
LEON SANCHEZ:

Okay, so we have the recording started. Thank you very much, and welcome, everyone, to the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 Leadership Kickoff call on Wednesday, the 27 July, at 19:00 UTC.

Today, we will be having this call to kick off the work of the Work Stream 2 subgroups. For that, we have an agenda. Can we please have the next slide?

This, of course, includes the welcome that I've just done, a review of the Work Stream 2 subgroups. Then we would like to present a subgroup working method approach, and of course open discussion. Then we will have a review of the subgroup meeting slots for your [consideration], and also the status of the staff papers for each of the subgroups. You might remember that staff has been preparing some papers to help the discussion in each of the subgroups for subgroups to review and enrich with their input.

Then we will be also having a CCWG plenary session schedule and the subgroup deliverables review, and finally the draft CCWG travel support process, which we want to discuss with you also in this call.

For the next agenda item, I would like to turn to my co-chair, Mathieu.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thanks, Leon. Hello, everyone. It's good to get this group formed so that we can kick off Work Stream 2. Probably we should go to the next slide. Basically, the set of slides that we've assembled for this meeting is mostly based on slides you've seen already. It's just in order for us to

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

get on the same page so that we can kick start the various subgroups by being aligned on expectations and deliverables.

Please interrupt us at any point so that we can answer any question or issue that you would have as rapporteurs. The purpose is really that you are comfortable with the whole setup, that every detail or question can find an answer before you get to real work in the subgroups.

You have the list of topics of Work Stream 2 on this slide. On the next one, we have the list of our group if we go to the next slide, slide number four. I hope I forgot no one on the rapporteurs and co-rapporteurs. It's great that we have volunteers for each and every group, and it's great that the most complicated ones have several volunteers so that work can be [driven] in a [collective] manner.

The next slide, that's the group we are assembling here with the co-chairs. A small reminder that we have defined a common framework for the subgroup deliverables. They're meant to include an objective summary, descriptions of the issues, including the current state of play and what the supplemental report was saying about it. That's the [scope], obviously.

We're expecting recommendations – you won't be surprised by this – and a rationale. We also discussed that we will need to explain how our recommendations fit the NTIA criteria, as well as whether they are consistent with the Work Stream 1 recommendations.

To answer the question from Niels in the chat, no, I don't think you've received the slides yet, but I think you could do that right now so that it's easier for everyone to follow. I'm not sure if Brenda or Karen can do

that as soon as practical, but I think it will be easier. It is also meant to be material that you can use with your groups to remind everyone of where we're heading.

That's the deliverable that we've already discussed with the CCWG. The next slide is a reminder of the proposed timelines that we've discussed in Helsinki, as well. As you will remember, there were two categories: the simpler, lighter topics and the more complex ones. You will see that we are somehow already late on the left column because we should be having the first discussions with the CCWG in just a very short number of weeks. That's going to be very tight, but it's also an invitation for each and every group to consider which timeline you would fit into so that everyone can set expectations right and no one rushes in the last few weeks by switching.

That was what we discussed in Helsinki. I don't know if there are any questions, comments, discussions at this stage. Chris, I see your hand is up, so please.

CHRIS WILSON:

Thank you, Mathieu. Yes, just a quick question with regard to distinguishing simple, light topics versus complex topics. I must admit I missed the part of this discussion in Helsinki. It occurred before I arrived. Are we talking topics within the subgroups? In transparency, for example, obviously we have at least four subtopics that were in the supplemental report. Are we drilling down as to whether those particular subtopics are simple or complex, or are we just talking about

the broader issue of transparency or the broader issue of human rights?
How's the approach exactly?

MATHIEU WEILL:

I think it was conceived with the idea that this would apply to each subgroup. Each subgroup would be either simple or complex, but maybe we'll find out that there's more [certainty] there and that some of the subtopics in the transparency, for instance, would be pretty [easy] to deal with and come up with recommendations, while others would be more complex.

It was just to introduce some flexibility in the timeline. Honestly, I think there's still room for adjustment if you feel like, in your group, you need some adjustment into this. I'm aware that it's not providing a very simple answer to your question, but I think you're putting your finger on something we haven't discussed [well] with the full group yet.

Does that in any way clarify?

CHRIS WILSON:

No, that's helpful. I think [I've spoken briefly with] my co-rapporteur, Michael. I think our approach would be to assess how we approach each subtopic within the transparency group. It may be that one or two of them are considered low hanging fruit, so to speak, and that maybe one or two are considered much more complex. I think, at least initially, we were going to attempt that way to suss out on a more granular level within our subgroup. That's helpful to know that it hasn't been ruled out.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thanks, Chris. Any other questions on this? I would be tempted to say, does anyone think that their topic is going to fit into the simple, lighter topic category? That's what I feared, the lack of a simple, lighter topic. Yes, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Mathieu. I have trouble to answer your question because I guess it will be easier for me to answer when we will have our first meeting with the whole group. I am not feeling that it's a simple topic, but not so complex, either. I hope that, for example, Ombudsman will fall into the first type of topic. I don't feel comfortable to say as rapporteur that I know that it will be. I would prefer to answer this question after first conference call with full participants of this subgroup. Thank you.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thanks, Sebastien. I think this shows that the question needs to be reframed. I think the key question is not whether it's going to be simple or complex, but whether we believe after speaking with the respective groups that the first discussions with the public input can take place as early as end of October around Hyderabad. It's more a question of how long we think we'll need to get to the first step of public comment, rather than simple/complex because obviously it's tempting. I think Avri said that saying that a topic is not complex, it tempts the fates. I agree with her. We'll certainly have to make sure we don't ask this question publicly this way, but rather identify quite early which topics could form

the basis of our first call for comment or would be mature enough to go for public input in the first wave.

Let's agree that once you've had the first set of meetings with your groups, one of the informations that we need as co-chairs is going to be in which kind of timeline you think your group is going to fit into. That's going to be an action item probably for everyone to get back to us on this after the first meeting in the groups. Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Mathieu. Can you hear me?

MATHIEU WEILL: Yes, very well, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks. Hi, everyone. I'm Jordan Carter here from .nz. I don't think it's really about simple or complex. It's more about the amount of resources required to do justice to the topic, and the relative importance of that topic, and the fact that we know that whatever happens, we cannot expect the community to work through eight or nine topics at one meeting. If we do that, I don't think we're doing our job as the Cross-Community Working Group because I think we're overloading the community and being completely unreasonable in what we ask it to do, which would at that point make the Copenhagen meeting next March unbearable.

I really think that when people go to their groups, if the mindset is, “Our topic is complicated and difficult and we need to do it in depth,” I don't think that that will work. All of these topics can be done simply and lightly, and all of these topics can be done more slowly. We're going to have to choose some to be in one set and some in the other. Maybe everyone giving some thought to that question about whether it is possible to do justice to their topic in a shorter timeframe to get some consultation might be the most motivating question.

I agree with the suggestion that we should make that a first point of discussion within each subgroup to see how people feel about it. Thanks.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thanks, Jordan. They're very useful suggestions. Lori? Lori, if you're speaking, I cannot hear you.

LORI SCHULMAN: Hello. Can you hear me?

MATHIEU WEILL: Yes, I can hear you now.

LORI SCHULMAN: Good. The system muted me. My apologies. I didn't mute myself.

Following up with Jordan's thoughts, which I think are on track and on point, maybe the idea is that we have, I believe it's nine categories that

we're tackling. Perhaps if we paced it out: three at the next meeting, three at the meeting after that, three at the meeting after that. Maybe have the goal be three per meeting and have it happen over the course of a year, rather than the piling or splitting perfectly in half.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thanks, Lori. That might be an adjustment we might have to make. I think that's consistent with Jordan's proposal, as well, to make sure we have [this timing] with the action item to consult with the groups, [follow up], then collectively assess what timeframe we could adopt for each group and try to meet these deadlines after that without rushing, obviously. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks. I would like to proffer that in my view, some of the topics – the one of accountability is obviously the one that I'm thinking of in particular here – may in fact not be as traditionally definable as complex, per se, but will have certain time limitations, whereas some of the sub activities will simply take longer logistically to get through because of the nature of how much desirable and necessary interaction with the wider community and the SOs and the ACs is, for example.

You may have a sort of staging occur where we may have some, as Chris was suggesting in the beginning, low hanging fruit that can be written and signed off early on in the process, and some that will be running for a medium or longer term of our project. I'm not sure it's going to be one size fits all, but I certainly agree with Sebastien. I think it's presumptive

of us to think that we should be making these landmark decisions on the timeline before we've even met with our work groups. Thank you.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thanks, Cheryl. I think the takeaway on this side is that's certainly something to put very high on the agenda for the first meeting in the subgroups. That's also going to be part of our collective responsibility moving forward in Work Stream 2, to make sure we don't overload the community with all subgroups going for comments at the same time, and maintain the dynamics within the subgroups so we can [still] make the best use of the face-to-face meetings we'll have before every ICANN meeting, but also of the engagement and outreach that's possible during the face-to-face and the general meetings of ICANN.

Let's leave it at that for the moment. It's certainly a topic we need to get back to once we've had feedbacks from your groups and something that collectively we'll have to set right so that we can deliver efficiently, including the efficiency of the public input, which is very valuable in this process.

With that, I'm going to move to my fellow co-chair, Thomas. Thomas, you're going to speak about the working methods of the subgroups as they have been described so far? Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT:

Sorry, I had to get off mute. Hi, everyone. Basically, the approach is that the design team subgroups would do the heavy lifting and they would be responsible for having documents drafted. That doesn't necessarily

mean that they have to write every single word, but they are responsible for making sure that subteams deliver something that can be reviewed by the CCWG plenary, which basically remains in charge of both discussing and approving the draft.

Basically, the heavy lifting is done by the subteams, decision making by the CCWG plenary. In order to be fully transparent and as inclusive as possible, we will also have the review of public comments, i.e. the public comment review tool that we are using, in the hands of the CCWG plenary.

We will also stick to the consensus-level determination as described in our charter, which means that the co-chairs (i.e. Mathieu, Leon, and myself) will try to determine, to the best of our ability as usual, whether there is consensus in our group on proposals or not. You can rest assured that we will conduct this in the same fashion as we did in Work Stream 1 by trying to avoid any sort of voting by CCWG members.

You will remember that our charter allows for votes to take place, and members sent to the CCWG by the chartering organizations would have voting rights, which is actually the only difference between members and participants. But we've successfully managed to avoid voting so far because we think that there is more credibility to the outcome if we determine the level of consensus by not voting, but actually by working and refining on the proposals until they reach consensus within our group.

We will, as co-chairs [inaudible] co-chairs, we will make sure that we liaise with the chartering organizations and the Board, the reason for

that mainly being to ensure that there is no friction or no misunderstandings on the proposals and their potential acceptance by those groups.

As you will know and remember from Work Stream 1, our group is not the group actually deciding whether certain policies will be adopted, but we will put our recommendations in front of the chartering organizations for their adoptions. Then those will go to the Board for the Board's adoptions because ultimately, the Board [and] its duty will need to implement, let's say, Bylaw changes required following our recommendations.

We will also try to ensure that the subteams are efficiently coordinating, and we will make sure that we monitor the budget and the other support and financial support needed so that this is handled efficiently and responsibly. Can we see the next slide, please?

I would need some help from a co-chair. [inaudible], is this actually a slide that I should speak to, or am I turning back to Leon? Okay. This is [good] for me because I don't have the e-mail with the rotation of [chairing] in front of me. Sorry for that, and thanks for bearing with me.

The role of rapporteurs. This is actually the slide that I'm sure you all have been eagerly waiting for to discuss is something that we will take a look at now. Your duty will be to coordinate the work of the subgroups. You will have to make sure that the subgroups stay focused, that they stay within their mandate, which might require the groups to stay focused on their topic, as well as ensuring that the group does not do things that are reserved to the CCWG plenary.

You might remember that we had a couple of occasions in the CCWG Work Stream 1 work where our group got sidetracked and tried to embark on discussions that were not within our mandate according to our charter. You will do a parallel thing by looking at what you are supposed to deliver on and then call the group to order in case there are individuals or multiple individuals in your group that want to discuss things that are not within the CCWG's mandate or the subteam's mandate in particular.

The background papers have already been mentioned by Leon during his opening statement, so staff is in the process of producing or has produced background papers that will inform the work of the subteam.

You will also need to ensure that we get reports from your teams on a regular basis. Those reports shall be [useful] reports. It doesn't mean that the report themselves should take a position. I'm sure that you don't read it that way, but the report should actually reflect the positions within the CCWG subteams.

[While] all of you will have certain views or strong views on the topic that you're working on, it will be your responsibility as rapporteurs in particular to ensure that you report in a fashion that doesn't particularly highlight your own view, but that gives an accurate reflection on the state of play inside the subteams so that the CCWG can have an as neutral as possible update on where you are.

You will also, hopefully, have the pleasure to liaise with us and the other rapporteurs as appropriate, so we will try to do the coordination as

[inaudible] as possible, but as intense as required in order to get the job done.

You will need to ensure with your teams that if you need legal advice, that you frame the request for legal advice in a fashion that allows for the process of procuring legal advice to actually be successful. That means that ideally the questions that you bring forward are framed precisely enough so that they allow for the legal teams to respond to that or, where external advice is needed, for a legal advisor to [quote] for their work. Can we see the next slide, please?

The idea is that we will reduce the frequency of CCWG calls in order to give everyone room to breathe and work in the subteam. We hope that we will be able to maintain a monthly CCWG plenary meeting frequency. We might need to readjust that as required by the work that's been done and by the work that then comes from the subteams to the CCWG plenary. But the idea is that we would go to monthly calls and that before Hyderabad, that would intensify a little bit in order to make this meeting as efficient as possible.

We will have meetings with all rapporteurs before these calls to ensure that you are not reporting for the sake of reporting. We will determine whether you are on track, whether you have something to report, and whether there's enough substance to bother the whole group. According to that, we will refine the agenda for plenary meetings. We will do time allocation based on your specific needs, look at documents that need to be circulated so that people can appropriately prepare for the meetings. As always, no decisions are being taken in leadership prep or debrief calls.

[Talking about] debrief calls, we will have debrief calls after the plenaries. There might be the exceptional circumstance where we waive that, but our usual [inaudible] so far has been that debrief meetings have been very useful in order to look at what can be improved, what action items need to be worked on by whom to brief staff on where they can help us so that we can make the best out of the meetings and then take action accordingly. Next slide, please.

Let me just look at this. With respect to the subteams, I think I've covered part of that substance of the slide, but you should meet for at least one hour on a weekly basis. We think that rather than scheduling extra calls, you should rather try to make the group focus on written submissions so that we have a discussion documented on the mailing list. Some of you might prefer having more calls to have an exchange on the phone, but actually for the subteams, since a lot of folks have subscribed to multiple subgroups, it may be easier for those to follow discussions in [asynchronous]. I hope that was right: asynchronous. Now I got lost. You know what I mean. They don't have to go to a meeting on a specific time, but they can actually read the mailing list and chime in as convenient for their time zone and their other working needs.

Thanks to Greg for setting me straight on the word that I've struggled to pronounce. I'm not going to try it again, so please read what you see and read in the chat section.

The role of staff will be to participate the subteam calls, the one-hour calls, capture action items. You will need to manage your own document development, apart from the initial staff prep document. Once the subgroup has submitted their redraft, staff support will help

with document management on behalf of the CCWG. I think that's a good point in time to move to the next slide.

Another slide on the working methods. In your report to the CCWG plenary, you should try to give at least 24 hours' notice so that the CCWG can properly take a look at documents that you've prepared. This might be a challenge at times, but please do try to give at least 24 hours' notice. The rapporteurs should give written updates to the CCWG at each of its meetings. Not all of you will be able to give updates to the group in an [oral] fashion, so we need to rotate that a little bit. We expect you to come up with a draft work plan within a month of the first subgroup meeting. I think that's necessary for the groups themselves to structure their work and see whether they are on target or not with their delivery.

I think some of you have already had this in mind when we had the discussion earlier about easy topics and tougher topics. I think it was Sebastien, for example, said that he's willing to wait for the first meeting to take place to see what needs to be done. That should all go into the draft work plan then.

We have discussed legal advice briefly, so we need a formal legal request clearly stating the question and why the advice is needed. Then the legal committee will take a look at it. We as co-chairs who have the budget responsibility for this, we will then forward the request to legal counsel for a response. Next slide, please.

When it comes to the CCWG, i.e., members and participants, I spoke to the different members and participants earlier, but we look at the group

as a whole so we will try not to make a distinction between the two types of individuals working on our teams. We will not make any final decisions in a single meeting, so we're going to follow the practice of two readings. We will also endeavor to follow a 40-day public consultation period. In Work Stream 1, we had to go a little shorter at times, as you will remember. If our planning and your delivery allows, we will still try to go for a 40-day consultation in order to allow for as much time as possible for the community to review the draft recommendations.

We will then have the subteams' recommendations that are approved posted for public consultation. As I mentioned earlier, the CCWG plenary will consider the public comments. We will use the public comment review tool, take a look at what tweaks need to be made to the recommendations, and then make a determination whether the changes that we need to make to the recommendations are such that require us to do an additional public comment period before accepting any final recommendations. Next slide, please.

As I mentioned earlier, I don't have the [chairing] rotation in front of me right now. I think that this is actually the point in time for me to hand over to Leon. Isn't that right?

LEON SANCHEZ:

You are right as usual, Thomas. [inaudible] Thank you, Thomas. I think it would be good to do a small pause at this point. Before continuing with the slides, we could of course open the floor for questions. Both Mathieu and Thomas have explained the different working methods and

approaches that we suggest that each of the subgroups take on developing the work for each of the subgroups. If you have any questions or comments at this point, then it should be perfect for you to actually raise them.

I remembered that Jordan has a couple of suggestions that were considered to be quite useful, but I think Chris Wilson's hand is up. Chris, could you please take the floor?

CHRIS WILSON: Thanks, Leon. Just a quick question regarding the available time zone slots for calls. I see that on the slide, it's got 6:00 UTC, 12:00 UTC, and 19:00 UTC, but I think in an earlier e-mail from Karen, the suggested time slots were 5:00 UTC, 13:00 UTC, and 20:00 UTC. Do we have clarification on which is the correct three time zone slots?

LEON SANCHEZ: [inaudible] actually, Karen's hand is up, so Karen, I think you want to answer that.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes. Thank you very much, Leon. Actually, these were just suggestions. I know previously there was a discussion about doing the 5:00, 13:00, and 20:00 slots for August. Then we're considering the slots for September. The critical [path] for staff support is we're down to three people at the moment, so we can only support so many slots per week in terms of the subgroup meetings. Just keep that in mind. Let us know what three time zone slots would be the most appropriate for your

group to take on for August. Then we can reconsider that in September if you'd like.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Karen. I think that the spirit of this rotation is to of course try to distribute the pain amongst the different zones and the [budgets] and the [inaudible] belonging to each of the different zones. Of course, we'll look into it.

Next on the queue, I have Jordan. Jordan Carter?

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Leon. I'm just trying to unmute myself. The only thing I was going to suggest was that, given the widely diverse participation in all of the groups, I think it would be ideal if we used as few phone calls as possible. I can think of phone calls being useful at the start for everyone to table their perspectives and so on, and then after that, for resolving deadlock or finalizing proposals. But if as much as possible we use e-mail and share documents in between, I think it will be easier to manage the pace of the workflow. It might be able to be more spread out, and it'll be more inclusive of the people who live in strange time zones like me. Thanks.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Jordan. That, of course, would be useful, as you say, to try to avoid the hurdle of the different time zones. It would foster, I think, a more collaborative effort across the different regions and time zones. Next, I have Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Leon. Jordan, I appreciate your proposal, and I'm sure that's going to work for many if not all of our work groups, but we've come in with fairly reasonably established and agreed to, I gather by the lack of howling complaint from any of us, working methods. I think we're risking micromanagement if we expect all of the DTs to work in exactly the same way. Some may require the regular, routine, weekly calls as proposed all the way through. Some DTs may not.

Obviously, however, the shared documents and use of wikis and e-mail lists is an essential tool for all of us to use. I just want to caution us against doing the "thou shalt," especially this early in the process. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Do we have any other comments or questions? Jordan, is that an old hand or a new hand? I assume it's an old hand. Thanks.

We'll continue to move on with the slides. As you can see in your screen, we have this calendar for August, and of course the different subgroups and some additional meetings that could be taking place. I think that this slide is self-explanatory. We have nine one-hour slots per week, and we should allocate them accordingly with the time zones that we have just discussed.

I guess it would be up to each of the rapporteurs from the different subgroups to suggest the time for your calls. This way, staff would

coordinate with each of the rapporteurs from each of the subgroups to allocate the different time slots so you can hold your meetings and of course be provided with staff support. Can we move to the next slide, please? Thank you.

In regard to the CCWG plenary schedule from now to Hyderabad, we have determined that our next plenary meeting will be on August 9. Then, as you can see, we will be having meetings every other week. We will be meeting twice a month on September, October, November, and December. We have also allocated a slot for November 2, which will be [actually in] Hyderabad.

We must figure out which are the best dates to allocate for the meetings in September, October, and December. For these, we need to of course get to know the working plan and the schedules of the subgroups to better adjust the dates of each month's meeting so that we make the best use of everyone's time and not have meetings that are not fruitful. Next slide, please.

As I said at the beginning, you already know that staff has been drafting some papers for each of the different topics for [Work Stream 2]. The status is that which you have on your screen. Diversity is on final drafting. The human rights paper is completed and posted. The jurisdiction is on final drafting. The SO and AC accountability as well is on final drafting. The Ombudsman is completed and posted. The transparency is on final drafting. The staff accountability as well is on final drafting. Then the [guidelines for] standards of conduct presumed to be in good faith associated with exercising removal of individual

ICANN Board directors has been completed and posted, and the review of the CEP is on final drafting.

Let me remind you that these papers are a tool for the working groups. This would feed into your discussion, but also be the baseline for any documents that you might want to produce and that you would like to get help from staff to actually draft your final documents.

I don't know if everyone has already the location for these documents, but we will ask staff to remind us all on the location and the links for these documents and keep us posted as soon as they continue to post and complete the rest of the documents. Can we move to the next slide, please? This is the time where I turn back to Mathieu.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you, Leon. Just checking whether there were any outstanding questions on the previous slides. Yes, [there's] Niels. Yes? If you're [speaking], I can't hear you right now. Niels, you're silent on my side. Niels, will you try and fix the audio? Maybe let's hear Sebastien first and then go back over to you. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Mathieu. Can you hear me okay?

MATHIEU WEILL:

Yes.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Because I changed system since the last time I talked. Thank you. I just wanted to be sure about the status of the documents. It's written, finalized? I want to be sure that if everything from the comments, from the documents we wrote and so on are taken in each of these documents. I ask this question because I am not sure about that. I remember, for example, that about [inaudible] some proposals were made in comments, particularly the one comment I made. It's not the question of what I wrote is important. It's to be sure that from the staff point of view, is everything it's included in those documents. Thank you.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thanks, Sebastien. I don't know if, Karen, you wanted to comment on that.

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes, thank you. We wanted to let you know that the papers actually are meant to be a compendium of what the issue is from the previous Work Stream 1 report and provide references that are related to that topic from other documents, both within ICANN as well as [inaudible] references externally. I can use human rights for example. We've noted the work at IETF and some other organizations that have been engaged in human rights and Internet discussions.

We're attempting to assemble that kind of reference compendium for each of the subgroups so they have that as a foundation for their work. With Grace leaving in the middle of trying to finish up all of these papers, we haven't gotten them all completed yet. We are working

diligently to get those finished and get them to the groups as quickly as possible.

MATHIEU WEILL:

Thank you, Karen. Niels, your hand disappeared, and I'm not sure I saw any question in the chat from you. Are you still with us? No. I'm not seeing Niels. You were asking in the chat whether we will discuss with our group what the best times would be for meeting and then request the time slots.

If you are feeling comfortable enough to request the time slots right now after this call, please do. That's going to be helping the organization a lot. If you start like this and then adjust with your group, then it's up to you. Good. That's answering your questions.

Moving to the last part of this agenda is the draft travel support process that we have to define because we have basically 20 travel slots available for our group. That's been the outcome of the discussion with ICANN. The co-chairs have the pleasure to be able to allocate this amount, and we would like to have as much clarity as possible up front about how this is going to take place.

The draft that you have in front of you is based on what we did so far with the CCWG, which was to basically see who's requesting funding and provide funding for members in priority. When members could not make it, we sometimes allow the possibility for alternates.

I think this raises a question that we wanted to raise with you as rapporteurs, which is that some of you are not members of the CCWG.

We can go with that member-focused approach. We can introduce some flexibility for the rapporteurs, but we also have to think about what would be the criteria if we have more requests than available travel slots. That's a discussion we would like to start with you to get your input, feedbacks before going to the full group obviously with that discussion.

What you're seeing on the slide is the basic. This is how we've done so far. This is designed to hear your views on that process before we go to the full group with this. It's going to be pretty soon because I understand that once we have confirmation of the date of our face-to-face for Hyderabad, the turnaround for requesting travel support is going to be pretty short because of the lead time that's necessary for the travel team to book everything. It's pretty necessary that we get your informal feedbacks at this point and then that we go to the group on this.

One of the questions is from Avri on the ATRT expert task. I think there would be no reason to not continue that, given that some of the topics are still very much related to the ATRT previous exercises.

I'm trying to follow in the chat, but if you want to ask a question, please raise your hand as well. Ed is asking whether one night [adds] would be available for those who are already covered elsewhere. I don't know if that would be possible to factor in into the process. We'll need to check with [Bernie] and the finance project team whether that has been factored in. That might seem a small addition, so maybe we can do that if we have less than 20 or something, but we need to check with them. I

know Bernie is on vacation right now, so we'll check with him on this question, which is a good one. We need to [take that on].

Any other comments, feedbacks on this? Good. We will try to clear that question up and then open the discussion to the full group so it's transparent what kind of process we're going to use for Hyderabad. Karen, your hand is raised.

KAREN MULBERRY:

Yes. In terms of the draft travel support, I believe that the approach was if we could break things up and therefore if one traveler only needed an additional hotel room or per diem, we could split this up. Right now, the budget is just set for 20 slots for seven days. That's airfare, hotel, and per diem. If we can break that up to accommodate, as Ed proposed, maybe just an additional hotel room night, then that might leave airfare and the other six nights for someone else so that we can accommodate more than 20 people. In terms of the budget amount, that's a dollar figure that was put together by the budget committee for travel support for meetings.

The more we could accommodate, I think the better off the group could be if they could split up. I think we're trying to address that when we get down to the form we developed to go along with the travel policy so that it creates that flexibility.

MATHIEU WEILL:

That's on the next slide, right, Karen?

KAREN MULBERRY: Yes.

MATHIEU WEILL: Okay. We'll try to do that. I think the idea is that we have a set envelope for each meeting. If we can find a way to optimize this, I think we'll try to do that as much as possible because the purpose is to have an inclusive face-to-face with as many diverse participants as possible, obviously with the lowest cost possible. We'll try to use good sense, but that's something we're going to try the first time and be transparent about. Maybe we'll learn from our mistakes. [inaudible]

The next slide probably is the follow up on the form. That has been shared maybe already. For the process, if you have feedbacks in the next 24/48 hours about this travel support application process, please do share it with us. We'll try to take that on board as much as possible. Stay tuned for the confirmation of the meeting in Hyderabad because the deadlines are going to be pretty short in terms of requesting travel support if you do.

I think with that, I'm moving back to Thomas for the last slide.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks, Mathieu. I guess that you've all been waiting for the slide which is actually the last slide to close this meeting. Before we do, I would like to give you the opportunity to make some closing remarks or ask additional questions or bring up an AOB. Is there anything that you would like to raise? Niels? I'm not sure whether your hand has been lowered in the meantime. Was that a new hand?

NIELS TEN OEVER: I'm here. I hope you can hear me better now. Does this work?

THOMAS RICKERT: Yes, we can hear you. [inaudible]

NIELS TEN OEVER: Excellent. I just saw the latest version of the human rights paper, and there are actually quite a couple of mistakes or representations that weren't intended during the drafting of that paper. I don't know if it was finalized. I do not think I was contacted about that. I would [inaudible] something [inaudible] some reference in there that are there now actually do not make sense. Could we correct that, and if so, what would be the best process to do so?

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks, Niels. Since those papers have been worked on by staff, I guess it would be best for you to send it to staff. Maybe staff can help me as to who's been working on that specific paper. Has that been Grace?

KAREN MULBERRY: This is Karen, if I can assist. Yes, Grace was the primary author, and I have been doing some supporting work with this. We also have someone on staff who is very engaged in human rights work in our development group, and we have been working with her, as well.

We're happy for corrections. It's based on a limited scope and work that we have been engaged in, so anything you would like to add, Niels, to the paper or correct in the paper, if you would like to send it to staff support, we can get that reposted on the wiki. We have an updated reference document to start working from.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks very much, Karen, and thanks, Niels, for the question. Niels, please send that to staff and then staff will work with you to get the errors corrected.

I think this has been a tough ride. A lot of requirements for the rapporteurs, a lot of duties, a lot of interaction with the leadership team, as well as with the subteam, as well as with the CCWG plenary. We do hope that we haven't put you off the idea of volunteering to be a rapporteur. It's going to be work. It's going to be a lot of work. We will have some challenging discussions, but I think that Leon and Mathieu will agree with me that even in Work Stream 1 – maybe the rapporteurs for Work Stream 1 will also agree – even though it has been an enormous task, it has been very gratifying and a lot of fun many times.

Please feel free to contact us in case you have questions. I think we can get this pulled up and continue writing history for this organization and for the multistakeholder model in general. Thanks to all of you for your time. I hope that you're as energized as we are. We've done an awesome job so far. Let's keep up the good work.

Thanks, all of you, and talk to you soon. Bye bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]