ICANN

Coordinator: Brenda Brewer
May 31, 2016
1:22 pm CT

Leon Sanchez: This is Leon Sanchez. Welcome to the CCWG and I have the ICANN's Accountability Meeting Number 94 on May 31, 2016.

I feel like I already missed all the people in this group because it feels to me like we haven't spoke to each other in ages. So it is good to be back. And we have a compact agenda for today and hopefully we will be able to carry it out short.

And well if you haven't filed your statement of interest by now we definitely encourage you to do so if you have any need for assistance (unintelligible) statement of interest feel free to approach anyone on staff. They would be happy to assist you filing your statement of interest.

We have been following the discussion on this exercise that we are building here on trying to figure out how we are going to set up the budget for Version 2. And I think that it is important to state that nothing is set in stone at this time.

And this call is precisely to listen and to gather the feedback from to the CCWG so we can better shape this budget for our next steps. And also one thing that is important to highlight is that no constraints are being set on the CCWG.

We just want to of course provide the means to achieve a rational use of the resources that we have in hand to carry out our work.

So I will let of course my coaches speak deeper into this subject later on the call. And with this I think I will hand over the call to Thomas so we can move forward (unintelligible) Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks so much Leon and hello everyone. This is Thomas speaking and this is sort of partially an opening remark but it also helps us segway into the budget discussion.

And we would like to start this discussion following up on what Leon has said by making reference to some of the thoughts that have been exchanged on the list.

And I am sure that we will disappoint those who think that dark evil forces are working against the CCWG. And if there are any dark forces then those are us, co-chairs and (unintelligible).

Because actually we have been working on a way forward, a suggestion for a way forward that we want to discuss with you. And so if there is anything that you don't like about the proposal that is going to be presented to you by Bernie in a minute or two.

Then blame us. Don't blame staff or don't blame the board. Don't blame anyone who you think might be responsible.

This is actually the works of some folks that are concerned about the future of the CCWG. And they are going to come up with a proposal that is sensitive to budget requirements. Obviously we need to exercise some budget control. We need to make sure we are accountable also in that regard.

And at the same time we want to make sure that we have a working method that is available that allows for the group to develop proposals that are required for all the important issues that we have in front of us for Workstream Number 2.

Now as (unintelligible) said and I think Jordan has also mentioned this also on the list. Nothing is cast in stone.

And so we are going to present to you what our ideas were and then we are going to discuss this and the need for changing what we have prepared since certainly we can try to get those (unintelligible) exceeding what we have suggested to get that done.

Also I would like to note that with respect to the proposal that there might be no transcript for the sub-team calls. We think and let me just offer a bit of rationale for why we suggested it the way you saw it on the slides.

There is a difference between let's say PDP working group and the work of the sub-teams. Let's stick to the example of let's say GNSO PDP working group.

Such group where today as far as I know, all the meetings are recorded and transcribed. Comes up itself with a recommendation, policy recommendations and it itself conducts a consensus call on these recommendations on first report and then on the final report.

And these recommendations are then passed over to in this case the GNSO Council and then ultimately the board.

So PDP working group leads to consensus recommendations. PDP working groups do (unintelligible) themselves. This is not what we see in the sub-teams here.

The sub-teams that we are setting up are there to work on suggestions that are being brought from time to time in front of the CCWG plenary. So all the pros and cons of the ideas that are developed and perhaps in the sub-teams will be brought to the post-CCWG and the CCWG call will remain to be recorded and transcribed.

So all the rationale for recommendations will be recorded and transcribed. Not each and every part of the discussion that is true. But there will be room for bringing out to the community all the concerns and all the support that might be for the suggestions made by the sub-teams.

And then if we are (unintelligible) sub-teams but the whole CCWG that will work on consensus recommendations. So this is just to shed some light on why we suggested things as we saw them on the slides.

That is not to discriminate the work of the sub-teams but it is actually to be conscious of resources while making it possible for the sub-teams to work

efficiently in supporting the CCWG to come up with its consensus recommendations for all Workstream 2 items.

I would now like to ask Bernie to show us through the slides. And we will open it up for discussion after Bernie has talked you through and guided you through the slides that you already saw on the list. Thanks so much and over to you Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Thanks you Thomas. I hope everyone can hear you.

Thomas Rickert: Yes we can.

Bernie Turcotte: All right this given Thomas has introduced the topic and said we will take questions after. This will be a quick walkthrough most of the slides have been out there a little bit.

So we asked people to mute if they are not talking. Someone is typing away.

ICANN requires such an estimates Fiscal year '17 by the end of May 2016. For the CCWG-Accountability and CWG's stewardship which will be approved by these groups.

So really the idea is that – is to develop something that is reasonable with the communities involved. The community at the SO & AC level worked with the ICANN board to develop something called the (TCSB). And the project (unintelligible) support team and the key word in there is support.

Really the idea is to have a team of people which I am leading just give support so you can generate these numbers in an intelligent fashion. We have been working with the leadership and the CCWG to try to get that.

And I think as Thomas has said, there is really no evil plot here. The idea is just that when you did Workstream 1 (unintelligible) it might be a bit more compact than it was.

And given the expenses and no one is blaming for anyone for any of the expenses. We did what needed to be done to get it done. And everyone is comfortable with that.

But the idea is going forward let's try and work together to see what we can identify as reasonable to get our work done. So that will be my introduction.

(Unintelligible) costs for Workstream 2 cannot be estimated at this point. They do not need to be included in the estimates. Really I think the idea there is that we have to get into the various Workstream 2 topics to start to understand that and, you know, there is obviously no point to do that.

I think the co-chairs have said they expect that there be some amount there available so that they are not running to the board every week with an estimate for something. But that will be worth it.

Budget for legal council has to be approved by the ICANN board when it comes to possible to properly estimate these. So when there are huge chunks of work for specific Workstream 2 topic and I am talking about legal expenses still. This should be developed properly and then submitted for approval to the board (unintelligible).

So let's move onto the next slide. We now have nine Workstream 2 topics for those who were paying attention. Our original proposal has seven and the lawyers when they were drafting the bylaws from our report noted that there

were two areas that we said in our report, the CCWG that there would be additional activities in Workstream 2.

And those are guidelines for standards of conduct presumed to be in good faith associated with exercising the rule of individual ICANN board directors. And the review of the (CET) which is engagement process which we include.

And of course we can't forget in here IRP Phase 2 which (Becky) is still leading. And I was very clear in the previous slide that Workstream 2 legal contracts have not been made but they have been completed for IRP Phase 2.

Moving right along. Core assumptions for Fiscal '17 budget estimates were CCWG-Accountability. There are a total of nine Workstream 2 projects plus IRP Phase 2.

The expectation is that the work of the CCWG-Accountability could be completed by the end of June 2017. So basically that is the fiscal year. We would try to wrap up all these projects by the end of June 2017. So basically 13 months from now.

The CCWG-Accountability would hold a one day face to face meeting prior to each ICANN meeting. The leadership has been very clear that given our work and how we perceived that this would be required for our work to continue.

There is already a subgroup defined for IRP Phase 2 which is slated to complete this work by March 2017 latest. And that may be accelerated depending on circumstances.

Continuing on the assumptions. Given the subgroup approach was validated by IRP Phase 2 and that this was discussed with the CCWG-Accountability in

Marakesh. It would be (unintelligible) to expect that the remaining nine Workstream 2 projects would be approaching similar fashion.

Concerning it would be difficult to consider significantly advancing all the projects only in plenary. And I think, you know, that is just the sensible way of approaching it.

There is no expectation that the nine we are seeing two projects and IRP Phase 2 will publish the results in any kind of synchronized fashion. So we are not linking them. They don't have to be all started in the same place. They don't have to publish for public comment at the same time. They are not synchronized.

However, it doesn't prevent any number of them from being synchronized if that makes sense for timing. Because we have to understand that if we are going to go for a public consultation to the community out there.

If we are bombarding them with a number of public consultations at the same time for different subjects and they are completely separate public consultations.

They may actually make the task of the community harder. So if it can work out we are not excluding the fact that such things could be joined.

Continuing on. If the subgroup approach is confirmed it is expected that the CCWG-Accountability would only meet in plenary every two weeks until February 2017 when they may need to increase the frequency to weekly.

So the general idea is that if we do have subgroups working on specific sub-issues as the topics of Workstream 2 and that the (unintelligible) from those

topics will be presenting progress and issues as the plenary doesn't necessarily make sense to have plenary meetings every week.

Because we have to allow the subgroups where the work is actually being done to advance somewhat.

Now the thing that has generated some discussion on the list which I am sure we will be talking about in a few minutes. Support for subgroups who would be similar to what we are seeing one of the following exceptions.

Dedicated email list for each subgroup. Observers of read only. For plenary meetings, virtual meeting room with recording transcription for subgroup meetings (unintelligible) with recording only.

Use of ICANN services including (unintelligible) global need for teleconferencing in ICANN language services for transcription. No note taking by staff beyond action items.

And subgroup members will be expected to draft their own documents. Staff will not produce documents for subgroups unless requested, approved and available. And I am sure we will be coming back to the point.

Current staffing and (unintelligible). Karen Mulberry management (unintelligible). Brenda Brewer, full time CCWG support. Everyone knows and loves Brenda. Grace Abuhamad who is part time and is doing some ICANN coordination and other activities for us.

Hillary Jett, part time communications support. And myself full time CCWG support and (CCST).

Additional CCWG support staff could be required as subgroups for the (unintelligible) consultation and public finalized recommendations CCWG-Accountability meeting would continue the same support as currently available on a (unintelligible) weekly schedule unless otherwise required.

So basically everything that we have in our plenary meetings right now continues exactly as is.

The assumptions for trying to figure out how we are going to use resources from the subgroups is that the subgroups would meet on a weekly basis to try and advance through various topics.

Considerations based on these assumptions. Public consultation and final reports would be translated as per Workstream 1 recommendations. So there would be translation.

One day face to face meeting prior to November, March and June ICANN meetings. So plenty of rules are clarified here. Basically (unintelligible) appointed members already supported to attend the meeting (unintelligible) support. One extra hotel night.

The three co-chairs will receive support as follows. A and C meetings (unintelligible) ICANN meetings and they may be expected to participate in engagement efforts around Workstream 2 proposal.

For the B meeting the co-chairs will receive support to attend the face to face meeting only.

For (unintelligible) will receive support per the rules for SOAC appointed members. If already supported to attend they will receive support from the extra hotel.

Remote participation services will be available for those who are not able to attend in person.

The next slide. Other considerations. Specialized legal contractors and we anticipate there will be need for legal expertise. Not all Workstream 2 items will require the same level of legal support, required legal support could be intensive for items such as human rights, (unintelligible) interpretation or collaborative engagement review.

Our suggestion would be in budgeting amount based on a reasonable estimate of low intensity engagement lawyers in order to (unintelligible) but clarify beyond these levels to take requests with the board (unintelligible).

Specialized non-legal contractors, graphic support in amounts should be made available for graphic support since that seems to have worked well for us in Workstream 1.

Other considerations. There is the question of advisors. Workstream 1 advisors were appointed to support the work of the CCWG-Accountability and not selected by the group.

Per the CCWG-Accountability charter the group does not control the advisors and therefore cannot have the support for the advisors as part of the work group subject associated with the CCWG-Accountability.

The CCWG does not require advisors for Workstream 2. However, since they were not appointed by the CCWG, ICANN or the (unintelligible), the group that appointed the advisors initially would need to officially release the advisors should the CCWG-Accountability agree.

So basically implicit in here is a question for our group today. Do we need the advisors? Or you agree that we should ask that they be released? Advisors are welcome to continue to participate in the work of the CCWG as individual participants.

So that takes us to the end of this presentation. Sorry to drill on but I wanted to go through it if there were any departures that did not have time to go through these slides. And I will turn it back over to Thomas for questions and comments.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you very much Bernie for talking us through the slide deck. And I would suggest that we structure our discussion a little bit. I am sure that many of you want to speak to the results that is available for us, i.e. the services to support the work of the sub-teams.

So I would suggest that we discuss that first. I would suggest that we discuss the question of how to use the advisor in the months to come separately. So let's first talk about the results of the working message we kept for the CCWG and then discuss the question of advisors.

Just before (James) raised his hand to ask about what ICANN are going to be worked on. I think it would be premature to discuss that today. We will hear the lightening talks in Helsinki and hopefully we will learn in Helsinki what items the community wants to spend its resources on.

I think it is quite unlikely this is a view shared by the co-chairs and (unintelligible). It is quite unlikely that we will have the bandwidth to work on all items in parallel. But let's do the choosing of the items that go first when we are together in Helsinki.

Because that hugely depends on the volunteers wishes because basically you need the community resources in order to get the work done. But now let's to move to Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Can you hear me?

Thomas Rickert: Very faintly Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Okay (unintelligible) I have two questions. I have one question (unintelligible). The first question is what is the rationale behind the (unintelligible) June '17? Is it only because it is the end of the fiscal year? Or is there any other objective or rationale reason?

Second, I don't understand (unintelligible). I would like to say that the subgroups, the work of the subgroup is different from the work of the (unintelligible) that we used at the beginning of our work.

Thomas Rickert: Tijani the first half of your intervention you could hardly be heard. But now you are breaking up on me. I am not sure whether others can hear you. Can you please repeat the second question please?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I would like to say that the work of the subgroups is different from the work that the working party did. Is that the sense that all the work will be done in those subgroups and the result will discussed at the CCWG (unintelligible).

I think the work of those subgroups is very important especially because the items to be discussed are very – are sometimes (unintelligible) and need a lot of procedures and a lot of work to be done.

So I don't think that we have (unintelligible) the means that we use for the CCWG for those working groups, for those subgroups. I think that the (unintelligible) and also for (unintelligible) is something important to (unintelligible) work of the sub-team for the subgroups. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks so much to Tijani. I have to confess I had a hard time hearing part of your intervention. So please confirm whether my summary is correct. The first question related to the June deadline of financial year 2017 and why that is. I guess the answer is simple that ICANN's fiscal year is covering that period.

And then Tijani made a point that the work of the sub-teams is different than the work of other work parties. It is important to have transcripts and have the staff to do the drafting. So thank you for that.

I hope that (unintelligible) accurately reflected the main argument. Let's hear some more views should there be any.

(Unintelligible) and then (unintelligible).

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes thank you Thomas. Can you hear me well?

Thomas Rickert: Yes. But today people seem to be a little faint. You are also not as loud as another location. So please go ahead.

Sebastien Bachollet: Okay I will try to be louder. I have two points. The first one is about support for travel and participation to the meeting. I am questioning the

proposal to have the co-chair treated different for the A & C meeting and the B meeting.

And I really think that it must be revised because the B meeting is a meeting where the organization will do a lot of work internally in each SOAC but also collectively with all the SOAC in one group.

And I think that the Workstream 2 will be one of the topic of any B meetings and will need co-chair to be participating. And I really suggest that this must be changed and if somebody wants to discuss with me why I think that as I was the chair of the working group who came with A, B, and C meeting will be very happy to do so.

And my second point is about the advisor. I really think at least some of them I am not saying all of them. And I know that it is not ourselves to decide but I would like very much to suggest because it is written somewhere. Should CCWG-Accountability agree I think we need to have still advisor.

And if the only way to retain them to participate it is to do the same thing that Workstream 1 let's do it. I think that for example, for (USCT) one of those advisors will be very useful in the discussion then we will like. I think we need to keep them on board. Thank you very much.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Sebastian. I am not going to try to respond to the points that are being made now. But let's just collect views and then try to work on this (unintelligible) or improvements to the proposal at the table.

But Olga the floor is yours.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Thomas. Can you hear me?

Thomas Rickert: Yes you can be heard all right.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you very much. First of all, I would like to concur with Robin comment in the chat. I think that not having travel support is not a plus. It is a minus and it is not good for some participants in the cross community accountability working group.

And another comment is about bAlance and diversity. In the whole group we had representatives from different stakeholders and different SOs and SEs in from ICANN. How are we going to deal with this diversity of views and regions in this nine subgroups?

Because it is my understanding that they will go in parallel. So I see some difficulties in having this diversity from stakeholders and regions in this subgroups.

And it was not clear to me in (Bernie's) presentation when we are going to plenary and discuss what every subgroup is doing in its own meetings? Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Olga.

Kavouss Arasteh: Why we need nine group? Why not 20? Why not 30? One single subject, one group. Why we need nine groups? Where these nine come from? Why not just make it four and five? This is more easy for the people to participate.

These particular (unintelligible). And the second, the people talking of the cost millions of dollars have been spent for this accountability and 200 people

from ICANN travelling all around the world but now once comes to the CCWG people they say cost.

So I don't think that there is sufficient argument for that. And I don't think that we have to make discrimination among the people. Co-chair will decide.

Support of others will not be supported. It depends on the people. Co-chairs sometimes (unintelligible) very developed country, a lot of money and rich people. Why they have to support?

I am very sorry. People they don't have the sufficient financial support. To (unintelligible) participations. Unless they should go to the ICANN and beg for the travelling of the something. Why this situation?

They are always (unintelligible) around the world. You provide support for those people who need support. Some people they don't need support at all. I just want to name the people. How (unintelligible) rich companies or rich institutions they have billions of dollars and so on (unintelligible). What is this process?

To have so many little groups (unintelligible) people to participate when they are in parallel to (unintelligible) because they don't have financial support. They don't come.

That is part all of this. How many physical meetings we have? And what is the cost to support them or not support them? Has there been any analysis for that? Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks Kavouss. Pedro and then Jordan and that is take a little bit of a break in order to go through the point and try to answer them. Pedro?

Pedro da Silva: Yes hello can you hear me?

Thomas Rickert: Yes we can hear.

Pedro da Silva: Okay thank you. Hello everyone. Yes I just wanted to make a point on the advisors. I am in favor of keeping them especially when taking a look at the – at our Web page and we see a nice look at the areas of expertise of our advisors.

Some of those areas are actually will be more useful in Workstream 2 as they were in Workstream 1. For example, if I take (unintelligible) sample which is expert in international law of (unintelligible). This will be clearly an expertise that will be imported in the work of the jurisdiction working group.

So I think maybe we could probably evaluate which areas are expertise are more let's say needed for Workstream 2. But definitely I think those advisors I think are necessary in our work going forward.

Finally, I would like to support Tijani and also what (unintelligible) has conveyed in the list. I think the importance of using our staff not only for transcripts but also for drafting of documents which will I think give the level of impartiality that we need for the work of the CCWG.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks so much Pedro. Jordan?

Jordan Carter: Hi can you hear me?

Thomas Rickert: Yes we can hear.

Jordan Carter: Great thanks. Hi everyone, it is lovely hearing your voices again. It has been far too long or something. Just a point about this working message. We set up to nine groups of topics together in the room in Marakesh in March.

And I don't mind a lightweight small group for each of those topics taking responsibility. To me it is more the topic that are divided rather than groups.

I think there will be a lot of overlap in the groups people are working on each of the topics. But the key to making that working model and that resourcing model work for all of us has to be that the groups don't present the CCWG as a whole but any kind of (unintelligible).

In other words, they can't do lots of work developing a proposal. And then right on a deadline give it to the CCWG and say, you have to agree with us now. We have run out of time. There is no time to make changes and so on.

It has to be quite the opposite actually. These small groups needs to regularly engage the whole CCWG in plenary discussion and all of us at that point need to add the diversity about perspectives and views.

The alternative is really running a large number of discreet CCWGs with lots of people on them. And so I actually favor the smaller more restrained design team type approach to get thinking together and then to test it with this group.

But I will like others will be a strong guardian against something pushed through these small groups and then imposed on the CCWG. That model can't work. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Jordan. As indicated earlier, I would now like to offer a few comments or remarks on the points that have been made. Just so that it

doesn't become overwhelming. But Robin and (unintelligible) you will surely be heard. I would suspect you to be patient for a few seconds.

Now we heard a couple of interventions that were around the topic of transcripts and document drafting. I would suggest that we take that back. We would likely liaise with (unintelligible) organizations to see whether they support us in asking for more resources.

And then we will talk to ICANN and try to work on that and get back to the group with a response on that.

The same would apply with respect to the points that have been made by some when it comes to travel support. I think that we need to come up with some suggestions on how we maybe streamline this process a little bit so that we are more cost efficient than during the first phase of our work.

So I would really like to hear from the group that basically has rejected a couple of suggestions that they made in order to save costs on how you as a group would think we can help reduce the overall financial burden for the community. Because ICANN (unintelligible) the money that which then the community's money.

With respect to the advisor, let's think about that a little bit more. As I mentioned earlier, we are going to get back to that point at the end of this agenda item. We don't need to make a decision on that today but just to get the thought process going.

As Jordan mentioned, the nine sub-teams were the result of our discussions in Marakesh that as Robin mentioned in the chat. Some of these points are

related to each other but if the group thinks that we should maybe group some of the items and put them into one sub-team or (unintelligible) item.

It is not cast and concrete we can still do that. But the number of sub-teams and the selection of topics is actually something that this group has previously decided.

So I hope that I have at least captured the main points and let's now hear from Robin and then from (unintelligible).

Robin Gross: Hi this is Robin. Can you hear me okay?

Thomas Rickert: Yes we can.

Robin Gross: Okay great. I just wanted to weigh in on a couple of the issues that had been raised before your intervention. I will be brief. I don't want to repeat a lot of the arguments that others have made but just sort of to let you come down on the issues.

I think we need to make sure that we have got a full transcripts for all of our discussions. I think that is such an important part of transparency. It is such an important part of the work that we are doing and the way that it helps with accessibility of the information and enabling us to communicate and have more people participate.

It just adds so much value that I think that, you know, we need to look at the costs of those transcripts with all that enormous value that it adds.

I also think that we should invite the advisors to join as participants with others the way others have. I know there was a question about how can we

help to cut costs? I think this would be one good example of one way we could cut some costs.

Again these people have made valuable contributions and could be invited to participate as participants.

I think we need to make sure we have got the members of the CCWG supported to travel to the meetings. I know a number of us are not able to go to Helsinki because ICANN decided not to cover our travel and I think that will be the same for the subsequent meetings as well.

Particularly those of us from civil society and the non-commercial community who don't have businesses that can support our participation.

We talked about having several of the nine issues being pushed together into subtopics or into different topics together. I think that is worth exploring but I want to caution also on that.

Because some of the issues, for example, the transparency issue already was a collection of four or five sub issues that we said we needed to incorporate with respect to transparency changes at ICANN.

So I want to just, you know, I hope that our search for a simple solution when we have got nine issues doesn't make the quality of those decisions suffer. So that is all I wanted to say. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Robin. And thanks for reminding us that actually the transparency issue is already grouping of subtopics. And I think that our group has already wisely chosen the nine topics. So if you ask for my personal view I think the nine sub-teams cover quite nicely what we have on our plate.

But I mentioned that this is – this can be reopened because it is actually not a decision that we are making and that needs to stand. But if the group thinks that it can work more efficiently by regrouping the topics than by all means let's go for it. Let's try to make this as easy for the community to deliver on.

But thanks for that Robin. Next is Kavouss and then Alan.

Kavouss Arasteh: I read a lot of (unintelligible). If the majority of the people are in favor of this transcripts we should do it. This is number one.

Number two, we stick to the nine little group there is a risk that if it continues there are two options. Either the people cannot participate and (unintelligible) so the chairs in the (unintelligible) should not take (unintelligible). Little group and we have no time and (unintelligible).

So I think there is still a possibility to regroup them. Some of them really married to be a single group like human rights or larger addictions. Some others could be combined or the (unintelligible) group.

Why not we try to see whether they could reduce amount of - the number of the group to some optimal 3, 5 or 6 and so on so forth. Make it possible for people to participate.

And thirdly, you did not reply to my question. How many more meeting apart from Helsinki we have face to face? If there is one perhaps we could arrange them to have some financial support from the people. It is more than that. It is very difficult. We cannot participate. And it is not good that you do not allow the people to benefit from the discussions and to work with the other people.

So can you please tell me, how many more (physical) meetings we would have between now and end of the year apart from Helsinki?

Helsinki, we have always managed that to the situation. And we have already (unintelligible). I (have not asked for ICANN support. It is my personal support (unintelligible). But please can we regroup in five or six (unintelligible) majority in favor. Go ahead with that one and kindly reconsider the issue of (travelling), if it is more than Helsinki. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Kavouss and before we move to Alan, who's actually going to be the last speaker on this topic, let me briefly recap.

It looks like the issue of transcripts is of highest concern. So we will take a look at that looking at (James') comment in the chat. There is flexibility o cost depending on the turnaround time for those who work on the transcripts but we will definitely take a look at that in order to make transcripts possible on a low cost basis.

(Kabos) asked for regrouping. The topics is, as I mentioned, is a possibility. At the same time the topics as we see them in the slide deck are the result of discussion by the CCWG. So if the CCWG wants that to change, I would suggest that you come up with concrete proposals for regrouping. And then we'll see whether there's sufficient traction for making that change.

And with respect to your last point on how many face-to-face meetings there will be, I would like to ask you for a little bit more patience because that's a point that (Matur) is going to address in the next agenda item and I will try not to be (unintelligible) at that point. But we will get back to that in a moment. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I'll be brief. I'm presuming at least that some of the decisions that you're showing that that Bernie talked about were made based on at least rough approximations of what things cost.

If they were made without that then I'm not quite sure how they were made. If they were made with that kind of thing, then can you please present them? There are those of us in this group that don't have budgeting experience and we can compare things and make value judgements.

It shouldn't be passed down to us as the decisions based on the numbers but we can't show them to you. So it would be really helpful, to the extent we have numbers, let's see them. You know, one of the examples we've talked about before is bringing members who are not otherwise funded to ICANN meetings.

It may well be a complete irrational thing based on what the cost would be for the number of people we're talking about. But it would be nice to know what that number is so we can agree if it's the rationale thing to do or say, you know, that's being foolish.

Lastly, in terms of the co-chairs and B meetings, flying people halfway around the world for a one day meeting and then sending them home unless they're willing to take their own cash and pay for a hotel for another three days or four days, is inhuman. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks so much Alan and thanks for the support for the (B meeting action). You're the second person speaking in favor of helping out for the co-chairs. That's much appreciated.

Alan, to give you a straight answer to your question on the figures, it's not like ICANN has given us the promise to give us a certain amount of money and the leadership team has sliced the cake and made allocations. It's the other way around.

We're actually working on the basis of (unintelligible) CCWG approach and that is let's look at the requirements. So we are in the process of certifying our groups' requirements for this next case. And then we will try to get all the funds required for that allocation.

So actually there is, there is no fixed amount that has been promised to this group but I can also say that at some point when we have refined this a little bit further, we are more than happy to share cost estimates with the group. But there is no such cost estimates at the moment that we could present.

Alan Greenberg: Thomas, may I have a very brief follow-on?

Thomas Rickert: Sure.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I wasn't presuming there's an overall envelope number. Just that as you go along these lists, you know, we are really talking about tradeoffs. If we spend more money there, then we're going to have to try to become more, be more frugal somewhere else.

Having an idea of what the ballpark numbers are, which someone's going to have to eventually translate them to find out what this is costing, it makes it a lot easier to make those decisions. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: That's understood and as I mentioned, we will bring number in front of the group. But at the moment we don't have (an overview) prepared that we could

share. But I understand the need for it but it's too early in the process for us to be able to do that.

So we have a little bit more than five minutes left for this agenda item and some of you have already commented on the role of the advisors. Yes, I had suggested that we discuss this separately at the end of this agenda item and I would like to give the opportunity to those that have patiently waited to chime in now.

So if you want to speak to the question of whether or not we should keep the role of the advisor (unintelligible). But if there are any views on whether or not we should use the services and if so, in what shape or form, please do put yourself in the queue. And the first hand is raised. Avri, please.

Avri Doria: Yes, thank you. This is Avri speaking. I wanted to get my hand up right away because last time I didn't manage to get it in before you cutoff the queue.

I think since we're already talking about not providing travel support for people keeping these advisors becomes a no cost item. So when we're thinking about it, we're not thinking about it in terms of budget. We're thinking about it in terms of what role they provide.

Some of them have provided incredibly good comments to us along the period and because they were outsiders in a large sense and not those of us both members and participants who in some sense have interests, their voice is especially valuable.

And so I personally see no harm and I see advantage in terms of the outreach into the larger community that they give us, especially if we're not flying

anybody anymore for anything. So you know, that's where I start to think about pennywise pound foolish.

We'll no longer have, you know the degree of legal expenses You know, but some things are tools and some people do provide a special value that is part of our charter. And, you know, we really do have to look at it carefully and not look at something that is valuable and would cost us close to nothing, if nothing. Thanks.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Avri. Very good point indeed. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thanks very much. Along the same lines, our advisors were not paid as far as I know. Therefore, we're only talking about travel costs. I think it's quite reasonable to say there are no default travel costs for advisors at this go around.

It becomes a very awkward discussion to have in public because some of our advisors provided far more value than the zero we paid them or for the travel expenses than others did.

So, you know, can I imagine that some particular advisor at some particularly important point may be warranted to bring them to a meeting? Yes But as a matter of course, I would suggest not. Thank you. But I see no reason to fire them at the zero price we're paying them. Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you. And just to be clear, we would not fire them anyway because we have not appointed them. So it would not be our role to do that and at the same time we would certainly not fire them, but relieve them of this duty, if it were not a mandate which it isn't.

So there are no further hands raised. And thank you all for your excellent points. We will now take this back, work on an improved proposal, hopefully improved to your liking and then get back to the group. So please do understand this as a iterative process.

So we're going to work on the next version of this and then share this with you. So with this, I would like to end this agenda point and hand it over to Mathieu.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you very much Thomas. Maybe before we close and this is Mathieu speaking by the way, a question raised by James in the chat was whether we had only 24 hours to finalize this?

I think we'll obviously try and renegotiate a little bit of time to finalize and come back to you because obviously there's some updates to be provided and I think we really need to have clarity on the needs and the potential tradeoffs later. So I don't think it's the last time we discuss this item in this group.

So next agenda item is getting even one step further into the preparations for the Helsinki meeting which is really designed to be our work stream to kickoff meeting. So if I can have the slides on the screen, Brenda. That would be helpful.

The goal here is to start the discussion about how we structure the meeting but also what's (unintelligible) so that we can focus most of our facetime in Helsinki on substance issues and discussion rather than spend a full day discussing process.

And so we're trying to advance the conversation as much as possible before that. So I see the slides now. Can I get to the next slide? So this is the list of topics. I'm not going back to this. We've seen that before.

Obviously everything that we say is irrespective of the structure but that was our assumption in (Mariachi) to use the nine topics. And you will note that diversity would deserve its own bullet on the list here and it's just a typo that would be corrected obviously.

So next slide. So the first item is the principle of who's doing what. So well – someone has unmuted while I'm speaking? Okay. So who's doing what? The concept is that we have design team of subgroups that will do the heavy lifting. We've discussed this already.

The plenary as Thomas was saying, still remains the point of discussion and can raise new issues. There's no decision that is made in the subgroups without the CCWG having full rights to reopen the issues, reviewing the proposals. Assessing the components is only at the CCWG level.

And of course the CCWG will liaise with the chartering of the Board and the organizations that we are accountable to. And in terms of co-chairs, we see our role in that. I'm going to open the discussion obviously as monitoring that each group is bAlanced and has the appropriate resources.

That the group or design group and subgroup leaders also is bAlanced and diverse. And there's a bullet missing here as well that requests for extra support to handle the efficiency but also responsibly and the (unintelligible) obviously is the legal advice request that we would still need to have a focal point of approval and review so that we can monitor progress and budget considerations.

Okay. I'm seeing some discussion in the chat. I'd just like to take, make sure that on this particular architecture there's, we're on the same line before moving next. Okay. Then as (Jordan) was saying, as was our policy so far, there will be no unbAlanced sub-group leader.

And I can confirm that in our policy for the working parties. So the next slide please. This slide was already covered mostly on the support and the frequency of meetings so I'll move next. Straight to the next slide. What do we have to do before Helsinki?

We would like to discuss and that's going to be the topic of this presentation, a rough project plan basically to, just to make sure we all share a view about when we will meet and the kinds of expectations in terms of the lay and obviously that's just a plan and we'll have to adjust.

The type of documentation we need and we will also issue shortly after this call a survey to start identifying participants wishing to contribute. And I'm stressing the words actively contribute to the various topics so that we get an idea of where there's a lot of interest and actually bandwidths and where there's, there may be a need for reinforcing because there's a lower level of volunteers.

That's something we're planning to do before Helsinki so that we can adjust, if need be, in Helsinki as well. So that's, next slide please. So in terms of documentation, the idea is that staff will produce a paper per topic recapping the subsections of the supplemental report, the prep material that we might have produced during the course of work stream one.

Like legal memos or interim documents from working parties. So that each group has the basic so that each group has the basic documentation ready before starting. That's pretty basic. The next slide. And we're coming to basically the rough idea of how work stream two could take place, if everything went well.

The idea is to use Helsinki to form the groups, launch discussions. There would be, our goal would be to try and use issued public comments for as many topics as possible in time for discussions in Hyderabad in November where we would meet as well and engage with the various communities, refining proposals hopefully in time for another public comments round in Copenhagen, in time for Copenhagen in March.

So that we might finalize the proposals in time for approval in June in the Johannesburg meeting. So that's a rough best case scenario for a topic that we'll be able to move efficiently forward. And to answer (Kaboo's) questions previously, in terms of face-to-face, that implies that we would only meet face-to-face at each of the ICANN meetings basically on the day before it starts.

And I'm not familiar yet with the new meeting structures. So I'm not making any assumptions of the day of the week. That means that just before the official meeting starts, we would try and arrange this meeting date and we discussed about travel support previously but that's part of the budget request.

That's a tentative timeline that we're discussing and maybe I should pause here and assess whether there's any questions, comments, feedback on that. I see a question of (Jose) about ad hoc meetings during ICANN meetings.

I think that that's an excellent idea. We would certainly would need to anticipate a lot because of the need for, I mean I know meeting rooms are scarce during ICANN meetings and staff support is also, that is already highly booked so there might be challenges here.

But that's an excellent idea and I think that applies as well to the IRP group maybe as soon as Helsinki. I'm having trouble following the chat accurately so if you want to raise a point on the timeline please do so and Julie, your hand it up.

Julie Hammer: Thanks.

Mathieu Weill: You're welcome.

Julie Hammer: Thank you very much. Julie Hammer, ALAC. Just wanted to ask whether each of the nine groups is being planned to be kicked off currently. The reason I'm asking is because the smaller groups like ALAC where we don't have a large number of people (leaving now as well), if everything is done concurrently, it might be a little bit hard for us to keep check of everything. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Julie. That's a question indeed for our group and probably one of the key outcome of the discussions in Helsinki. What's ready to start, what's not because of the bandwidth issue that we will have in the group and that the community will have in terms of the ability the committee will have to submit comments, assess proposals on each of the topics.

So yes, we can safely assume that it's going to be a challenge moving forward. So there's, nothing is cast in stone on this at this point. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Just a quick heads up. One of the activities, one of the things that ALAC will be discussing in Helsinki is how to get more people involved in some of these subgroups. People who may have a specific interest in that subgroups but has not actually been following the CCWG otherwise.

So it's fine to try to put together groups at Helsinki or in that timeframe but we are hoping that we'll find other people who we can lure into to do some of the hard lifting on particular topics. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Yes, ALAC has apparently arguments that are very interesting. If you can lure people into our group, you are powerful indeed. The force is strong within ALAC. But that's right.

There's not an intention to close the group composition at any point in time. We need to keep the groups open anyway. But it's just to assess the strength and the type of dynamics from our volunteer community ahead of Helsinki and I mean (unintelligible).

Okay the next slide then. Also in order to streamline the whole process, basically we think it would be useful to use the same type of deliverable to every topic or group of topics. And I mean we haven't been looking very far. We've looked at the annex of our supplemental report and basically what could be expected on each topic.

An executive summary, a description of the issues, the current state of play what was in the supplemental report, the recommendations with their rationale for each topic and a reminder that in the new bylaws. We still need to provide documentation that we are meeting what was previously called the NCIA criteria.

But now the new bylaw criteria in section 27.2 and so supporting the stakeholder model and so on and so forth. And that's part of the documentation that we need to provide as per our charter. So it's basically using the same framework just like the ICG called for recommendations with a certain structure in the document for each of the operational communities.

We would use this standard to make sure we get a similar type of information in each of the recommendations were providing. Any questions on that? I'm not seeing any so moving to the next slide. So what would Helsinki look like? Our proposal would be to use as much time as possible in Helsinki for what we've mentioned is lighting talks.

.

So very short talks by one of us in five minutes. A bit of questions and answers highlighting an issue. It could be highlighting how to address an issue. It can be highlighting a particular vision of the recommendations. And the idea is to stimulate debate and ideas and make sure we have, we share at the group level what the various topics we're going to be discussing.

So we are aware of it. And we realize the amount of work that we have in front of us and have a first round of questions and answers on it. Basically that's a little bit of format we've used in the first day of our, first face-to-face meeting in Frankfurt where, if you remember, we had a few, a few of us took the stage and explained how they were viewing the future governance of ICANN.

And this was extremely helpful in helping us coalesce around some key principles that we, that were, we used all around our work as the four pillars of ICANN accountability. So that's the reason why we are trying to go in that direction for the meeting. With another outcome that would be to attempt to form the design teams.

So I think the design teams on the topics that we're ready to move on, selecting (unintelligible) and trying to obviously be planning based on the next steps. One important aspect also being that we're going to have discussions with our various communities in Helsinki and beyond so that's also an area of coordination for the group.

Regarding the potential agenda, I'd like to pause for a second to see if there's any comments. And the word design team, I think was used by CCWG and that's why I'm using it but you can use sub-group. You can use whatever other term you want to. Let's not get stuck on the word design. WE can certainly adjust that.

There will be, (Paul) is raising the question about people not attending Helsinki to how they can access these lightening talks easily. Maybe, actually participants in Helsinki, I think we're going to have remote participation in Helsinki. Unless I'm contradicted by staff, I think that's the plan.

So that's going to be possible obviously with full transcripts and so on. And documentation, any supporting documentation will be shared on the list as well. And the idea for us would be to invite each of you to consider whether you want to provide one of these talks and make yourself known on the full list that you want to speak about each or a particular topic.

I see Niel's already done that on the human rights and from now on if we agree on this structure for the Helsinki meeting, everyone is invited to apply for a slot in these sections. (Steve) the idea, the idea of Helsinki, we anticipate to be more plenary on Sunday because of the different talks.

But and I don't know if we have a lot of flexibility about subgroups. I think we have some so if there's any need we can split a little bit for a certain section of time. But this has to drawback on remote participation as you're rightly mentioning.

So that's why so far it's a full plenary all day but with lightening and maybe sometimes entertaining talks to make sure we make the best out of the full day. Okay. I'm seeing no questions now so maybe more to the next slide. Okay, that's something else discussed already. So let's move to the one after that which is an idea of the structure of the meeting. Nothing really new.

And I think that closes this section on preparation for Helsinki. Any other thoughts on preparing Helsinki. Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you very much. Tijani speaking. I hope you can hear me well now.

Mathieu Weill: Very well.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you very much. A question not exactly about your presentation but I have seen that the subgroups will be in charge of the public comments. My understanding is that the subgroups will prepare the work for the CCWG and the CCWG should make the public comment. So would appreciate an explanation.

Mathieu Weill: Yes, so your view is correct. That's subgroups prepare the work. It's discussed in the CCWG. It's a CCWG public comment. Analysis of the comments is made obviously by the subgroups. But it's the CCWG's decision in the end to, how to reconsider, adjust the recommendation.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: So you have to perhaps correct the duty of, the task of each of the subgroups and of the CCWG because it is not written like this. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Okay, mistake on our side and we'll correct. Thank you. Okay, if there's no other points on this issue, obviously comments on the list can, we'll still have a little bit of time but I think it's good to anticipate on this. And we'll make sure we make the best out of Helsinki and ideas that work.

But please apply for the talks and make sure you fill out the survey that we'll issue shortly after this call. Before closing this issue, Jordan.

Jordan Carter: Thanks. Mathieu, can you hear me?

Mathieu Weill: Yes, very well Jordan.

Jordan Carter: Right. Just to make sure, it's a kind of plea of someone who won't be present in Helsinki, to make sure that there aren't any breaking off into individual groups or anything after all of the lightening talks and plenary so that all of us who are remote participants can watch and listen to them and participate in them. And if necessary, present them through that means as well.

Mathieu Weill: Thanks Jordan. It's noted. Holly, please.

Holly Gregory: Hi, I just wanted to respond. I know that (Robin) had raised a question about one of the items that was attributed to the lawyers came from on the list of items to be discussed in work stream two. And it comes directly, it's quoted directly out of Paragraph 54 of Annex 4 of the CCWG's own proposal.

And for some reason it hasn't make it into the list of things that would be in the transition bylaw and that is what we as lawyers corrected. And it's clearly

in the proposal. And it specifically says, guidelines for standard of conduct that will be presented will be in good faith. For example conducting reasonable (unintelligible) will be developed in work stream (two).

And if you'll recall, Annex 4 is about ensuring community involvement in ICANN decision-making seven new community powers. And paragraph 54 is, when will indemnification be available associated with the removal of individual ICANN Board directors?

Mathieu Weill: Thank you for this clarification Holly. Indeed that was a good catch from you in terms of consistency across our report. And I'm actually looking forward to working on this issue which promises to be a very useful one I think in the long run for ICANN to document. (Steve), you're next.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Mathieu. It's Steve Del Bianco for the record. I put this into the chat and it's not for discussion at this point. But as a plea for the CCWG members coming to Helsinki, if you could please review the document that was circulated on 26 May regarding work stream two and ATRT three.

In that document we lay out consideration for how to synchronize work stream two in ATRT because six of our nine work stream two topics deal with accountability that could fit well into an ATRT scope and I make the case speaking for myself personally that we ought to defer ATRT three wo that work stream two can take care of those six accountability items.

I make that case based on the fact that in the bylaws we are about to adopt, work stream two has stronger powers of persuasion than ATRT would in terms of getting something difficult past ICANN's Board and management.

And if you just review that document, it's only a few pages long, we'd be prepared to maybe have that discussion when we gather in Helsinki. Thank you.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you Steve. That's really a good point. That's really an item we need to discuss in terms of how we synchronize before we engage our respective communities.

So I make sure we put it on the agenda as a full, regular item so that everyone can prepare for that. And thank you for the work you've put in with (Karen) actually on providing an abstract of the considerations around that issue. Holly, I assume it's an old hand?

Holly Gregory: Yes, apologies.

Mathieu Weill: No worries. Thank you Holly. And with that, I'm not turning back to my fellow co-chair, Leon.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Mathieu. This is Leon (unintelligible). And I think we have a topic for any other business at this point. And this is the public comment that is ongoing on the Articles of Incorporation and that ends on July 26 at 23:59 UTC.

So this of course is a topic that we feel that the CCWG should be spending time on and would like to put on the table to ask our lawyers to review the Articles of Incorporation that have been published for public comment and prepare a comment so that we can discuss this in a plenary meeting of the (CWGC) before Helsinki.

And why we think this should be taken care of before Helsinki is because of course in Helsinki we'll be very busy with other things preparing for work stream two and carrying out all the agenda that we have set out for Helsinki. So it would be best if we could close this before Helsinki.

And I would like to see if there are any objections on asking our lawyers to review the Articles of Incorporation that have been published. And of course preparing a comments, a draft comments for us to review. And I see (Holly's) hand is up. Holly you have the floor.

Holly Gregory: Yes. Given that the Articles of Incorporation that you have and that have been posted were essentially drafted by the (Adler) team and reviewed by (Sydney), I think at this point we can tell you that they are consistent with your proposal. I don't know that we need to do any further review. We were the source of the draft.

Leon Sanchez: All right. Thanks.

Holly Gregory: There may have some questions. There are a couple of things that we took out of the old bylaws because they are no longer required by law that relate to some tax issues. And if at some point you want to have a walkthrough so that we can explain it but it's really very, very simple.

It's a very short document. It's very simple and so (Adler) had suggested a couple of changes that don't relate to the CCWG itself but really do relate to the State of California law and the fact that they were not needed.

Leon Sanchez: Thank you very much Holly. I have Jorge on the queue and then I'll go back to your comments Holly.

Holly Gregory:	Oh, and I just wanted to state we just saved you some significant lawyer's fees.

Leon Sanchez:	Thanks Holly. Jorge, you have the floor. Jorge, we cannot hear you. Maybe you're on mute.

Jorge Cancio:	Hello. Can you hear me now?

Leon Sanchez:	Yes, we can hear you now?

Jorge Cancio:	Good evening. This is Jorge (unintelligible). On the Articles of Incorporation, I think I sent an email to (unintelligible) and I think it sits quite well, what Holly just explained.

	It would be very helpful for all of us, also for those who are not following this issue so closely to have a short table where the Articles of Incorporation are explained and identification of those parts of CCWG Report of the ICG Report where the changes are based on.

	So I think as Holly said, it's just a three page document. For many of us who are in this group, it may be a no brainer but for many other people from our side, it would certainly help to drive the point and to perhaps a short explanation of why every change is being proposed. Thank you.

Leon Sanchez:	Thanks Jorge. I disconnected from the call a little bit so I wasn't really able to get the sense of what you were saying. So if any of my colleagues would like to comment on what Jorge just said, I would just like to go back to what Holly was referring on her comments on reviewing the Articles of Incorporation.

I think that it would be useful for us to have our legal team to walk us through the Articles of Incorporation. They have (unintelligible) that there would be no need for further comments on this, maybe just preparing a very brief document to walk us through these Articles of Incorporation so that we can review it in the CCWG and prepare our comments, if the case may be. And I think that would be the way forward.

And I guess that the comments on, I think that the comments from Jorge was to add some footnotes on where changes came from. Is that right? Okay, good. So I think that our lawyers could also help us with that while preparing the documents to walk us through the Articles of Incorporation.

Okay, so please Holly and (Rose Marie) have this certified by the co-chairs to prepare this document for (unintelligible) changes in the Articles of Incorporation. And we'll be waiting for this document to come.

Okay, so are there any other business that should be taken care of on this call? I assume that that's an old hand Jorge. All right.

So seeing no hands up and hearing no one else wanting to comment on any other business on this call we can have this call adjourned.

Thank you everyone for attending and we'll talk to you soon. Bye-bye.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Bye everybody.

Man: See you.

Man: Bye.

Man;   Bye everyone.

END