we could start the recording, although hopefully that's being done since there's a big red sign there that says the call is being recorded.

So and then what I'd like to do is Bernie provided us with a template that's being used in Work Party 1 for the briefings analysis that I think is very useful. I circulated it to everybody but I thought we might just go through that.

And what I'm hoping is that we can get drafts of the analyses that we agree should be in the briefing for Dublin over the weekend and that on Monday the 12th at the call scheduled for 1200 UTC we could go ahead and review those and finalize the analysis comments. So that's the proposed agenda for today. Hopefully it won't take the whole two hours since we all have substantive work to go back to doing.

Kavouss, I see you - oh - are you asking a question, Kavouss?

Kavouss Arasteh: Do you hear me?

Becky Burr: Yes I hear you, Kavouss. Yes, please go ahead.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yeah, yes there has been some misunderstanding since many many times that some board member mentioned or referred to IRP as a dispute resolution. There are two different things. So we are not (unintelligible) in CCWG against or in favor of the current dispute resolution. The IRP is entirely different thing, is empowering the community with some binding and is different.

And I wish that all distinguish member in particular, you know, Bruce, be so kind and do not - or does not kindly mix up the existing dispute resolution with the IRP that we are referring to. That is something I wanted to make (unintelligible) will not be directly referred to what you're talking now. But it is relate to Work Party 2 and I want to make it quite clear. Thank you.

Becky Burr: Thank you, Kavouss. Okay in terms of the issues for briefing for discussion in Dublin with respect to the mission, commitment and core values, there were quite a few comments on the statement and the mission statement that ICANN essentially is an organization of enumerated powers and that it would not use its authority to regulate services that use the Internet's unique identifiers or the content that those services deliver.

There was strong pushback from the community both in the first and the second comment period regarding the need for ICANN to have the authority and responsibility to be able to enforce voluntary contractual commitments that were provided, for example, in TLD applications such as PIC specifications, or eligibility requirements that were part of the application.

And second, that the prohibition on regulation, that's something that was within the scope of consensus policy was fair game for ICANN to enforce and would not run afoul of the prohibition on regulation.

We noted that the language in the second draft report, of course, is not proposed to be actual bylaws language that was intended to inform the process of legal drafting of bylaws language. And so the discussion that we had was that we would get a write up on - essentially as an aid to the final bylaws drafters clarifying the sort of - analyzing the comments that came in on this and clarifying the voluntary commitments and consensus policy that voluntary commitments and consensus policy would not run afoul of the prohibition on regulation. And I think that Greg and David were volun-told on this item so that's where we left it.

The other issue that came up in the comments and that I think require some clarification was moving language in and out of the core values regarding consumer trust and choice. There are two sides of this issue. One, the language was inadvertently dropped from current bylaws and we need to put that back in. And two, the issue of the language surrounding the, you know, consumer protections and IP rights and sovereignty protections in the AOC review commitments process. And I agreed to write up that draft analysis.

Can we go to the next slide? I don't seem to be able to scroll. Okay, guys, thanks. The third area in which I think that there was quite a lot of comment from the community was on private sector, retaining the language of private sector leadership and the comments came in two forms.

First of all, the ALAC and others noted that we had, you know, expanded the definition of private sector to make sure that it included academics, you know,

the technical community, civil society and so the notion was that end users should be in that group. And I think that there was a fair degree of comfort with that approach.

On the other hand, we also had certain GAC commenters pushing back on retaining the notion, the language, the private sector leadership language, on - based on the argument that that language was, you know, written in 1999 and was not an accurate reflection of the current situation.

I think that this is an area in which we will probably need to have a briefing paper that describes basically those two views of the world and leave that for discussion in Dublin. I did not sense that we would reach closure on that issue within Work Party 2. And I know that Kavouss and David did work hard on several different varieties of the language over the weekend and we do have a compilation of those.

But I don't know if David McAuley is on the line.

David McAuley: Yes I am, Becky.

Becky Burr: Great. But I think that that's what we're going to need to write up. And I'm hoping I can ask you working with Kavouss, to prepare that brief description of the issue.

David McAuley: I think - I can't speak for Kavouss but I believe he would be. I certainly would be. And you correctly described - Kavouss and I tried over the weekend. We went through four different variations. We didn't reach agreement. And I had started us off on the path of let's see if we can't come up with language that would actually fit here as opposed to ideas. And that may have been the wrong path to go down.

But I thank Kavouss for his efforts. And you correctly described it. I would be happy to take the pen on the issue paper and work with Kavouss on getting something ready for Dublin.

Becky Burr: Great. Thank you very much, I appreciate that. We also had quite a lot of discussion about the language relating to global public interest. I think that this was sparked in part by a discussion in Los Angeles where members of the board asserted a kind of free standing obligation to serve the global public interest. Some responsive comment on the part of the CCWG that we had really tried very hard to cabin that concept to ensure that that - that the global public interest was identified through the bottom up multistakeholder process.

I posited the notion that the intention was to say that, you know, in developing policy that that, you know, that the output of the policy development process as a bottom up process, should endeavor to identify the global public interest and the policy should reflect that so that there wasn't really a - an independent identify the global public interest.

Now Alan disagreed with me a bit on that. And so - that was an area on which I thought we needed to provide a write up. And according to my notes Alan was going to work - was going to take the pen and consult with Kavouss on this. Alan's not on the call but...

Alan Greenberg: Alan is on the call for at least a while.

Becky Burr: Great.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: But I won't be able to speak most of the time.

Becky Burr: Okay. Well if I have like, you know, mischaracterized our conversation please speak up to that. But I guess the question is are you still willing to try to write up the issue statement on this? And I'm happy to work with you on it as well.

Alan Greenberg: I just got on. I don't know which statement you're talking about.

Becky Burr: This was the discussion we had about global public interest as that is described in the mission, commitments and core values. And how that plays out in a sort of a - in that context.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I'm not sure I remember but, yes, I am willing to and I'll contact you separately after the call.

Becky Burr: Okay great. And then the final area where we got quite a lot of comments, you will recall that in our first iteration we essentially limited ICANN's obligation to engage in consultation with the intent of finding a mutually acceptable response to GAC advice to advice that was within ICANN's mission, statement and consistent with its commitments and core values.

This was strongly opposed by individual GAC participants and in general caused discomfort with the GAC in general. So it wasn't merely a subset of GAC members but it was broader concern about that provision.

We spent a lot of time talking about this and we arrived at a compromise solution that essentially left the obligation of the board to consult with the GAC over advice with the objective of finding a mutually acceptable solution intact. And unimpaired or unlimited but elsewhere clarified that the ICANN board was obligated to the extent it accepted and implemented GAC advice it

had to do that in a manner that is consistent with its bylaws. Which I think we all agreed was the case anyway. And we said in general that advisory committees were requested to explain their advice.

There was a lot of pushback from public commenters on the compromise that we arrived at. I didn't hear anybody in our discussion reconsidering the compromise but I think we do have to do a better job of explaining it to the community so I was going to take on the commentary - the analysis explaining that.

So those are the issues that I've identified, the big issues that I've identified with respect to the mission, commitments and core values or the principles section of the report that I think we've agreed would be briefed going into Dublin.

At this point if there are any other issues coming out of the comments on the mission and commitments and core values I would love to hear about them now. David.

David McAuley: Thank you, Becky. David McAuley here. I don't have any issues, I just have a question. And the question is logistics. The issue paper that we're going to do up, is that something for us to have ready for Dublin or is it something that we're going to discuss on our call on the 12th?

Becky Burr: I'm hoping that we will be able to discuss it on the call on the 12th. You'll see when we get to the template that this is not intended to be a dissertation but a brief plain English kind of description of the, you know, the views on either side areas of agreement, areas of disagreement and possible ways forward.

David McAuley: Thank you.

Becky Burr: So it's not - it's not - it is not a - your doctoral dissertation.

David McAuley: Thank you.

Becky Burr: So hopefully we would have it able to read over the weekend, discuss on Monday and finalize in advance of going into Dublin.

David McAuley: Okay doke. So I'll - to read over the weekend I frankly would think that - I'll try and have this together with Kavouss finished by Saturday so that we could read it on Sunday perhaps.

Becky Burr: Sounds like a deal to me. I take a liberal interpretation of the weekend.

David McAuley: Thank you.

Becky Burr: Okay. Could we go to the next slide please? Maybe I have the ability to switch. There I go, I have the ability to switch it. Okay with respect to the issues that we discussed on our call on Monday that were independent review process I looked over the comments on the request for reconsideration and I added in where I think that there are some overlap but generally there were not areas of large contention with respect to the request for reconsidering - for reconsideration.

So one issue that we talked about was sort of funding, costs, accessibility and independence. This came up in a variety of contexts but in particular we noted the board's suggestion that it - that ICANN would fund the sort of community based dispute resolution or enforcement what they were calling MEM, what I will call sort of community-based enforcement of the community powers

and/or a community-based complaint that ICANN was acting in a manner that was - that violated its bylaws.

But that - the sort of traditional commercially-based disputes should continue to be funded by the parties to that dispute subject to allocation of fees by the panel in the manner that currently applies.

We haven't tested this concept widely. But on Monday when we discussed this I think that there was a fair degree of consensus within the group that that was an - that the board's approach was appropriate and was consistent with concerns about curbing abuse and the like. So I think that is an area where we have some - where we can clarify and have some convergence.

We also talked about issues related to scope, whether reconciliation of expert panel conclusions should be within or without. Whether, you know, the panel should have the ability to consider whether an action was fundamentally irrational or not. Whether a community - whether this process should - could be applied to determine whether the community acting - whether as a single member or as the MEM or as the whatever it is was being accountable.

All of those were issues that I think are worth being framed up. We did have at least one comment about the standard to be applied. We did have a variety of comments about standing. And, you know, the materially harmed...

Bernard Turcotte: Becky.

Becky Burr: Yes.

Bernard Turcotte: Just to point to Bruce's comment - previous point in the chat about costing and I think is relevant.

Becky Burr: Yeah, you're going to have to translate. We were a 1b on this topic, not a 2 - into English. I think that's - that was - does that mean the board was expressing concern not a firm position? Read the comment a little earlier on this. Oh.

Chris Disspain: Becky, it's Chris. One Bs mean we agree - Becky?

Becky Burr: Yes.

Chris Disspain: It's Chris. One Bs we mean agree in principle but we might have some horse trading to do on the detail.

Becky Burr: Okay. Well I think that's where we were. And I know that you were on the call briefly on Monday. But I think that actually was quite a lot of sympathy for the notion that leaving the cost allocation model as it is for ordinary commercial disputes might be a useful tool in the abuse of process basket. So I don't think that we're particularly far apart on this.

There were some other standing issues and then questions about requiring participation in the PDP for standing and a lot of other things. And the need for prompt action to establish the CCWG work subgroup to work on details here.

To this list I should have added the sort of question about whether there should be separate panels for sort of enforcement of community powers versus bylaws violations, which was something - was a question that was raised by the board. And I think that, you know, that that really is a question and there is some openness to discussing that.

We also when we got to the end of our conversation on Monday about the IRP we noted that the issues - that the issues here are really not - we're not so far apart. They're not enormous issues. They are kind of particularly relate to details. And in particular go to the need to get going on the detailed work and establish the subgroup rather than spending a lot of cycles in advance of Dublin writing up issue briefs on these. I think that was Alan's comment. And I think that makes sense.

So what I propose to do is I will write up the sort of more general using the analysis that Bernie put together, which is quite detailed, a single issue brief for the IRP and the request for reconsideration. But that the work - that our work, our hard work should really focus on the principles or mission, commitment and core values issues where there's still hard work to be done.

So that's the way I propose to allocate the writing between now and Monday. Kavouss, do you have a question?

Kavouss Arasteh: I have a question. I don't know whether it is a good time to raise it. I just put it in the chat and I leave to you to raise it. There was some discussion that the number of the panelists should be modest changed according to the degree of importance and sensitivity and delicacy of the case of either three or five or so. And I wish that at some time if you kindly comment on that. I don't want to interrupt your discussion, disturb you, but please take that into account and try to reply that as appropriate. Thank you.

Becky Burr: Thank you, Kavouss. I do think that the notion that - or the discussion that we had was certainly that the panels would never be smaller than three members and that there would be the ability to appeal a decision to the full panel. I believe you're correct, there was a comment that as between three and seven there be some flexibility. To me that sounds like something that would be

worked out as part of the operation details for this. So I don't think that anything we have done would preclude, you know, an outcome where a panel of five was permitted under specific circumstances. But I think that is kind of yet to be determined.

I mean, I really think that the bottom line on the independent review is that the community senses it's time to roll up our sleeves and dig in on the details. We have broad consensus on the need for reforming this process. We have broad consensus on the need for it to be more accessible and cost efficient. We have broad consensus on the need for it to be binding. Now let's get to work and roll up our sleeves. So to me the biggest thing that we should be resolving in Dublin is how we proceed - how we propose to do that work. Other comments on this particular issue?

And again, accountability of the panelists, Kavouss, that really goes to the issue of, one - on the one hand - qualifications and independence, two and on the availability of a recall or impeachment mechanism that is something that is provided for in the - is generally provided for in the second draft proposal. It's also something that the board mentioned as something that was necessary. So indeed that would be part of the - of the detailed work would be considering that.

Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Becky. Greg Shatan for the record. Two things. First, I just wanted to support your recent statement about the rolling up our sleeves approach to what we need to do on the IRP, which seems to be the least controversial and possibly one of the better scoped and expressed sections of our report.

I was - I just want to bring up something that was said at the very beginning by Kavouss that this is not related to the existing IRP and that somehow the existing IRP system we have is remaining in place and untouched. That's really not my understanding of what we're doing here. I thought we were reforming the IRP and replacing it with this IRP. So if that could be clarified that would be helpful. Thanks.

Becky Burr: Well I understood Kavouss' comment and we can - I certainly defer to Kavouss to clarify. But that, you know, we are really talking about reforming the independent review process, enhancing the independent review process that we have now, broadening it to address - to provide the community an avenue to resolve differences with the board whether - and that, you know, sort of whether you call it a MEM or a - whether you call it binding arbitration in response to a MEM or a community IRP is just, you know, it's just labels as opposed to a really big substantive difference.

Is that, you know, Kavouss, if you have anything to add about your comment just to make sure that I've understood it correctly. Okay I think we're in agreement on that. Kavouss, your hand is up. We can't hear you, Kavouss. Let's go to David and we'll come back to Kavouss.

David McAuley: Thanks, Becky. David McAuley here. I guess I confess to a little bit of confusion. I thought that in what the board proposed the binding arbitration, the MEM binding arbitration, was separate from and alongside IRP. And I thought the board actually saw two bodies existing; they would roll IRP as it currently exists back to a pre-April 2013 standard. And they actually in their proposal set out that standard.

But then separately for community powers or for fundamental bylaws or whatever - I forget right now - there would be a community availability of a binding arbitration that was completely separate from that.

Becky Burr: Right.

David McAuley: so...

Becky Burr: That's my understanding as well.

David McAuley: Okay.

Becky Burr: And I think that is the, you know, that's one of the issues about whether it is necessary and appropriate to have two separate panels to do those two things is an area for discussion.

David McAuley: Okay then I missed - I just didn't hear you correctly. Okay doke, thank you.

Becky Burr: Chris.

Chris Disspain: Yeah, hi Becky. Hi, David. I hope you can hear me okay. Just to slightly expand on what you just said, Becky, I agree with you and I also agree you said a little earlier about this just labels really. I don't think that - I think the board - in the board's comments our thinking was along the lines of it would be - it might require - a community IRP panel might require a different skill set then the commercial IRP panel.

And for that reason we sought (unintelligible) might be helpful to make that distinction because our comments - as our comments say we felt that ICANN would take the costs of what you would put under the heading of the

community IRP or MEM or whatever you want to call it and not the commercial ones.

So those were really the reasons for doing it. I don't think there's anything in principle reason why it needs to be done that way. And if the general feeling is it all lumps together into one system with all of the checks and balances in place (unintelligible) the right panelists and be that the costs headed in the right direction (unintelligible) the IRP status then I think that's (unintelligible) - I hope that's helpful.

Becky Burr: Yes, that's helpful. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Becky it's Alan. Could I get in for a moment?

Becky Burr: Yes, sir.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, one of the things that I never quite determined, because the board's document said two different things in different places, was is the MEM or what they were proposing as the MEM, just for fundamental bylaws or for all bylaws?

Becky Burr: So we had a long conversation about that (unintelligible) - somebody needs to go on mute. And I believe that he - his assumption had been that we were talking about the MEM or the community IRP for enforcement of the community powers. And that he had not anticipated that there would be a community IRP based on concerns that the board was acting in a way or staff in a way that violated the bylaws.

The sense of the WP 2 on Monday was that we had certainly intended that. Again I don't think that Chris expressed a view one way or another as whether

that was problematic for him or for the board but that is something that would be in the discussion.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you. Because my recollection (unintelligible) now that that's one of the things that I said when I mentioned the ICANN (Cert) as an example of the community wanting to take action even though our powers were not affected.

Becky Burr: Right and I think...

Alan Greenberg: And I'll go on mute again.

((Crosstalk))

Becky Burr: And I think that that's exactly - the intention of the CCWG all along has been that the community - that the community could invoke this process not simply to enforce its powers but also in response to concerns about bylaws violation.

And Robin does raise a point in the chat about the violations of standard bylaws versus fundamental bylaws. I think that's another difference. It's not clear to me, and I'm - and Chris has got his hand up so after we hear from Kavouss we'll go to Chris and he can explain this. Kavouss, are you able to talk now?

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, I think in LA we have discussed that several times. And perhaps it may be result of some (unintelligible) or forgotten by the board that they always refer to fundamental bylaws. We are concerned about not only fundamental bylaw but standard bylaw, article of incorporation therefore that should be understood that we do not agree that this issue be limited only to fundamental bylaw. It should be clear in your report as such. Thank you.

Becky Burr: Yes and I agree that was the sentiment of the group on Monday. Chris.

Chris Disspain: Thanks, Becky. Again, just to I think agree with you and (unintelligible). Yes, Alan, you're right, that was the example you gave, the (Cert). I think where we got to - I think (unintelligible) on our last call. And I don't think any of this is problematic but obviously everyone will need to see it written down.

(Unintelligible) saying there are three different types of process whether you put them all in one bucket is a logistical matter, but you put your commercial IRP, you've got your sort of high level fundamental bylaw brief thingy and then you've got sandwiched in between that you've got a sort of - an ordinary IRP if you like but (unintelligible) between the - the reason for doing that is because of the cost issues. I think we came to that understanding, didn't we on the last call? Was that - is that right?

Becky Burr: That was - that the community...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: ...of the community (unintelligible).

Becky Burr: Yeah, we did come to that agreement on the last call. And I reported that consensus.

Chris Disspain: So if there's anything else that's not clear, I mean, obviously I'm not speaking for the board, I'm just giving you my personal view. But I think most of the board would probably follow that logic. So anything else that you're not clear about or anyone else is not clear about at this stage. If you want - if it's going to help the debate in this group or coming to drafting exercises in this group to

get any additional clarity on what the board's view is, if I can be of any help at all let me know...

Becky Burr: Well so perhaps I could enlist you...

((Crosstalk))

Becky Burr: ...to help me in the drafting process since I will be the drafter for this note? I've stunned him into silence.

Bruce Tonkin: Well, this is Bruce Tonkin. I'm happy to work with Chris on that as well. I think certainly the intent of the board is not to say that...

((Crosstalk))

Becky Burr: Okay great. Thank you. I'm just like so happy that I, you know, caused Chris to, you know, open mouth and gape in silence for a moment. I won't - I won't revel in that any longer. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Becky. I think you were helped by electronic gremlins in that case. That's what it takes. Just a more general comment, and maybe - I think it applies to the IRP but maybe more broadly it's certainly important for us to understand what the board's comment was and to accurately, you know, deal with it accurately just as it's important for the board and other commenters and members of the community to understand our proposal accurately.

But in the end adopting or modifying any particular aspect of the board's proposal or our - or our proposal is to my mind at least entirely ala carte in terms of, you know, coming up with a particular end product. You know, more important to deal with concerns rather than mechanics in terms of trying

to resolve, you know, we definitely want to try to resolve concerns but whether we need to adopt - we're certainly not adopting the mechanics in whole cloth and we will, you know, continue to kind of look at each of the aspects of these and all the other proposals to see, you know, ultimately what works. Thanks.

Becky Burr: Agree completely, Greg. Okay, other comments on the IRP, RSR, MEM issues? Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: Yes, Becky, I apologize, perhaps you mentioned that but I'm not clear what is the new - the difference between the board MEM standing panel and the IRP? Are they two different things? They are the same things? They act differently? They act differently for different issues? And so on. It is not clear is it possible that if you have resolved the issue kindly once again explain it for us to be recorded in this meeting. Thank you.

Becky Burr: Thank you. I do not believe that we have resolved the issue. If I could turn to either Bruce - I'm not going to turn to Chris...

((Crosstalk))

Bruce Tonkin: Well I'm happy to comment. This is Bruce.

Becky Burr: Thanks.

Bruce Tonkin: Look, I think the way I look at it is we've got an IRP and we've got different types of complainants so we could have individual commercial complainants which is pretty much what we've had up to date. And then we're also envisaging that we might have community complainants. They could either be

a single supporting organization or a single advisory committee or it may be some grouping of supporting organizations or advisory committees.

So from the board's perspective we thought there might be some different rules that might apply to communities as complainants, which would probably be easier for them to lodge a dispute, let's say, then the rules that might apply to commercial complainants. And so that's why we separated them into two names, IRP and MEM, just to kind of distinguish the complainant type really. And then based on the complainant type there might be some different rules.

Now you don't have to do that, you could obviously just call the whole thing IRP. But the concept from the board is that you might want to tailor your rules for community complainants.

Becky Burr: Okay, thank you. And again tailoring rules I would say that typically a court would distinguish rules not by the nature of the complainant but by the nature of the complaint. So to the extent that the community has a - I mean, obviously there would be the need for some specific rules because of funding differences and the like and because of the need for some level of consensus within the community to bring such a complaint if they're bylaws-based.

The only question would be whether the nature of the complaint, if it's an enforcement of community powers is so different that the standing panel would not have the requisite skill set to deal with it. Again I, you know, this is something we have to discuss in Dublin and see whether it makes sense.

Bruce Tonkin: Yeah, I think that's a good point, Becky, is the difference between whether a standing panel might be different. Yeah, that's a possible distinction as well. So it's really just - you can obviously run all as one process but we just thought it might be more useful to focus on, as you noted, the nature of the

complaint being a complaint by the community about a community power. And we might craft the process a little differently which could include, as you mentioned, a standing panel with different skills. So that's just giving us the option.

Becky Burr: Right. If it's - if the skill set is sufficiently different that it's merited. I just will tell you my personal opinion is that having two standing panels doesn't make a lot of sense because the, you know, in the end the document - everything turns on the same document which is the bylaws.

Bruce Tonkin: I think my personal view on it is that a standing panel is going to have a cost and I'm hoping that it's extremely rare that we have a community-wide dispute therefore that particular standing panel wouldn't do much whereas if you have a single standing panel then they can be available to all disputes.

Becky Burr: Right. And I think that's right. Just it's an efficiency question. Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: No, thank you.

Becky Burr: Okay. All right, if we don't have any other comments on this could we put up the template that Grace sent around that Working Party 1 used for some of these issue write ups?

Okay as you'll see, and to assuage your concerns about whether your weekend is totally ruined, David, what we've got is a draft of the analysis that was put together by Working Party 1 on changes in fundamental bylaws. You'll see it's organized by areas of consensus, areas needing refinement, areas of divergence and options for CCWG consideration.

This is two pages and one paragraph. And that is essentially - I think that is essentially what we are looking for by way of comments. Something short, direct, to the point, you know, not an advocacy document as much as a sort of fair statement of the issues document.

So all of you should have a copy of that. And we're hoping that, you know, as I said, over the next couple of days people who have accepted writing assignments can put pen to paper so that we can have some time to read them and then discuss them on Monday before forwarding them to the group. And I think it would be very helpful if we could follow this template, this format.

Any questions about the format or any disagreements about the format? I mean, obviously it was not meant to be a - a strait jacket. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Been using this format in a couple of other pieces of work and also just got off another call discussing it. I think one enhancement or refinement to this that we've been doing is in the last section on options for CCWG consideration not merely restating the suggestions from the commenters but providing a little bit of context, a sentence or two of context, in each bullet point.

And more importantly, even if you choose not to do that, summarizing the view of the working party on that particular option and any recommendations for the full CCWG in dealing with that option which we set off by putting it in italics so it could be distinguished from the objective reporting that the rest of this document is supposed to be.

I think reason that that was adopted was that there was a lot of lively discussion in the working party about the comments and how we reacted to them and some, you know, I wouldn't - some, you know, in the end kind of a

coming to a common sense perhaps in most cases of how we might see the group dealing with it.

And so we didn't want to just leave that on the cutting room floor so to speak so instead we've been putting it in in the options for CCWG consideration after each bullet point. You know, so to create - which also I think will enhance and speed the work of the CCWG. Thanks.

Becky Burr: Okay that's good. Thank you, that's very helpful. Okay any other questions, comments, thoughts? Hearing none - David.

David McAuley: Becky, do you have or should we consider getting together in Dublin - in all of our free time? And the only reason I ask is I noticed that I think Brenda and Bernie have set aside a room on Saturday morning. I don't - should we...

Becky Burr: Yeah, so I believe that there are rooms available Saturday for breakouts and working groups. I definitely think that coming out of Friday we will have, you know, we will have assignments that are, you know, best tackled in, you know, smaller groups rather than the committee as a whole. So I am reluctantly eliminating all fantasies I might have had about site seeing or drinking Guinness on Saturday and leaving that time available.

I think, you know, I can look ahead and, you know, see if we want to just have, you know, a Work Party 2 time set aside, you know, early in the day just for us to regroup as the larger group and have that be something that people can count on and plan their day if they're brave enough to do around that.

Brenda - not Brenda, Bernie. I see your hand.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you. Can you hear me?

Becky Burr: I can.

Bernard Turcotte: Excellent. Just to note on making plans versus the schedule, the meeting staff is busily working at looking at providing the maximum amount of time to the CCWG during Dublin as per comments from (unintelligible) in a meeting yesterday that I believe is summed up by why aren't you focusing everything on getting this proposal out the door?

So the final schedule for availability meeting for the whole CCWG and rearranging other things will be published sometime Monday as I understand it. So making plans at this point may be leave some options - those changes which will be published Monday or reconsider those things after that has been published.

Becky Burr: Okay, thank you that's useful information. As I said, I've just abandoned Saturday. I expect somebody will find something for me to do.

Greg Shatan: You can come hang out with the GNSO.

Becky Burr: Okay well you can tell me whether that's going to be more fun.

Greg Shatan: No.

Becky Burr: Hello, Avri. You arrived just in time. We're wrapping up and you didn't get any assignments. But...

Avri Doria: Oh lucky, lucky me.

Becky Burr: Yeah, you know, we failed to note that you weren't here and therefore failed to make assignments appropriately.

Avri Doria: That's because I'm really so transparent and invisible when I'm around, I can understand that.

Becky Burr: Yeah, no it's because we were distracted. But don't worry, we'll never make that mistake again. Okay so there we go. I think that we are - I think that we've gotten our work plan down and we can march forward and conquer the world and find a way through. So thanks, everybody.

END