>>THOMAS RICKERT: Operator, can we get the recording started, please? Thanks very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is Thomas Rickert speaking, one of the three co-chairs of the CCWG, and I'd like to welcome all of you to this face-to-face meeting of the CCWG accountability at ICANN61. And I would like not only to welcome the attendees in this room, some of which are still going to their seats, but also a warm welcome to the remote participants. And thank you in particular to the remote participants because it's always much more challenging to follow such a long session remotely. So thank you so much for your energy, for your interest in this important topic. And I hope that we're going to have a very interesting, fruitful, and good working day together.

now, I do not know whether I have scroll control. I don't think I have. So if somebody could please move that slide in the Adobe room. So as you can see, the first topic on the agenda next to coffee, which certainly is the most important topic for everyone at this time of the day, is the review of the agenda. So you see the agenda in front of you, and I should say that we already got one request from Kavouss to move things slightly with respect to the second reading of the jurisdiction report. And our suggestion would be to try to keep the agenda as is because our great Bernie has kindly put UTC starting times next to all of the agenda items and we do think that particularly the remote participants expect us to stop on time. To start and stop on time. So while there might be changes to the agenda based on our discussions today, what I would really like to avoid is mixing things around before we even start. So there is a speciality about this jurisdiction topic because we have that on the agenda twice. And you will have seen that Bernie has made this abundantly clear on our behalf yesterday on the mailing list, this is somewhat unusual for our working practices, but in order to be able to make things on time for the final report, we need to be somewhat flexible. So I expect our substantive discussion on the jurisdiction final report, or at least the changes to it -- and there are not too many

substantial changes, I should say -- I expect the substantive discussion to take place during the first part of our discussion. I do not expect any additional debate during the second part. So the second part, which I think is agenda item number 11, the second reading should be a mere formality. So those who are -- who have things to say on jurisdiction should make sure they say them during the first session and if, for example, they want to put on the record an objection or an additional remark, which they want to make at the second part, make it during the first session and we will make sure that we read it into the record of the meeting for the second half of that meeting. So I hope that this is something that works for everyone, which actually would be great. Let me open it up to the floor and to the remote participants to make additional comments on the agenda, if any. So I see Kavouss' hand is raised and then Sebastien. Kavouss, you go first, please.

>>KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, good afternoon, good morning, good evening to all of you and I (indiscernible) is categorically rejected. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Kavouss, maybe it's only me, I'm looking at my co-chairs. I had a very hard time understanding what you were saying and the captioning didn't really work. So I need somebody's help.

>>KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I repeat --

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Please do repeat.

>>KAVOUSS ARASTEH: (indiscernible) to attend remotely at the second reading of jurisdiction. That is why I have asked exceptionally, humbly, and respectfully to move it a little bit earlier within the first two and a half or three hours in order that I could attend at the second reading. But it seems that this request was rejected. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much. Kavouss, I would suggest that we see how we're doing. I outlined the general response that we had to offer on this. If we're doing extremely quickly, then we might be able to honor that request. Thanks very much. I see Sebastien's hand is raised as well. Sebastien, over to you.

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Sebastien speaking for transcript purposes, Sebastien Bachollet. First of all, I don't think that Antony Van Couvering or Olga Cavalli was talking before in this arena. It must be Kavouss all this three items. Just be careful to give your

name before because at the end of the day your name will not be recorded the right way if it's happened not to be your name here. Sorry for that.

 And my point, and I would like to apologize, I was not very concentrated on the preparation of this meeting today, but I -- I wanted to understand where we will discuss what I call overarching issue or a cross subtopic issue or whatever name we want to give them because I have the impression we jump directly to planning going forward after the public consultation. But before the public consultation, we need to create the document. And the document will be with all the document made by the subgroup but there will be one part must be done by us to create those items where there are discussion between subgroup or new items or whatever who are dealing with cross -- with overarching issue and I don't see where it will be discussed. And I understand that then we will have to discuss or to go to public consultation and what will be the work that we will have to do after that. In the same vein, when the -- I think we need also to have some discussion about the implementation phase of the Work Stream 2 work because when our work will be finished, I will say it will just start to be implemented and I guess our participation, or some of us, will be needed for when we will think about that also. And sorry to not have said that by mail before the meeting. Thank you.

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Sebastien. And no apology required. You make great points. First of which is we need to make sure that the captioning is corrected because Antony Van Couvering, as much as we would like him in the room, is definitely not here. So let's take this as an encouragement and reminder to state our names clearly before we speak. My name is Thomas Rickert so that we can get that corrected in the -- in the chat.

 The other point is about the report and how the report is put together. And Sebastien, I suggest that we discuss this when we get to discussing the final report, which I think is at -- Bernie, you need to help me, at 11:00, isn't it?

 >> After lunch.

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: The first item after lunch, Sebastien. So that's when we're going to discuss how we're going to put everything together. And we also have a session on the next steps that's planning going forward after the public consultation. That is actually the -- the last session before we break for lunch between 11:00 and 12:00 a.m. local time, 15 to 16 UTC. And

that's where we're going to discuss how we can have some impact on the implementation. So just double-checking, Sebastien, so these three points, you know, the attribution of comments has been covered and the two other points are going to be touched upon in the last session before lunch and the first session after lunch. Great. So there are no additional hands. Let's then take the -- the schedule as adopted and move to the next slide, please.

Introduction update to SOIs. Do we have any updates to statements of interest? There don't seem to be any. Should you have any, you know you can do that on the ICANN Web site. It's no problem at all to have an interest. You just need to declare which interest you represent.

In terms of introduction, I think I've covered that already. I mean, we've had a lot of these meetings, and let me say although we are slightly fewer people than before the transition, I'd really like to applaud all of you for having the stamina to go through this with us as a team. I mean, this is really remarkable. I think it's been unprecedented in ICANN. You know, this is really an -- an Herculean task, and you guys made this possible. And this might be the last but one time we're going to have a meeting such as this. It may already be over at ICANN62. Who would have thought that? There will be a big vacuum for everyone. So I hope that we're going to jointly overcome the trauma. Maybe we're going to have a fake CCWG, an unofficial CCWG at ICANN63 so that we can jointly get through that difficult phase of emptiness. But before we do, let's try to survive this and get our recommendations through. So next slide, please.

ICANN expected standards of behavior. We are reminding everyone of those standards each and every time. Some of you just see the slides with the nice visualizations and just forget about them soon again. This is actually important stuff. This is the basis for us working amicably together. So even though you know everything that's on there, it's worthwhile taking a closer look at what's in it so that we can all take it to heart and work even more collegially together as we move on. Next slide, please. Okay. So on administration.

>>JORDAN CARTER: I'm chairing this part.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: I'm going to hand over to Jordan.

>>JORDAN CARTER: Thomas has clearly got a flight brain this morning. Or maybe it's the GDPR.

We're going to share this.

My name is Jordan Carter, one of the other cochairs from the ccNSO.

Running you quickly through two administrative items. The first is the plenary dates going forward. A schedule there is on the screen in front. And the point of these meetings is not necessarily that we're going to all need to do all of these meetings but that it is better to schedule them so we have the time, if we need it, to deal with the public comments that will come in on the presentation of the integrated report. And, if we don't need the meetings, we'll cancel them.

It's a longstanding way of operating that we schedule and cancel rather than not schedule and then have to add meetings at the last minute. So that's a kind of weekly cycle from a point that starts after the closing of the public comments

heading up towards a face-to-face meeting in Panama.

The next bullet point there is about that. Don't forget the applications for travel funding to the Panama meeting close on the 19th of March at the end of the day UTC. And the same applicability rules apply as have applied to the last few trips we've done.

Bernie, is there anything you want to add on those two points?

>>BERNIE TURCOTTE: Simply on the plenary dates going forward, we've estimated when we planned to have the public consultation date completed. And so that's why we've included those weekly meetings there. And, as Jordan has said, if we don't need them, great, we'll just cancel them. But better to have them scheduled than not.

And, for the travel funding, our process is so well-rounded, if you will, that we expect that we'll probably be sending in the information to ICANN travel probably on the 20th or the 21st of March given that we're used to getting this all together for them very easily. Thank you.

>>JORDAN CARTER: Now I'll hand off to Tijani for the budget update.

>>TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Thank you very much. My name is Tijani Ben Jemaa. I am the third co-chair from ALAC. From the budget you will see that we are very good. We didn't spend a lot. I think we are very good the issue of the budget. And Bernie will give us the details of that.

>>BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Tijani. Can we have the budget slide up, please.

Thank you.

Uncertain if you can really read that. But the point is we continue to do very well with the community side of the budget. The ICANN side we're basically on track. And so, you know, we'll be allowed to take questions. But we continue to be, if you will -- our up to now good management of our resources from the community point of view. Thank you.

>>TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Bernie. I give the floor to Thomas.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: For that one, Greg, do you want to come up on the podium? So this is going to be the first reading of the final recommendations after the public consultation. You all have received two documents, one of which is the clean version of the jurisdiction report and then the markup version of the jurisdiction report. We have not prepared slides to highlight the changes. But I would hope that all of you have the jurisdiction report in front of you. My suggestion would be, Greg, that we walk through the red line version and that you briefly talk the group through the changes that have been made. It's already on the screen as I can see. So over to you, Greg. I would suggest that we go through the changes one by one and pause after the introduction of the change briefly to see whether there's any question or comment from the floor.

>>GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Thomas, and thank you, everyone. We'll dive directly in. Hopefully, you have the red line version in front of you. It's in an email from Bernie that came relatively recently.

So the first change, of course, is that the date is changed on the front cover from November 2017 to March 2018, just the inexorable change of time.

The first change of any substance is on page three in the section -- this is in the executive summary summarizing the recommendations.

The heading for the OFAC sanctions-related portion says, "Recommendations related to OFAC sanctions and related sanctions issues." This is reflected in the text with a slight --

>> We don't have it on screen. Sorry to interrupt. Can we have it on screen?

>>THOMAS RICKERT: We are working on it. The version that you're asking for to on screen, Brenda, who is working our Adobe room so perfectly, she has a file with the red line version, but it's corrupt. So we need to get her the fresh version of the document so it's going to be up in the Adobe momentarily. Thanks for your patience.

>>GREG SHATAN: I hope that's just a coincidence that it's been corrupted.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: We're talking about the document, not about the rapporteur.

>>GREG SHATAN: In any case, I am incorruptible. My Paypal, by the way, is -- oh, sorry.

So this is reflected in the text. The -- which is really just to add a footnote, actually. The word "particularly" is crossed out just because of the way red lining works. And let me read the footnote to the particularly OFAC sanctions.

"In the future, if ICANN's activities are affected by other similar sanctions, e.g., similar in scope, type, and effect and with similar methods of relief for entities not specifically sanctioned, the spirit of these recommendations should guide ICANN's approach."

I'm not following the Adobe. So, if there's anything that goes on there I should know -- I didn't bring a second screen with me. Sorry. So that is the first change.

The second change on that same page is in the footnote to the term "best efforts" which has now been added. There was quite a bit of discussion about what "best efforts" means and whether it includes the concept of reasonableness inherent or if you need to qualify it explicitly, we found a middle path which the footnote I think reflects.

The footnote reads as follows: "The term 'best efforts' as used throughout this report should be understood to be limited by reasonableness. Meaning that an entity, here ICANN, must use its best efforts except for any efforts that would be unreasonable. For example, the entity can take into account its fiscal health and its fiduciary duties and any other relevant facts and circumstances. In some jurisdictions, this limitation is inherent in the use and meaning of the term 'best efforts.' However, in other jurisdictions this may not be the case. And, thus, this is necessary to explicitly state the limitation for the benefit of those in such jurisdictions."

Moving on, the next change is on page 5 of the red line. And it's in the summary of OFAC sanctions and recommendation for approval of gTLD registries. Previously, the report stated that the subgroup recommends that ICANN should commit to applying for and using best efforts to secure an OFAC license for all such applicants if the applicant is otherwise qualified.

This has been changed slightly to read "as the applicant would otherwise be approved."

Moving on, the next change is in the middle of page 6.

Not really substantive, but just a little bit more of a transitional sentence or a note to the reader. "in the choice of law and venue provisions in the registry agreement," after we state that the subgroup identified several alternative approaches for the registry agreement, we now also say that the body of the report discusses the advantages and disadvantages of each approach. Rather than summarizing that discussion here in the executive summary, we just point the reader to the full text for those discussions.

The next change is at the top of page 7. Regarding the adoption or how we would like to see the -- or how we'd recommend that menu be adopted, a menu of potential choices of jurisdictions for choice of law.

We've kept the first sentence which reads, "The subgroup has not determined what the menu items should be but believes there should be a balance between the advantages and disadvantages applying to the same base RA which likely suggests having a relatively limited number of choices on the menu."

Previously we stated, "The subgroup has also not determined how options will be chosen from the menu, e.g. the registry could simply choose from the menu or it could be negotiated with ICANN."

This has now been changed to reflect a preference and now reads, "The subgroup recommends that the registry choose from among the options on the menu, i.e, the choice would not be negotiated with ICANN.

>>STEVE DELBIANCO: Greg? Steve DelBianco. Would you take a quick question on that? I fully support that edit. For clarification, I would presume then that ICANN legal wouldn't have put things on the menu unless it was fully prepared to agree to them should a registry pick from among the menu. That's the whole point of avoiding the negotiation step is that ICANN would preselect menu items that it was prepared to accept. Thank you.

>>GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Steve. Our report does not actually recommend how the meeting is developed. We expect that one potential model is that it be -- in essence the list be negotiated with ICANN so that everything is precleared. But that is not a foregone conclusion. Perhaps it might a little too cavalier to call that an implementation detail. But, nonetheless, the

door is open for any number of variations one could imagine. And we've left that for subsequent work.

Practically speaking, it would make sense if you have a -- the choice of the contracted party to be able to freely choose. The list should be from one that does not cause heartburn and has been precleared. But stranger things have happened than that.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks for your question, Greg, and for the response. Steve and Greg. Sorry.

I guess this is an ideal point to keep in mind when we talk about how to implement the Work Stream 2 recommendations. Because it quite nicely shows the group has come up with several options. The group has identified the menu option as the preferred option because that's the one that says the subteam reports. For others it says other possibilities are. But then the question is, you know, how do you deal with these different options where the Work Stream 2 subteam has preferred the menu option. And then, within the menu option, you still have a lot of variety when it comes to implementation.

How can this be operationalized. We think that this is something for the board to discuss with the community in terms of prioritization, budget allocation, and so on and so forth, so we're going to discuss this later during this day.

But I guess, you know, those are examples where all of us need to think about meaningful ways to help ICANN, the organization, kick off this process with the community to come to meaningful results.

>>GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Thomas. And just to mention an additional layer of complexity, since we're talking about changes to the base RA and base RAA, there are processes that have been agreed on how those will be dealt with, primarily by the contracted parties and by ICANN. So this is not a -- necessarily a recommendation that can be adopted by just by ICANN's board agreeing to it. So this is really in a sense has a level of being advisory as opposed to binding. But clearly, the will of the community should this be approved is clear.

Moving on, the next substantive change most -- is on page 12. All of the ones in between were just changes in the typography of the document, pagination and the like.

In this section we summarize what happened between November and March, so that we could update the work of the subgroup since the previous document was published. This reads, as follows: "The subgroup's proposed recommendations were submitted to the CCWG accountability plenary. The CCWG accountability WS2 plenary meeting on 27 October 2017 included a discussion focused on jurisdiction issues. The draft report was approved by consensus as defined in the CCWG accountability charter and not by full consensus." Footnote there to our charter, section 5A, "Full consensus, a position where no minority disagrees identified by an absence of objection. B, Consensus, a position where a small minority disagrees but most agree. In the absence of full consensus the chairs should allow for the submission of minority viewpoints and these, along with the consensus view, shall be included in the report."

Picking back up in the text, "The government of Brazil, which did not support approving the report, prepared a dissenting opinion which was supported by several other participants and can be found in annex E of the report. A transcript of the plenary discussions is included as annex F to this report. As a result of these discussions, the section further discussions of jurisdiction related concerns was added to the draft report, suggesting a path forward for these concerns beyond the CCWG accountability through a further other multistakeholder process." The draft report was published for public comment on November 14, 2017. The public comment period closed on January 14, 2018. 15 comments were received. These comments may be found at https:\mm.icann.org\pipermail\comments-jurisdiction-recs-14nov17. These comments were summarized by ICANN staff in a quote, unquote, comment tool spreadsheet which may be found at insert link, which we will do. These comments were each duly considered and discussed by the subgroup. Where this led to a change to the subgroup's consensus, the draft report was then changed to reflect the new consensus.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: So I see Thiago's hand is raised. Thiago, the floor is yours.

>>THIAGO JARDIM: Good morning, everyone. Thiago speaking for the record on behalf of the Brazilian government. I would like first of all to thank on behalf of the -- the chairs of the CCWG for the work you, we have put into this report as we attempt to complete it within the appropriate delays and deadlines.

My comment, if I may, will try to bring back one of the suggestions that I put to the subgroup during our last call, and the suggestion that I made at that time, for those who were unable to follow it, was to add a final paragraph to this summary part in which we explain that several comments that the subgroup received relating in particular to the need for the discussion on jurisdiction to continue at another process, for those comments to somewhat be reflected in that summary part. As you can see the very end of the summary refers to the comments that were duly considered and that eventually led to changes in the report. But as you all know, many comments that the subgroup received, to my understanding, was not as thoroughly considered as others, particularly because the subgroup felt that they were already addressed by the subgroup's suggestion that there would be a need for further discussions to be taken at a different time. So in respect to these comments that echoed many of our concerns, I believe it would be appropriate to add another paragraph to this description part in which the subgroup acknowledges that many comments were received expressing the need for further discussions on jurisdiction to be carried on but the subgroup did not consider them in detail because there was this feeling among the subgroup members that those concerns had already been somewhat addressed since the subgroup included the reference for these need for further discussions to happen. Otherwise, I believe that this description is not completely accurate, particularly because it ends with a reference that all the comments were duly considered. Thank you very much.

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Thiago. Now, this was discussed in the subteam already and we have a typical way of dealing with public comment. And usually public comment, unless it warrants changes to the report, is not repeated in the body of the report but it's made reference to in the public comment review tool. So when Thiago made the suggestion this was discussed in the subteam and the subteam ended up with the report in its current form. So just in terms of clarifying what we are doing today, as a plenary, the question to the plenary both on site as well as remotely is to see whether Thiago's repeated request to put more substance of their comments into the body of the report, which has been refused by the subteam, is supported by the plenary so that the report is changed.

So let me pause for a moment and see whether this suggestion gets traction. We have a queue forming. There's Milton and Kavouss. Milton, let me ask you up front, you made a comment in the chat. If you plan to speak to the qualified term, I would suggest that we go to that later and deal with this first. If you want to talk about Thiago's intervention, please do go ahead. Milton, over to you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, for the record, Kavouss Arasteh speaking. (indiscernible) I supported that comment before and I (indiscernible) support that now. (indiscernible) plenary and I would like to ask something (indiscernible), the commenter was not a member (indiscernible) unfortunately due to the (indiscernible) substance was not properly taken into account because they were (indiscernible) so there were already some objection not to take that into account. So comments like this (indiscernible) not fully considered and not taken into account. So I couldn't support (indiscernible) intervention and (indiscernible) not be interpreted that we criticized very good work done by (indiscernible). We appreciate very much (indiscernible) the views of those intervention to be taken into account and (indiscernible). Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Kavouss. Next is line in Greg, and then we'll move to Jorge.

>>GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Greg Shatan, for the record. I just want to reiterate, perhaps in some more detail, what the process was that we used with the comments. Each of the comments was kind of chopped up a bit into the constituent topics and then placed on a big spreadsheet which we call the comment tool. This allowed us to compare the portions of the different comments on the same topic, each to the other. Then we had this. And then we color-coded it to indicate whether we felt it was supportive of what was already in the comments or at variance -- sorry, supportive of what was already in the report or at variance with the report in some fashion or otherwise. And then we ran through -- I should say we read through each of the comments equally and gave each of them the same amount of consideration. Some of them inspired more discussion in the group than others. Some, after those discussions, were not -- did not cause changes to the consensus and others did. But it was certainly my goal and my impression after we were done that we had given equal, full, and due consideration to each and every one of the reports, or each and every one of the

comments. I would expect that the decision of the subgroup not to include this comment meant that I was not mistaken in my impression of our work. It would be rather a failing to have glossed over any comments. And if I recall correctly, because of the overall nature of comments that are being referred to, they were actually coded red, which meant that they were not nearly supportive of the -- of the report which meant that they probably got more consideration than the -- those that were, for instance, coded green. So that's the -- the way that we proceeded. Of course, you're free to discuss this change as that's in our work, but I did want to give you my summary of how I believe and recall that we proceeded. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much. We have more comments. So Jorge now and then David.

>>JORGE CANCIO: Thank you and good morning to everyone. I have perhaps a certain perception that we are talking across each other and because if I look into the text that was proposed by Thiago as the final compromised proposal for this comment, I see very much of a factual reflection of some of the comments that were basically made by a number of governments that went on the question of further discussions and mention also especially the question of jurisdiction -- jurisdictional immunities. And in the comment and in the note proposed by Brazil, it is just stated, which I think is factually true, that these comments did not bring any changes to the report and they could not be considered in detail because, amongst other things, we didn't know we were bound to certain time constraints.

So I think that really I -- I don't see the issue with adding this or very similar text and that's why I just wanted to repeat for the record that I was in agreement with that addition. Thank you

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Jorge. David.

>>DAVID McAULEY: Thank you, Thomas. This is David McAuley speaking, for the record. I rose, put my hand up to support what Greg said and to underscore the idea of consideration of comments. And I would like to note that when I was participating in the jurisdiction subgroup as I did, I read the tool that was produced and I read the comments as well. And I think other participants may have done the same. And so the fact that there was some silence in some respects doesn't mean comments were not considered. And I was fairly silent -- I made one or two comments -- fairly silent along the way because I thought the right result was being done. I

think in sum it's good to note that the final report contains a suggestion for further jurisdiction discussions. That's a concept I didn't support, but I'm a member of the group, I recognize that's part of the report. It is what it is. And it's in there. Asking for the concept of immunity -- I was just reading the paragraph that Thiago put in the chat -- the concept of immunity now be explicitly stated, that's part of the reason I didn't make comments along the line is because immunity was not stated. And there's a risk in giving direction or suggested direction to further discussions of calling out the idea of immunity. Those engaged in further discussions can decide their agenda. But immunity is a concept that needs to be approached carefully because immunities can undue the accountability measures that we have put in place for the last three and a half years. And so that was the reason for my caution. And so I want to support Greg, and I would simply say I'm not supporting an additional paragraph. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, David. We have Thiago or Benedicto back in the queue.

>>THIAGO JARDIM: Thank you. Thiago speaking, for the record. I hear David's concern, and I would be -- we would be happy to strike out reference to immunity in the paragraph that we suggested. We believe that the substance of it would still be an accurate reflection of what happened and we don't need to give specific examples of what were those substantive comments that were received and eventually did not lead to any changes nor could be considered in detail during the subgroup work.

Having said that, if I can make another suggestion to the chairs regarding the procedure that we may follow in order to eventually accept the inclusion of the suggested paragraph, perhaps Greg could help me here as well to remind everyone of how we came to this situation. During our last call I did suggest the inclusion of an additional paragraph very late in the call. But to my understanding, my suggestion received active support from some participants, myself, the representative of Switzerland, the representative of Iran, and other members which I see as traditionally opposed, due to their own reasons, to our proposals. They did not manifest any strong objection it to. They even suggested that it would only be necessary for my proposal to go to the list to get the -- the stamp of approval. But then according to the (indiscernible)

understanding of the rules of the process, it would be necessary active support from the majority of subgroup participants.

We know that in this late stage of our work we're a bit tired. They're not following as actively as they were in the beginning the process of the mailing list.

So what I would suggest for us to hear is to see whether there is any strong objection. And then we applied the same standards that we have been applying to other suggestions for changes in the report. That is, if there is a sufficiently strong objection to the text as suggested, then it wouldn't and shouldn't go to the report. And we would be, again, relying on those rules that would require strong objection, which is not just the objection of one or two or even the objection of the rapporteur, who I understand should keep doing his excellent job as being a neutral participant when it comes to appreciating the level of consensus within the group. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks, Thiago. Before I respond, let's go to Greg. And then I guess we can then close the queue on this point.

>>GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Greg Shatan. A few things. First, we did take a consensus call out to the group. And the consensus was not to accept this.

Second, there seems to be some difficulty in perceiving when comments are actually supportive or not. I think, in particular, the comment about taking it to the list was made by David McAuley who has indicated he did not support the inclusion of this statement. And, frankly, I've noticed a continued inability to note when statements that are made are actually supportive of comments or not. And it's unfortunate that we have to distinguish between those who are perceived to be in support and those who are actually in support. It's better to let people speak for themselves.

So, in any case, there are a number of substantive issues with this suggestion. First, it's -- while these are stated as facts, I find them to be factually inaccurate. First, the statement on, in particular, jurisdictional immunities who I acknowledged Thiago already said he would withdraw, if you read into the report, it does not say anything about, in particular, on jurisdictional immunities. It only says, as an example, there were discussions of limited, partial, relative, or tailored immunity for ICANN that did not come to conclusion.

The statement that these could not be considered in detail is incorrect or inaccurate. I did not find a belief by others perhaps other than those who essentially after the call had already broken up supported this suggestion.

As I said before, it was my intention that we give every comment an appropriate amount of detail or similar amount of detail. I believe that we succeeded. If that's not the case, then perhaps we should reopen our work. Because that was certainly the intent.

As to the understanding that there was existing -- that because there was existing support for further discussions in the document that we could not consider them in detail, there was no such understanding in the group. There was just the general understanding that comments that took a position that was consistent with the report did not change the report and would not be mentioned. And that, generally speaking, as was mentioned, we don't discuss what the comments themselves say. We just change the report. But, since the report is our recommendations and the report is a summary of our work, the comments are included and they speak for themselves. So that -- you know, with that, I think it's -- I would not support this. I believe that it's not an issue of neutrality to wish that the work of the group is factually accurately considered.

And, finally, I would mention that the no objections process is really used when we already see strong support or appearance of strong support for an addition. And not as this one where there still seem to be significant disagreements and indeed where the consensus of the group, at least of those who responded, was that it should not be accepted. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Greg. Actually, we have additional individuals who want to speak. So we have Kavouss and then I hear that Dalila wants to speak. So we have Kavouss first and then Dalila.

>>KAVOUSS ARASTEH: This is Kavouss Arasteh speaking. I don't think Greg is required to defend what he's done. Nobody criticized him. We appreciate what he has done. The question is that during the past four years we have (indiscernible)

We have been successful to guide --- once again I request the chairs of the CCWG at this stage to try to find some sort of legal --- to take it suggesting or later suggestion from Thiago that I could also support --- second proposal --- there's no need to say that who is right, who is wrong.

That does not --- take particular positions. The chair of the group does not need to take position at all, just to conduct the meeting. Thank you.

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: Thank you, Kavouss. Maybe we could have the technical folks try another line for Kavouss. I'm sure that he will make other interventions. This is difficult to follow. Not for now, but maybe we can redial and try to improve that.

 (Speaker off microphone).

 Okay.

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: Thank you so much. Kavouss, I've just spoken to our kind technical support. And they said that you are participating from a mobile phone which causes connection issues.

 If you have a landline phone number that you can share with staff, that would be great. We will then try to dial you in via landline with a more stable connection. Great.

 Dalila, the floor is yours. Over to you.

 >>DALILA RAHMOUNI: Thank you. Just a short comment. We think that to have a very complete report reflecting the different points of view, we are convinced of the necessity to add the paragraph and the line the necessity after the words to continue the work as there is no consensus and a very strong different point of view on the report.

 Just supporting what has been said by Brazil and Thiago, we have to give --- for the direction of further discussions and guidelines. That's why we support the suggestion to add a specific paragraph on this view. Thank you.

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Dalila. Do we have any further comments on this topic? It's good. The discussion is going on.

 Christopher Wilkinson, whenever you're sitting in this room. I saw you earlier. Chris, please.

 >>CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. Since this is mainly a discussion by members of the GAC, I would defer to Olga and take the floor subsequently.

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: I hadn't even seen you'd raised your hand, Olga. What a pleasant surprise. Over to you.

 >>OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much. Just to support what our colleague from France said. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thank you very much. Steve.

>>STEVE DEL BIANCO: Thank you. I would maybe ask the colloquy of Thiago. I want to understand the context here. We were attempting during many of these transitions, to give full acknowledgment of the points that Brazil had made when it objected to the subgroup report. And there's a separate thread about whether we are following process correctly at the approval.

Let me set aside the complex point. That's a very complex one. Just in a broader context, are you suggesting that, if we add the text -- the paragraph that we have here, that Brazil would then become satisfied that the subgroup report, while not exactly what you wanted, would significantly acknowledge Brazil's concern to the point where Brazil would support or at least not object to the subgroup report once this paragraph were added. I don't mean to put you on the spot. But, personally, I need to understand where this gets us in your opinion if we add the text. Does it get us to where Brazil is okay with the report? Thank you, Thiago.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Maybe we hear Thiago immediately. And then I would like to share some of the procedural aspects for you.

>>THIAGO JARDIM: Thank you. This is appropriate, indeed. And I think I've expressed the answer very clearly, perhaps not as clear as you would have wished during our last call. The reason Brazil is suggesting the addition is in a very constructive spirit. We all know that the consolidated reports will go to the SOs and ACs once they have harmonized the different reports. It was in the spirit of being very constructive that we suggested the addition. Because we know that once it goes to the GAC, in particular, those governments that submitted comments to the subgroup will ask the question what was done to our comments? And, perhaps by looking at the decision, they will feel satisfied. They may not oppose the report, if they see the added text.

Brazil, however, will continue expressing its opposition. So we have our views, which were clearly stated at ICANN60, annexed to the report.

But, again, it was in a very constructive spirit. Because we're not alone in this process. And we acknowledge the rate of reasons that other governments and other participants in general may have once considering the substance of this report.

We believe that it would be a positive step towards getting approval of the report even if the approval doesn't come from the Brazilian government. Thank you.

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Thiago.

 Now let me try to explain our thinking in terms of process a little bit.

 There has been quite some talk about no severe objection and support. I think this discussion is probably a little bit all over the place. Let's try to focus on where we are. We have a subgroup that has produced a report. That report has gone out for public comment. The group has reviewed the public comment and then come up with a consensus report that consensus report that they come up with for the plenary.

 The question for this plenary is do we need to change what came out of the subteam? And whether or not changes to the subgroup's report are warranted depends on whether this group would actually vote the subteam's report up or down in the absence or presence of additional changes. So now I think the question to be asked is does a request for change of whatever nature that might be get so much support that it warrants for the report to be changed?

 And, if it warrants a change to the subteam's support, then the question is can the plenary just do that on the fly, or do we need to send back to the subteam for further work? I understand that this subteam -- and I couldn't follow the last two sessions because I was sick. This group has gone to great lengths to strike a very fine balance of what's acceptable to everyone.

 As you will remember we did an extra session at ICANN60 to put all the concerns and comments on the record as an additional repertory of information. So whatever changes we're making now do need to have very strong support in order to be honored. Then that beg the question how do we assess whether there is a lot of support for a change or not? And what I heard so far is that we are basically relitigating the points that have already been exchanged at the subteam level. What we really need is additional people and more importantly more groups to support such change in order to sort of undo the subteam's consensus and rework it.

 So I think, if we are doing cosmetic changes with no changes to the substance, I think in the spirit of collaboration to get this done. This is something that probably this plenary could do.

If we're talking about changes getting a lot support in this group that change the substance of the report, I'm afraid we would need to send it back to the subteam. We can't just do that on the fly here.

I see that Christopher has been waiting patiently. Christopher now and then Steve and then Greg.

>>CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Chair. Christopher Wilkinson, for the record.

And, as a preliminary, let me thank and congratulate the subgroup for its massive achievement in many other areas of this particular issue with which I take no issue. And I think, particularly regarding the sanctions, the report is extremely useful.

In response to David, I've also been relatively silent in recent months for several reasons. Partly because I feel the subgroup on this particularly institutional and high-level international and political issue, the composition of the subgroup was lacking. And particularly that we're confronted with a rather small sample of what is, in my experience, undoubtedly a very widely political opinion about ICANN and about Internet governance internationally. To take a colloquial expression, this report will have legs. Thiago has already outlined the legs it will have in the GAC. It won't stop there. So I would add my voice, if only to countervail David's point. I would add my voice to support the position that Jorge and Thiago have outlined. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thank you, Christopher. Steve.

>>STEVE DELBIANCO: Thiago, thank you for the reply. And I appreciate the clarity that you brought to it by suggesting that, even with this addition to the text, "Brazil would continue to oppose the subgroup report."" I believe that's what the transcript will show you. "Brazil would continue to oppose the subgroup report."

In active opposition on an issue about which Brazil is an articulate and passionate leader will certainly be influential with other members of the constituency and GAC. And yet, when Thomas asks us as a matter of process, would the group support the additional paragraph, quite frankly, it doesn't cause a dramatically substantive change to the organizations. But to gauge the level of agreement and support in this consensus building process, we obviously looked to see whether the addition would be seen as a positive and pleasing step to those who are advocating for it. And the indication is that you would continue to oppose it.

That undermines the ability for us to suggest, yes, it's time to make a concession that gets us to consensus, which is really the only way this process has worked for three years. So the opportunity doesn't have to turn into Brazil suddenly supporting of all the recommendations in the report. I see that that's not likely. And yet to drop opposition to the subgroup report would at least indicate that you believe the subgroup report accurately reflects an acknowledgment of the views, even if the consensus of the group didn't agree with those views as its recommendation. So I appreciate the clarity you brought there, but it doesn't really provide an incentive for the group to try to accommodate that extra paragraph in the interest of consensus. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much. We have Greg who is patiently waiting.

>>GREG SHATAN: Thank you. Greg Shatan, for the record. First I'd like to point out that the section we're discussing is entitled Overview of the Work of the Subgroup. This is not, in fact, any recommendation in itself and -- nor is it a place to try to underline or change the perception of the recommendations. It's merely a tale told by weary travelers of the route that they have journeyed together. So I have suggested some different text which I believe would be factually accurate. I'm not saying I support putting it in, but at least I wanted it to be on the record. But that text reads, "For example, the suggestion added to the report that further discussions of jurisdiction-related concerns are needed was echoed in several comments subsequently received. But these comments did not bring any changes to the report since existing support for quote, unquote, further discussions to address unresolved concerns, including in other fora, had already been acknowledged." So, you know, that I think would reflect the work we did to indicate that we somehow did not reflect things in detail or that there was some sort of understanding by which we would not reflect them or we did not actually discuss them in detail is to my mind -- kind of casts aspersions on the process and I do think that that would not be accurate. I really did strive to give equal access and time to every comment. And on the second reading we spent additional time on those that were not merely indicating support to the proposal and I believe that these actually fell into that category, although on this particular subpoint they did, in fact, support the report.

Last, we should consider if we're going to cite these comments in particular, are there other comments that we should start discussing as well, which it's -- I don't know that there's a particular reason, other than the reason Thiago cited to, you know, give extra acknowledgment to certain comments over others, which also came out of groups that worked hard to produce those comments. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Greg. We have Kavouss, Thiago, and then Jordan. Kavouss, the floor is yours. We have you on landline now so the sound quality should be far better. Over to you Kavouss.

>>KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, (indiscernible).

>>THOMAS RICKERT: It's better. We're just having a little chitchat in German now.

>>KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you very much. First of all, I think there should be no pressure from anybody at this meeting to push a particular person or person or government or entity to reconsider its position. It is up to that entity. Listening to the discussions and the environment and the spirit of collaboration and principle of universality to consider if they want to make some changes to what they have said. So there should be no pressure at all. So I don't think that that is a good path.

Number two, what Greg said, the first part was almost in a good direction, positive. But it was neutralized by the second part that he added. Perhaps this time the suggestion of Steve would be that Thiago and Greg perhaps should get together, provided -- providing a better language but not saying something in the first part as Greg said and neutralizing or negating that in the second part. So there needs to be some massaging of what Greg said. The current statement by Greg is not acceptable to me, at least as a participant. But it has a good direction. It's a good way. It's a way forward, provided that it be modified by Thiago and Greg together. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Kavouss. Maybe just to add to this discussion about putting pressure on Brazil, I didn't understand Steve's question as imposing question -- pressure on Brazil. I understood it to be a request for clarification on Brazil's position. So if that reading is inaccurate, I think Brazil can speak for itself. But I think there was no intent -- or I didn't hear any intention to make Brazil change its mind.

So now my machine has hibernated sort of. It's back again. I see Thiago's hand is raised and then Jordan.

>>BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you. Actually this is Benedicto, for the record. Actually part of what I wanted to say has already been said by previous interveners and I see the value of the collective wisdom that emanates from these meetings on that.

One point I'd like to -- the first point is I think it's important to note and to reiterate that Brazil is not against the recommendations. We are not -- we do not -- not like to be seen as opposing the individual recommendations. We are in -- unfortunately in a position we have to object the report, not because we don't like the recommendations that are there but because we think the absence of one -- the most important issue to be addressed is not there. So it's not again because we -- we could not live with the recommendation. Actually we think they would provide benefits and should be indeed accepted but because there -- of the lack, of the gap in the report.

The second point I'd like to make is that -- I think that was already made by others is that we are not changing the substance of the report. There are some recommendations, there's an expression of minority opinion that does not support the report. And so this did not change in relation to the comments that were made in the public consultation period. So we are -- I think the concern expressed by the chair is not, I'd say, respectfully in discussion. We are not changing the substance. We are rather discussing among ourselves how to document the process and to reflect on paper the -- the comments in an appropriate way. And I think by doing this, we should not be thinking about a trade-off among ourselves because I think -- and I don't think we need -- each side would need to have an incentive to document duly what has taken place. We are just looking -- the addition that was proposed was just -- the intent was to document appropriately part of the discussion that we thought the overall language that was there before did not do it in an appropriate way. So this is just for the record of our position.

And having said that, I'd like to comment that the effort that was done by the rapporteur to try to reflect on that and to come up with something, I think this is very positive. I think it goes more or less in the same line we have thought, we think we -- if the group wants to entertain that kind of language, we would like very much to have an opportunity for that to take place.

We think that could provide a way out of that discussion. Again, we are just discussing how to document, how to memorialize. We're not changing the substance. But I think the starting point for all of us is very clear, and we are not changing that at this moment in time. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Benedicto. Jordan.

>>JORDAN CARTER: This -- these are just my -- a question really almost to Thiago as a participant. This is nothing to do with the fact that I'm a co-chair and sitting up here, just to be clear.

So an earlier version of this report added the section about further discussions of jurisdiction-related concerns. So we know that that's -- that's included and that's consensus and that's fine. Then this red text that's on the screen in the room that's the documenting of the process does note that there were comments received that were worked through and then Thiago's first presentation of some additional text sort of honed in a bit on jurisdictional immunity related issues and suggested that there weren't -- that they hadn't all been fully considered. The second text left that off, and so it became a process discussion or difference of views between Greg and Thiago. So that played out. The text that's on the screen now, at the end of it, because it goes over a long page break, does talk a bit about the process and the consideration. So is the issue that -- so as someone who hasn't followed this closely, I'm just trying to understand what the actual issue is because what it looks like the report text really says is that their comments had earlier (indiscernible) led to the change to have further discussion and then where the comments hadn't been -- led to changes in the report, there are no changes in the report. So really my question is, are you confirming, Thiago, that it's the second version of your -- your statement that you are -- you're seeking some views about or is it the first one that included the link to immunity?

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thiago, would you care to respond?

>>THIAGO JARDIM: Yes. Thiago speaking, for the record. Thank you for your question, Jordan. I appreciate it. It brings some clarity to this discussion. We indeed dropped the reference to immunity in our second proposal and would be fine just referencing what we suggested should be referenced without the mention to the word "immunity," if that's clear enough. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Jordan, would you like to get back in or -- we have a few more edits to the jurisdiction report to discuss. So let me try to take stock of where we are. I do not see overwhelming support, or very substantial support, for the inclusion of the original Thiago statement for the moment. I also do not sense an appetite for the plenary to send the report back to the subteam for further work. Given -- letting the time -- timing issues aside, but even Kavouss said there is -- in the chat that he doesn't want to have it sent back. So I guess that what we're stuck with is a lot of willingness inside this group to try and understand, like from Steve and from Jordan and from others, to understand what the pressure points for Brazil and its supporters are, and I can also sense a willingness to include some clarifying language that does not change the substance of the report. The question is, can this group come up with a set of words that can please everyone. So I think we should probably spend another five minutes or so to try to see whether we can find something that everyone can live with. And what I hear is that, you know, there are parts in what Thiago wrote which are uncontroversial, there are parts in what Greg said which are uncontroversial. If we had more time I would be inclined to send Thiago and Greg out for a few minutes --

>> (Off microphone).

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Well, I mean, seriously, because, you know, they've been in it for so -- so many hours and maybe what we -- what we should do instead is let us witness how these two fine gentlemen can probably bridge the gap. So if I may, let me try to suggest we take maybe your first part of your suggestion, you know, the one that has been applauded by Kavouss and then maybe Thiago can add a second part to it which can sort of further remain the gap. So Greg, can you repeat for us the suggestion that you made?

>>GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Thomas. Actually, in the chat, kind of had advanced discussion a bit. Not with Thiago but with Kavouss who indicated that he supported the first part but not the second part of my intervention or suggestion. So my revised proposal would be a shorter statement which I've put in the chat. "For example, the suggestion added to the report that further discussions of jurisdiction-related concerns are needed was echoed in several comments subsequently received."

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thiago has raised his hand physically in the room, for the remote participants. Thiago is that something you can live with, or Benedicto.

>>THIAGO JARDIM: Thiago speaking, for the record. I will accept your invitation to add the second part of this glorious paragraph that we will be adding to the report, and I'm picking it from Greg's suggestion initially, a more expanded version of his suggestion in which he already took away certain elements that he did not like in my text. So I will read it as a whole. It would start like this, repeating what Greg had suggested. "Further discussions of jurisdiction-related concerns" -- I'm sorry. Delayed --

>> No, no, no.

>>THIAGO JARDIM: Greg, could you please read your first paragraph, the start of your first paragraph?

>>GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I've just put it in the chat. I believe this is what you're referring to. The long form version of my proposal,"For example, the suggestion added to the report that further discussions of jurisdiction-related concerns are needed was echoed in several comments subsequently received. But these comments did not bring any changes to the report since existing support for further discussions to address unresolved concerns, including in other fora, had already been acknowledged."

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thiago, just go ahead. Play this between yourself.

>>THIAGO JARDIM: I will read it out loud, then. I would keep your initial sentence and add a slightly different second part to it. Would read like this: "The suggestion added to the report that further discussions of jurisdiction-related concerns are needed was echoed in several comments subsequently received. These comments did not bring any changes to the report since the need for further discussions to address unresolved concerns, including in other fora, had already been acknowledged."

>>GREG SHATAN: This is Greg Shatan. I would support that.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Now, that was quick, wasn't it? I think we need that in writing. Do we have it in the chat already, Thiago.

>> I've just pasted it out of the transcript into the chat. It's all in capitals.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: So what you see in green, in caps lock. So let's take a minute for everyone to go through this.

>> And Thiago's got the same language in nice not capitals.

>>GREG SHATAN: The word "and" needs to be changed to "any" in there. "Any" unresolved concerns.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: So this seems to be a version that is agreed between Thiago and Greg. I honestly don't know whether the three hands from Kavouss, Greg, and Thiago had been old hands or new hands. So please lower your hands if they were old hands and let me read this into the record again so that everyone can fully understand the text. "The suggestion added to the report that further discussions of jurisdiction-related concerns are needed was echoed in several comments subsequently received. These comments did not bring any changes to the report since they -- since the need for further discussions to address any unresolved concerns, including in other fora, had already been acknowledged." So I see that Kavouss' hand is still up so I trust it's a new hand. Kavouss, over to you.

>>KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah, it is good we are almost there. I suggest we replace "since" by "recognizing that." Not "since." "Recognizing that." Instead of "since." Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks, Kavouss. I have a hard time understanding where we are now.

>>JORDAN CARTER: I think just to be a Kavouss whisperer for a moment, what that would mean the sentence says, if we adopted Kavouss' suggestion, it would be like this. "These comments did not bring any changes to the report, recognizing that the need for further discussions to address any unresolved concerns, including in other fora, had already been acknowledged." I take back what I said in the chat, it does make sense and it doesn't make any substantive change, "recognizing that" instead of "since."

>>KAVOUSS ARASTEH: (indiscernible).

>>GREG SHATAN: I'm okay with that version as well. I'm okay with either version. Greg Shatan.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Okay. So we have a compromised text on the table. Now, isn't that great? That's real time collaborative drafting. You know, that's something that you can hardly find these days. Okay. So I don't see any objection to that. We're not yet there to approve or

refuse the overall report, so I suggest that we keep this and let Greg move on with the remaining changes to the report.

>>GREG SHATAN: Thank you. Now where were we? We now launch into the recommendation -- the actual recommendation section of the report.

Many changes here echo changes you already heard about.

So, for instance, on page 14, of the red line that I have, the footnote 9 has been added after "In particular, these issues have been raised in relation to U.S. government sanctions."

And the same footnote that appeared in the summary appears again. "In the future, if ICANN is subject to other similar sanctions, e.g. similar in scope, type, and effect and for other reliefs for entities not specifically sanctioned, the spirit of these recommendations should guide ICANN's approach."

The next change of substance --

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Greg, I apologize. We had asked Milton for patience with his comment. So, Milton, sorry for neglecting you. I'm not sure whether you're still online with us, but why don't you make your point now before we get much further away from it? Milton, the floor is yours. Over to you.

>>MILTON MUELLER: Hello?

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Yes, you can be heard. Fire away.

>>MILTON MUELLER: So it's a very simple point. --- and not terribly important considering all the stuff we've been through.

But we notice that on pages 4, when you talk about the registrars, you say that ICANN should use best efforts to secure an OFAC license if the other party is otherwise qualified.

And then two pages later when you're talking about registries, you have replaced "qualified" with "would be approved." So we just thought that should be consistent. Either return registries back to "otherwise qualified" or make the same modification in -- when you're talking about registrars. So probably uncontroversial, but consistency would be important here.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Greg, over to you.

>>GREG SHATAN: Yes. Let me explain why this -- why the inconsistency is there. And we can decide whether it makes sense or not.

It has to do with the process -- the difference in process between the registrar accreditation process and the registry application process. If I'm factually inaccurate, please let me know as well.

My understanding is that the registry accreditation process basically requires that the OFAC license be requested pretty much toward the earlier part of the process because it begins with the agreement to the terms and conditions between the applicant registrar and the -- and ICANN.

And, therefore, it's too early in the process to actually ascertain whether the potential registrar would be approved.

However, with regard to the registry application for the new gTLD registry, the point in process where ICANN would apply is later in the process and at the point it should be clear, otherwise the applicant would be approved. Thanks.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Milton, back over to you.

>>MILTON MUELLER: I thought he was going to say something like that. Basically, I'm just for the most general obligation on ICANN to apply for the OFAC license. So it seemed to me originally that the word "qualified" was the most general and should be retained in both instances. But I could go with for approval in -- you know, I don't think it's that significant to make the change. I just want to make sure that we have the strongest possible recommendation regarding ICANN's requirement to seek an exemption. So I think it would be nicer to have a consistent use of the word "qualification," but I'm not going to die in a ditch over that.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Great. Thanks, Milton. We have Steve's hand raised.

>>STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Thomas. Steve DelBianco. In the chat I posted a link to the ICANN process through which a party could try to become an ICANN registrar. The very first question is on qualification criteria. Much later it gets into approval. And I personally don't know at what point they write checks to ICANN or ICANN begins to interact with that potential registrar. But clearly there's qualification. And there's four steps of qualifications that are right in here.

I do agree with Milton that the word "qualify" can work there. And, if necessary, we can link to this page. So it's clear that in both cases, qualification seems to be the first hurdle that a party has to reach. So that we're making it clear to ICANN that our recommendations are that they should obtain an OFAC release and obtain the sanction relief more generally at the earliest point necessary to begin to interact with these parties. And qualification seems to apply to both. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thank you very much, Steve and Milton, for pointing this out.

I understand Milton is not willing to die in the ditch over it, so that's good.

I understand Milton wants the report to be nice. I think we all prefer a nice report, but the outcome of this group is not always nice. I've witnessed lengthy debate about this set of words. I suggest we even leave it as it is for the sake of, you know, making progress and not reopening that. Over to you, Greg, for the next part.

>>GREG SHATAN: Thank you. I think Steve just said something that was important which was that really what we're aiming at here either way is that ICANN should work on the OFAC license at the earliest appropriate time.

And what we're really trying -- the issue is how we characterize what that time is. And perhaps we got caught up in minutiae by talking about qualification or approval and we should just say that they should secure an OFAC license at the earliest point in the process. I don't know if we want to think about that for a little while and maybe come back to that for a second reading. Because I think worrying about how this ties into the minutiae of these two processes is probably a rabbit hole.

The next changes -- let's see. I lost my place a little bit. Apologies. I believe the next changes are -- we're not on page 5. Definitely not.

We're on 14 and then 15. 16. We're back to the same issues that we have some of the footnotes crossed out and reput in there or just moved. So we're not going to review those. Page 20 is actually the next change. And this is, in fact, the change we're talking about. The last sentence should be amended to require ICANN to apply for and use best interests to secure an OFAC license if the other party would otherwise be approved as a registrar. And I think this is actually a mistake, because it should be qualified to match what was in the summary, which I

think goes back to my other point which is perhaps a higher level statement that they should apply at the earliest appropriate point might be better.

The next change after that that is a real change not just a function of red lining fun is on page 21 in the middle, in the recommendation where it says, "ICANN should commit to applying for and use best efforts to apply for and secure an OFAC license for all such applicants." Here we're talking about registry applicants. "if the applicant would otherwise be approved." More of the same. Then the next change after that -- and this is a real change and not one you've heard before -- is at the bottom of page 24 going into 25 after the three diamonds, which reads as follows: "When implementing each of the recommendations in the section" -- and the section it's referring to is the OFAC and other related OFAC sections overall.

"When implementing each of the recommendations in this section, the utmost importance to ICANN in carrying out its mission and facilitating global access to DNS should be considered." Taking into account this importance, the implementation phase should start as soon as possible but in no later than six months after approval by the ICANN board."

I don't see any comments on this other than my own hand, which was an old hand.

So let's move on.

Page 25. Page 26 has no changes whatsoever. How wonderful.

After that the next change is 27 are just from artifacts of red lining. Next actual change is on page 29. Echoing what we already heard in the summary at the top of the page there. "the method of choosing from the menu also needs to be considered. The subgroup recommends that the registry choose from among the options on the menu, i.e., the choice would not be negotiated with ICANN.

Once in the summary and once in the full text.

Made it a particular joy to go through Work Stream 1 where it said the same thing four times. But I digress.

I believe -- let's see. What else do we have?

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Greg, usually you can only afford that type of repetition when you're paid by the hour, right?

>>GREG SHATAN: I'm paid by the brilliant thoughts, so it really doesn't matter. On page 27 --
We may have skipped this.

 Page 27. A statement after the menu discussion, the subgroup recommends that the registry
choose from among the options on the menu, i.e., the choice would not be negotiated with
ICANN. So that is one more time that we're saying the same thing for emphasis.

 Then after that we have the further discussions of jurisdictional aid or concerns which did not
change. And after that we have the insertion of stress tests.

 Stunningly, these were originally drafted by Steve DelBianco. They've now been adopted by
the subgroup as if they were their own. I'll read this somewhat quickly since we've fallen
behind a bit. "stress testing is a simulation exercise where plausible but not necessarily
probable. Hypothetical scenarios are used to gauge how certain events will affect an entity or
system. In the financial industry, for example, stress testing is routinely used evaluate the
strength of banks facing plausible scenarios of external crises. Stress tests are used to assess
how recommendations would improve ICANN's accountability when faced with plausible
scenarios that imposed stress on the ICANN organization and community. An improvement in
accountability can be seen when comparing the status quo with the structures and processes
that would result in implementing new Work Stream 2 recommendations.

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: Greg, since you're -- shall we not read through everything? I think the
concept of the stress test has been -- no one? Any questions with respect to the stress test? I
don't see any hands. So let's move on.

 >>GREG SHATAN: Thank you. This is since the stress test to see whether stress tests can exist
without reading in full. Seems we passed that test, and that actually ends the report.

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: Great. Now, we will break for coffee for 15 minutes after we do the
consensus call. So just so you know, we're not going to discuss diversity and other topics
before we break for coffee. We had a good discussion about this report. So I will now ask for
objections from the plenary to the Work Stream 2 jurisdiction subteam report including the
compromise additional text that we collaboratively drafted this morning.

 Again, the question for you now is to do nothing if you are happy with the report including the
additional text. If you reject the overall report, you need to raise your hand now or better use

the red tick mark in the Adobe room. So you only need to take action if you object to the overall report. I see Benedicto's hand is raised. Do you want to speak or put your position on the record?

>>BENEDICTO FONSECA: Just for clarity and to reiterate what he said before, we had expressed our opinion with regard to the report in the minority opinion. And it stands. So, if you're asking whether we confirmed our position expressed in the minority statements, yes, we do. So we don't object to the report in its present form.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Okay. We'll put your objection on the record. Any further objections to the report? Dalila, to you want to speak or just state your objection?

>>DALILA RAHMOUNI: Just to underline that the statement proposed by Brazil was for France, in his point of view -- sorry. Underline some critical view. And we want to support it once again. And that's why if you ask about today supporting the recommendation in the report, we are not able to support it.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Okay. So we also note an objection to the report from France. So we have France and Brazil objecting. Argentina rejecting as well. Any further objections? For the remote participants, please do use the red tick. I see Kavouss's hand is raised, Kavouss, please. Your hand is lowered. Now it's raised again. Yes, Kavouss, please.

>>KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I also object to the report.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Okay. Thank you. Let me pause for another few seconds.
Okay. If there are no further wishes to speak, nor do I see any further objections. So the subteam's report is approved with the first reading. That's great. No congratulations to team meeting. That's good news.

So, as you know, we're going so have a second reading. We do know that Kavouss will probably not be present for the second reading. So, Kavouss, is there anything else that you would like us to put on the record and read into the record when we get to the second agenda item, the second reading?

>>KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Okay, go ahead, Kavouss.

>>KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Hello. I don't object to the -- so many feedback. I don't object to the report anymore (indiscernible) on what I did, but with respect to the footnote on the -- sorry. With respect to the footnote, under best efforts, I am not happy with the footnote because there are many (indiscernible) in that footnote.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Okay, Kavouss, sorry for interrupting you. I guess what we need to know from you is, do you object to the entire report? You can just say yes or no to the entire report. If you have additional remarks to make, you can do that with a minority statement.

>>KAVOUSS ARASTEH: (indiscernible) remarks to make. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Is that an objection or not?

>>KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No additional remarks.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much. Thanks very much for that. So we will take good note of your objection. So with that, thanks, Greg, for showing us through all the changes. Thanks to everyone for a very collegial and productive meeting on this. We're now going to break for coffee for 15 minutes and then reconvene. Thank you very much.

>> Everyone, let's just make it practical. We'll start at the top of the hour. Thank you.

[break]

>>THOMAS RICKERT: This is the two-minute warning. We're going to reconvene in two minutes. So please be seated.

>>JORDAN CARTER: Good afternoon, good morning, good evening. Wherever you may be, please take your seats. We'll kick this next session off of Work Stream 2 deliberation. The next item on our agenda is the second reading of the final Work Stream 2 recommendations on diversity. So I'll just keep talking for a little moment while people grab their seats. And some people like Robin Gross stop talking in the corner and Greg Shatan and all these troublesome people who don't want to come and grab a seat. Nothing personal, guys. I just recognize you. And presenting for the second reading these diversity recommendations is Fiona Asonga, one of the rapporteurs of the group. So Fiona, please take us through that second reading, and I encourage you to refer to the red line version of this document and I'd invite the staff to pop the red line version up in front of us and to follow through as Fiona takes us through it. Fiona, over to you. Thank you.

>>FIONA ASONGA: Hello, everyone. This is Fiona Asonga, for the record, taking you through the second reading of the diversity recommendations. Thank you, Jordan, for the opportunity. We'll go through to page -- page 4, where we begin to make changes, we have the recommendations, so page 4. As a recap, for those who were not able to join us in the first reading, we received a total of 72 comments. Out of the 72 comments, 9 of them were able to impact on the recommendations that we had provided. And so four recommendations received changes. Some were significant changes. Others were editorial, small changes. But have changed the recommendations. 30 comments touched on important issues, but these issues have to do with implementation. And as a subgroup, we agreed that we were not going to get involved in the implementation issues. And so we have kept those 30 comments as issues for us as a subgroup to carry forward to the implementation and as areas where we will discuss when we're looking at implementation issues. And the other 33 comments, the group felt that they were not in line with the approach that the group wanted to use and were not agreeable to the subgroup and therefore have been recorded as such in our schedule of comments.

 Now, when we look at recommendation 1, we made an editorial of adding the word "should." It previously read, "SOs, ACs, and groups agree that the following seven key elements of diversity should be used as a common starting point for all diversity considerations within ICANN." We changed that to, "SOs and ACs and groups should agree." So we added the word "should" which is -- we consider a minor adjustment. There were no changes to recommendation 2. Excuse me.

 On the next set of recommendations that are measuring and promoting diversity, we have no changes on recommendation 3, no changes on recommendation 4. Then we have a change on recommendation number 5, which read previously, "Each SO/AC group supported by ICANN staff should undertake an annual update of their diversity assessments against their diversity criteria and objectives at all levels including leadership. They should publish the results on their Web site and use this information to review and update their objectives and strategies." That is on page 4. And this has changed to read, "Each SO, AC, or group supported by ICANN staff should undertake regular updates of their diversity assessments against their diversity criteria

and objectives at all levels including leadership." And we added in, "Ideally this update should be carried out annually but not less than every three years." And this is accommodate the fact that there may be groups, SOs, ACs, that do not -- are not able to do annual updates but handle a number of their review processes in a three-year cycle, so that's to accommodate them appropriately.

So we hope that that covers from -- so far from the subgroup it does cover the request from the -- and input from the public comments. In the first reading there was an issue on that.

When we move to recommendations supporting diversity, recommendation 6 had no change. Recommendation number 7 does receive a change. It changes from "ICANN staff should develop and publish a process of dealing with diversity-related complaints and issues" to "ICANN staff should support SOs, ACs, and groups in developing and publishing a process of dealing with diversity-related complaints and issues." And this came from comments, public comments that indicated that it was the SOs and ACs that were going to be the ones handling a lot of the diversity required issues and therefore ICANN staff who support them should be able to continue providing that support as opposed to the staff then developing and publishing processes for the SOs, ACs, and groups within ICANN to use. Then recommendation 8 also had some changes. It previously read that "ICANN staff should support the capture, analysis, and communication of diversity information in the following ways," and we listed the different ways there. But we added in the need for external expertise to be included so ICANN staff may be able to reach out for external expertise where they feel that they may not have that resource within their skill sets of ICANN. So it now reads, "ICANN staff should support the capture, analysis, and communication of diversity information, seeking external expertise if needed, in the following ways. Create a diversity section on the ICANN Web site. Gather and maintain all relevant diversity information in one place. Produce an annual diversity report for ICANN based on all the annual information and provide a global analysis of trends and summarize SO, AC, and groups recommendations for improvement, where appropriate. This should also include some form of reporting on diversity complaints. And it should include diversity information derived from annual diversity reports in ICANN's annual report."

So those are the changes that have to take place in the recommendations. And then we had indicated in our report on page 12 there was a note when this went out for public comments that read, "A number of CCWG accountability Work Stream 2 diversity subgroup members thought this insufficient and believe that it is essential to establish an office of diversity. The role of this office would be to independently support, record, and keep track of issues including complaints from the community on diversity issues within the organization. The proposed office being a very specific structural adjustment to the organization did not receive consensus from either the diversity group or the CCWG plenary. However, further input and comments on this matter from the wider community is welcomed." And we did receive comments on that that the subgroup discussed, and as a subgroup we did not seem to have sufficient consensus for the office of (indiscernible) and office of diversity because it was considered as an implementation issue. And it is one of the things we have put in as high ranking in the implementation that needs to be considered and discussed at the implementation stage on whether there's going to be an office of diversity or the second option we received from the public comments that was to have an independent organization reviewing ICANN's diversity. So we received those two options, and we've not made a decision on any of them as a subgroup. Or reporting it only. I think -- we did receive two options. One was to have an independent entity review and analyze ICANN's diversity, and the second one was to have the office of diversity within ICANN. And then there was also the position where there were those that did not want the office of diversity. So those were the three positions on the office of diversity. We have left the issue of the office of diversity as something to be discussed because it's an implementation issue. If it has to be -- if it has to be done, it cannot be done as a recommendation. And as such, we have put that as a footnote on page 12. And the footnote reads, "A number of CCWG accountability Work Stream 2 diversity subgroup members thought this insufficient and believed it was essential to establish the office of diversity. The role of this office would be to independently support, record, and keep track of issues and submitted comments from the community on diversity issues within the organization. The office was envisaged as being a very specific structural adjustment to the organization but it did not receive consensus from either the diversity group or the CCWG plenary. However, further

inputs and comments on the matter was sought from the wider community which did not yield sufficient support to include these as a recommendation. So the -- the office of diversity cannot be included as a recommendation and if it has to be considered because we discussed it is an implementation issue, it would have to move into that discussion. And those are the changes within the diversity report and therefore, I'm opening the floor for further comments. Thank you.

>>JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Fiona, for that run-through. There is a speaking list already in the Adobe room so I'll be working through that speaking list. The first comment is from Kavouss Arasteh. Kavouss, go ahead.

>>KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Fiona, for the reports. Unfortunately I was not in a position to participate at your activity. However, with all thanks. I think the first change that you have made, replacing "would" by "should" agree, "would agree" by "should agree" seems okay. But the word "should agree" is not a proper term. I suggested replace that by "should take into account the following seven" and continue.

We never say somebody should agree, because you could not force somebody to agree. You should put in a source of operational aspects asking to take into account but not to think that they should agree. Thank you.

And I have another general comment that I'll put in the chat. Thank you

>>JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Kavouss, for that suggestion. I noted that she should be a small grammatical change to improve the readability of that report.

We'll move to the next speaker who is Alan Greenberg. Alan, go ahead.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Alan Greenberg speaking.

With regard to the requirement that ACs and SOs published reports on diversity, did the group consider privacy implications in that? Even if the data is anonymized, some of these groups are small enough that you cannot hide who it is you're talking about.

And I'm just wondering to what extent you considered that in light of the focus within ICANN of GDPR, which is not just a WHOIS issue. Thank you.

>>JORDAN CARTER: That sounds like a question for Fiona. Was privacy considered?

>>FIONA ASONGA: We did have a brief conversation on privacy and even had ICANN staff who is responsible for collecting information -- I can't remember his title but he did come in or a call us with and he explained how they handle data and how ICANN handles issue of privacy. And we were comfortable as a group with his presentation. And he shared with us some slides on how they go about it which gave the group comfort that then the data collected would be handled in the same manner.

But that was before we had the GDPR announcements. Since the GDPR announcements, we've not yet had a recap of that discussion. And maybe we need to. So it's good that you raise it, Alan. Because we may need to go back to ICANN staff and see how the internal policies on data handling are handled because you asked that we adapt to existing policy on data handling.

>>ALAN GREENBERG: I have a follow-on. Two points. Number one, if things were being done on an ICANN-wide basis the anonymization would be quite sufficient. But, if it's being done on an AC/SO basis, we're dealing with small people. And if you're giving age ranges and things like that, that is personal data.

Number 2: ICANN's stand for handling data at this point by my estimate -- and I'm not a professional -- do not meet a lot of our privacy regulations. So careful what we say about established process. They themselves may not be sufficient.

>>JORDAN CARTER: I think one of the comments I would just make is that in implementing all the Work Stream 2 recommendations, we have to be cognizant of applicable law and make sure that we're complying with it. So I think that privacy concerns are a key one given the heightened focus on policy WHOIS, GDPR, and other reasons. So I think it will be taken into account. Thanks, Alan.

The next person in the speaking list is Sebastien. Please go ahead.

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:Thank you, Jordan. Sebastien Bachollet.

I know that I wrote for this report and I will again. But I have still big disagreement, and I want to express at least two of them.

The first one is that even if recommendations 6, 7 and 8 are written in the same way, the ICANN staff is in recommendation 8 already way of implementation.

It's not the same for the previous one because ICANN staff will help SOs and ACs. And that's normal role of the staff that we underline here that they have to do something specific regarding diversity. And it's way in the report.

In recommendation number 8 it's just to say that they should support the capture and so on and so forth. I will not read it again. I think it's already a decision who will do that. And, from my point of view, it's an implementation decision that must be taken later.

The second point regarding the way it is written, the comments on page 12 is that we talk about the organization, within the organization. And I don't know if we are still using the word as a CEO is using it, or is it another way to use it here as ICANN's -- a full ICANN. If it's the first one, no, definitely the first proposals of the Office of Diversity was not a proposal to change the organization as it was specifically mentioned that it must be independent from all part of ICANN. Therefore, it has never been submitted as a proposal to change the organization as it's meant by the CEO. If it's not the same meaning, we can discuss it again. I will stop here. I really think that there is some work to be done. And, as soon as I will be released with my hat of rapporteur of one of the subgroups, I will come back with a suggestion on how to deal with that and another issue from at least one other subgroup to try to find the consensus.

I feel that we may have tried to have done I will say better work. I don't know if it's the right term. Nothing against the people who try to find work. But just to try to find consensus and not to say we don't have consensus. That's what we tried to do with the jurisdiction. I think it could have been done and it still could be done with other part of our work. Thank you very much.

>>JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Sebastien, for that comment. Any response you want to make, Fiona, to that?

>>FIONA ASONGA: I think from the onset the subgroup understood their role of the Office of Diversity to be a new position created within the ICANN organization to facilitate the different activities. It is only later after the public comments that the idea of having an independent office came forward. Even though that office has not been clearly explained on what and how it's supposed to engage, that is why it didn't receive any traction in terms of moving forward with an independent office or an existing office within ICANN. So, when you explain to them,

say it was supposed to be independent and out of -- it's still not -- what the group hasn't understood and has not been able to get clarity on is what is this independent office out of ICANN going to do and how will it be established and how does it report and to whom does it report. That's --

>>JORDAN CARTER: Sorry. Please forgive my rudeness in interrupting you. I don't think we need to get into these implementation details because the consensus of the group has been not to proceed with it. If the consensus of the group would have been to proceed with it, then the details of how would have needed to be fleshed out, which is why reminding you all that this is a second reading -- the second reading isn't usually the chance to reverse a decision that was taken and agreed in the first reading. Just want to put that context around the discussion that we're having now. This is a chance for any last points to be made. If we don't approve a second reading here, then there aren't going to be any recommendations in the final report. This meeting is where the train stops. That's just where we're up to in the process. The next speaker I'd invite -- sorry not in the Adobe room. Sorry. Got the order wrong. After Cheryl we'll have Dalila from France. Cheryl, you're next.

>>CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jordan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record. I did put my hand up early on. And I must say Julie and I were concerned that the text here was not, by our belief, in keeping with what we are supportive of. And that is the current recommendations of what we're doing a second reading of.

So thank you for your intervention as well, Jordan.

I was concerned -- and I might not be the only one in the room who was concerned that this seems to be a softening on what was the consensus outcome in terms of the proposed Office of Diversity or indeed independent. So providing that we're clear and the transcript capturing text here is not seen as a softening or a proposal softening what we've agreed on here, we certainly wouldn't be comfortable if there was a proposal on change. And, of course, I could point out that the ALAC's statement on at least what they got when they reviewed their member opinions is not counter to that as well. I'm certainly supportive of a second reading as she is read. Thanks.

>>JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Cheryl. Just to be clear about the process that we're going through, we're confirming what's in the text. And the dialogue and transcript of this might provide some context. Because it's a discussion and we're all people, that context may clarify things. Sometimes it may unclarify things for a while. But the decision is only in the text. The next speaker is Dalila. You've got the floor.

>>DALILA RAHMOUNI: Thank you very much. I would like to thank the rapporteur, because it was not something very simple to find the consensus about the recommendation. I have one comment and one suggestion.

Further comments, in the footnote, I see that the idea of having supervision instance for the Office of Diversity, I'm not sure sufficient support. But, if I see the recommendation -- the public comment -- sorry -- we heard the large majority of the comments about the Office of Diversity in favor of this recommendation. So I don't find this very -- I don't find that these symptoms reflect the reality of all the public comments.

Secondly my suggestion: I prefer to replace the footnotes in an annex about the Office of Diversity because I think it is better for the people who want to see what is this Office of Diversity? What are the propositions? I think it is better that these footnotes. So thank you.

>>JORDAN CARTER: Thomas just wants to make a point briefly about the process. And then I'll take Fiona and Thomas.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: I fear that backing on the substance of the report -- and we're on the second reading, when we invented the concept of two readings, that was primarily in order to make sure that those who are missing one meeting don't find themselves in a situation that the group has made a decision on something that they also want to chime in on. So we already had that first reading. And the second reading is to give those who want to object to the report an opportunity to do so. I don't see any procedural way for us to reopen the substance of the report at this late stage. That's just my five cents.

>>JORDAN CARTER: Just before I -- Fiona, go ahead.

>>FIONA ASONGA: I just want to comment that the Office of Diversity was never a recommendation even from the onset. We never listed this as a recommendation. Even at this point when we're discussing it, we went to public comments to see if we could get enough

traction from the community for it to be a recommendation. And we did not. Because the comments that came through from the chartering organizations and from the different government and different entities that participate ---

>>JORDAN CARTER: We're back. Big hand for the tech folks. Quick rescue. Fiona, you want to keep going.

>>FIONA ASONGA: Thank you very much, Jordan. As I was saying, the Office of Diversity was never part of the recommendations. And, even at this point in time, it is not part of the recommendations that we are tabling. We went for public comments. We didn't get enough traction from the public comments to include it. And we discussed about the weighting of the public comments how we weight that. And it wasn't based on the number of comments. It was based on a number of issues that the subgroup had discussed and agreed on to be considered. It is not a recommendation we're tabling. And that is why we have put it aside as something to consider on implementation. Because it touches on structural changes of the organization.

>>JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Fiona. The next speaker is -- Cheryl, that's your old hand, isn't it? So I think we're up to Jorge.

>>JORGE CANCIO. Thank you, Jordan. Jorge Cancio, for the record. First of all, apologies. I haven't been able to follow this specific discussion in such detail. But, from reading this footnote, and recalling some of the comments in the public comment phase, it seems that that footnote starts from the premise that there is a kind of dichotomy between either not making any change regarding external oversight and the very specific institutional external Office of Diversity.

And it seems that no middle ground solution was sought. Or I don't know if that was the case in the following sense. The Office of Diversity, let's say, is a very specific institutional solution. But the idea underlying some of the comments including mine in the public comment period was that all these recommendations are very good. But it would be each better if we had some sort of external or independent assessment or evaluation of how these recommendations are implemented. And that could be drafted in a very let's say institutional neutral manner without prejudging how this would be done. Only let's say encapsulating the thought that those

implementation efforts may require -- or it would be good that there would be an external independent assessment of how that works.

So my question -- and again with apologies for not having followed this as closely as it was, this thought entertained in a very open manner the recommendations could include this idea of an external assessment or evaluation. And also the question whether we are still in the position of including the recommendations. Thank you.

>>JORDAN CARTER: Fiona.

>>FIONA ASONGA: Thanks, Jorge, for your question. In response to whether we have included the thought of our review, analysis of the diversity recommendations and all of their implemented, yes, we have. And that is why in recommendation 8, we talk of there being a diversity report that feeds into ICANN's annual report. Through that reporting mechanism then we will be able to assess -- and see, because when the ICANN reports go out, we do give public comments. As long as ICANN maintains a mechanism where we have public participation through public comments and engagement in that interaction as a subgroup we believe that it will be possible for us to then review the performance of diversity and we shall then be able to know whether it is the appropriate time to put pressure for an external review or for independent additional review of whatever reports will have come through from the existing recommendations.

And the other second thing we need to remember is we have said it is an implementation issue. It means your views were considered and it has -- your views have been captured as an implementation issue that can be considered when that discussion is taking place. So we did not ignore them and we did not discard them. We have considered them. It's just that there is not -- the views that came in on that office of diversity were not -- were not many in -- and significant from the right ACs, SOs, and groups because there has to be a balance between the chartering organizations as well as other public comments for it to carry substantial weight to create a recommendation. So there's no recommendation as of now, as of this time as we move forward on creating the office of diversity in any form. Thank you.

>>JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Fiona. And I just want to remind people again, this is second reading, so there's a chance to make any comments required. We have got two people left on

the speaking list and to be clear the speaking list is now closed because we've only allowed 15 minutes for each of these second readings and this has been about half an hour. Kavouss, you're next. No, we're not hearing anything from you. So okay, it may be an old hand. Thank you, everyone, for those comments. As I've already noted, they go on the record, this is a second reading for this set of the -- part of the report which is on diversity, final recommendations. So at this point in the discussion, what I'm asking for is if there are any formal objections in the room for us finalizing this second reading? Are there any formal objections? If you're in the Adobe room only, please issue us with a red cross to indicate such an objection. If you are physically in the room and not in the Adobe and you want me to note your objection, please wave your hand vigorously. And at this point I see no red crosses and no vigorous waving. So I will deem that a second reading of these diversity recommendations and ready for inclusion in the final report. Thank you, Fiona, the other rapporteurs of the subgroup and everyone who's made comments today. Some of the implementation detail and process will be picking up in an agenda item later in this meeting. Thank you very much. I will just be handing --

>> (Off microphone).

>>JORDAN CARTER: Kavouss, hello.

>>KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I have the general comment and I wish to be included in the report of this meeting. It is in the chat.

>>JORDAN CARTER: Kavouss has made a general comment that I think he wants read into the record. He's noted that from the very beginning he was of the opinion that the implementation of these recommendations would be extremely difficult due to the subject nature of the criteria suggested. These criteria are mostly theoretical and idealistic in nature and may not be implementable since many other (indiscernible) take the same course of action but were faced with certain difficulties." So apologies to the transcribers for reading that much too fast, but Kavouss, that's now in the audio record and will be in the proper transcript.

>>KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I have amended that. I put a second one. Amended that (indiscernible). Thank you.

>>JORDAN CARTER: I think what we'll do is we'll ask the staff to copy and paste from Kavouss that into the notes of the discussion. So thank you, Kavouss, for drawing our attention on this point.

>>KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you.

>>JORDAN CARTER: And with that, we'll close this agenda item. And I will pass the chair now to Tijani to do the ombudsman final recommendation second reading. I just want to reiterate the point, we will finish in 17 minutes for lunch. This is a second reading, not a first reading. Please keep that in mind in the nature of your interventions and suggestions. There you go, Tijani.

>>TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Jordan. For the next agenda item is about the second reading of the final recommendations of the ombuds office, and Sebastien is the rapporteur of this subgroup. Sebastien, you have the floor.

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Tijani. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Hello, everybody. Second reading of this report. I just want to remind you that this report is just part of one bigger document. It's -- it's include also the report made by the external reviewers and it's very important because in the report we just take the recommendation and we try to adapt them with the current situation of ICANN where one of the requests was sent to us that please don't do -- oh, yes, don't do any change on the bylaws and we will rewrite the recommendation. I don't think we change it so much, but we rewrite them to allow not changes in the bylaws. And the third part of the document, it's, of course, all the answer that the subgroup have made of the comments, the public comments that we received.

There are very few changes, and I will try to go directly to them. On page 5, we just changed the place of the word "ideally." The second it's that we add -- it was coming from the comments that the extension -- eventual extension of the current -- the ombuds at the time of the extension is possible will be done after discussion with the community. And the community based feedback mechanism to the adversarial panel covering the ombuds performance over the previous years will be (indiscernible). And next changes on the same page, page 6, it's just to go from an English word to an American word and maybe other country English word. And the last changes, it's to emphasize that there is no -- even if the ombuds participate to helping

to set up the scene for any policy discussions they are not at all supposed to participate in the content of the discussion and they can't be in charge of any seal of approval by a -- stamp of approval, sorry, by the ICANN ombuds office, and I guess it's the only changes. Those changes are repeated in the core of the document, and I don't think that there are other changes in the core of the document.

 Once again, these documents is with attachment of the external review of the ICANN ombuds office and the answer from the public comment. Thank you very much, and I am ready if you have any questions to answer question if I am able to do. Thank you

 >>TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Sebastien. I have David McAuley, you have the floor.

 >>DAVID McAULEY: Thank you, Tijani. This is David McAuley speaking, for the record. And I'd like to make a statement about recommendation number 4 in the report on behalf of the registry stakeholder group which I am the member in the accountability group of. And so I'll read it. "With respect to recommendation number 4, I underscore my understanding that the registry stakeholder group fully intends to cooperate with and support the office of the ombudsman in discharging the important mission of that office as set forth in bylaw 5.3. In our public comment the registry stakeholder group noted that it must retain discretion to, one, allocate its resources including volunteer time as it deems best in balancing important calls on its input and secondly, decide which information and records, if any, are necessary to respond to ombudsman requests. While the registry stakeholder group has not yet had time to formally evaluate the ombudsman final report, it's probable that the registry stakeholder group will reiterate these points in its role as part of the GNSO, one of the CCWG accountability chartering organizations. That's the end of the statement, but I would like to add, this is not an objection. Something that we will pursue in the implementation phase. Thank you.

 >>TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sebastien.

 >>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you for the comment, and I hope that you will not be the only group who will follow the implementation of this important topic. Thank you.

 >>TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Any other comment? I don't see any. Ah, Farzaneh.

>>FARZANEH BADII: Thank you. Farzaneh Badii speaking. I just wanted to record my objection to the report. This is a personal objection. And I do not think that we have considered in the report either (indiscernible) measures for independence of the office. Thank you.

>>TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Any other objection? Any other comment? I don't see any. So considering that this is the second reading of this -- these recommendations and I see there is only Farzaneh objection on the recommendations, we can consider that this second reading these recommendations are -- there is no objection on them and so they are accepted. Yes, Thomas?

>>THOMAS RICKERT: I just note that Robin, you have supported Farzaneh's objection, that means that you also want to be added to the list of those objecting, right? So formally we have two objections.

>>TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, so two objections. Thank you. Okay. I think we are done. And the next agenda item will be -- will be with Thomas Rickert and be about the staff accountability. Thomas.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Tijani. And quite conveniently I have somebody who's able to speak to the recommendation sitting right next to me. So Jordan, would you like to show us through the changes?

>>JORDAN CARTER: Yeah. I'll just make a thanks to Sebastien for all of his work as the rapporteur on the ombudsman work. Right. Now, co-chair hat off and pro tem temporary non-rapporteur/rapporteur for the staff accountability second reading. I would refer you to the red line document that is the second reading that is the final recommendations, the tract -- well, it's actually a blue line document in the version I've got, showing the changes from the previous one taking into account the public comments. I'm not going to take you through the header material, those updates to the formalities of the report, and I'm not going to take you through the non-existent changes to roles and responsibilities. We will just focus in the second reading on the recommendations which in the PDF start on page 8. And the -- the changes begin with the part B of recommendation 2. And recommendation 2, if you like, is looking at guidelines for time frames for acknowledging requests and this is the -- it turns into, at the end, so if you go over the page on the screen, so the top of page 9 in the PDF -- oh, there we go. Top of the next

page. This was taking into account feedback on the idea of seeking community member input into performance reviews of staff. And it was just putting more context about it. Making it clear that it needs to be well managed because what no one wants to create is a difficult environment for staff in generally receiving constructive feedback. So that is what those amendments are, that several lines of text does as outlined in the first reading on the call a couple weeks ago or last week. And the other -- another significant change made was to remove the reference or suggestion of a panel being created. That didn't sustain enough support in the public comment process. So as briefed last time has been removed from the recommendations. And then what was recommendation 4 now becomes recommendation 3. And that all looks like new text for you. If you scroll down to the next page, please. Top of page 10. And that one is in red. And it was just so messy that we just ended up all being clean text. And this -- this one, the sort of suggestion of service level targets and guidelines that define services was one that achieved -- or received strong support across the community but some pushback from the ICANN board that said it didn't want to maintain that relationship with the community but didn't suggest an alternative. And so what we've done is try and -- the board also expressed some concerns about the workability of this, i.e., was the community looking for service levels from everything to the -- from the standard of bottled water that we get to the timeliness of responses to yadda, yadda, yadda. So they were worried about the scope of it. So what we tried to do with this revised wording is to just narrow the scope to be clear there's going to be an implementation process to identify the class of service which these targets and guidelines should happen and so on, and implementation underway this year. And the idea is not to create new contractual service level agreements with contracted parties. This is just moving to a more transparent and open recording of what people should expect from ICANN organization and doing a bit of measuring of it.

 So overall, the group did come to consensus around this. There were no objections raised in the first reading. So I'll hand back to the co-chair to see if there are any speakers or any questions on this.

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah, in fact we have a clear queue at the moment. So for those who want to speak, please do raise your hand. So that does not seem to be the case. So with that,

we can move to the second reading. Let me ask whether there are any objections to this report. Any objections? I don't see any hands raised nor any comments in the chat. And with that, we have our successful second reading. Congratulations to the subteam. Thanks, Jordan, for showing us through the changes, and I think we can give five minutes back to the group and have a slightly longer lunch break. For those who are not in the room, you will not be able to have the same food as we do. I hope that you're going to have some food at home or wherever you are. Enjoy. And we will reconvene in 65 minutes. Talk to you then. Bye-bye.

[Applause]

[Lunch break.]

>>JORDAN CARTER: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, let's recommence our meeting. It's just after the hour of 1:00 local hour here in San Juan, Puerto Rico, which means in UTC it is thereabouts 17 hours UTC. So, back into the agenda we are now with item 8 on the agenda, which is planning going forward after the public consultation.

So the slide is on the approval process. We're going to come back to that, I think.

Yeah. We're going to move -- so this is the right slide. Sorry about that.

Item number 8, what we want to do with this session is talk a little bit about what happens after the report is adopted, presuming that we get through all that process. And the reason for doing that discussion now and not waiting until June is that, of course, we'll want to say something in our final report about what we suggest should be done next.

And I'm going to tag team a bit with Thomas on co-chairing this item. What we want to get out of this session, just so you're clear about what the ask is of you from the co-chairs, is agreement with the statement that's in front of you at the moment in terms of this planning going forward statement.

And I think, time allowing, we will also look through a few suggestions about some of the criteria that might be used in starting to type the implementation path. But that's part of the conversation that Thomas will lead.

So ramping back to the implementation process, you will notice, I think, that the Board made a number of comments about seeking the input of the CCWG to prioritize implementation of the proposed recommendations and in some cases to look at the costs involved.

And we are clear and it's been clear in the responses to public comments that that is not the CCWG's job. This is not an implementation body. This is not a budgeting body. So that process needs to happen after the recommendations are finalized. And so it's -- this statement says that it's beyond the scope and capacity of Work Stream 2 and actually rests with ICANN and the community.

What the proposal from the co-chairs would be is that, in our final report, we propose to establish a small implementation team to assist ICANN and the community to ensure the implementation and plan preserves the spirit of the recommendations and provide any interpretation advice as required.

So it's an implementation oversight role that will continue after the report is finalized. The logical people to be part of that are the co-chairs and the rapporteurs, because those are the people who have been sort of most deeply involved. And what we think will happen with the implementation process is it will be a sequence of sort of seeking community-wide public comments once the organization of this group and the Board have come to agreement on the implementation process.

So no one would be locked out of commenting and having involvement. It's just in the small implementation oversight, it needs to be a small implementation oversight group. So I think it's a reasonably straightforward recommendation. It's saying we're not just going to drop these recommendations into the air and then leave it off to a different group of people to oversee as we have for other work that we've done earlier. That will be a role for the CCWG overseeing as suggested. Nor are we trying to say that the implementation should be done by -- I don't know -- just to scare you, the Work Stream 3. Keep this group going to do a prioritization and implementation process. We're not well placed to do that. And I don't know about you, but I would have given up by that point. So that's the proposal. And, Thomas, I don't know if you want to add anything at this point. But I would invite sort of comments and feedback on that text that's in front and the suggestion that the implementation team would be founded on the co-chairs and rapporteurs. Are there any sort of comments or questions about that approach? You may not have any right now, and that's okay. We'll accept comments and questions on this

for the whole of this agenda item. And, if you think of something in the next little while, don't feel like you won't be able to share it with the group. Sebastien, your physical hand is up.

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes.

Thank you very much.

Maybe it's just a little question, but I still have trouble with the use of word of "ICANN and the community."

The community is ICANN. Therefore, you can't use twice as -- two-word difference to talk about the same entity. I know there are people who just think ICANN is ICANN organization or ICANN the one registered in California alone. But ICANN is us. Thank you.

>>JORDAN CARTER: I agree with you. The ICANN family is all of us. I think what this is intending to point out is the organization and the community. What it isn't intending to point out is the CCWG. That's the distinction it's intending. Thanks, Sebastien.

Christopher is also using his physical hand as opposed to Adobe. Go ahead.

>>CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I haven't been able to use it since lunch, but I agree with what you said about the CCWG role vis-a-vis implementation that's elsewhere. But I would comment that the CCWG experience throughout the transition and subsequently has been a major achievement by the community. And the human capital and intellectual capital that has been brought together throughout this method should not be allowed to disperse or to be ignored in the future. I think that time has come when ICANN needs to take steps to create greater balance and internal consistency between all the SOs and ACs and that this should extend to some policy making fora. It would be a great shame if in 2 or 3 years' time we found that we were dealing with unresolved problems that could have been resolved earlier through a CCWG mechanism. So I think the message to the community and to the Board and to the leading SOs is that we need to maintain the capital that we have achieved. Thank you.

>>JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Christopher, for that.

I don't see any other interventions at this point on this process. And so thank you for the two perspectives that have been shared on this. I'm going to hand over now to Thomas to talk a little bit more about that.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: You want to take stock first?

>>JORDAN CARTER: I'm not entirely sure how to do that. But let me see if there's any sort of opposition now to the proposed approach. Does anyone have a difficulty with the implementation group being able to assist with implementation? I would be a little bit surprised based on your reactions so far. But, if you do have a vigorous objection, now would be the time to say so. Oh, Steve has his hand up. Not objecting.

Steve is not objecting but wishes to intervene.

Please go head.

>>STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Jordan. Steve DelBianco. The question I get from the commercial stakeholders group is how is this different would this process be than what we did in Morocco you recall in 2016. The process of chartering group consultations. It was Thomas Rickert, Leon, and road show. That was going on. And the atmosphere of having the GNSO Council vote up and down, that was done in a relatively pressure cooker way because of the deadline. This time around is how do we envision this process work? Something I realize that might be what you chartered this group to do. I get that. But what is our current thinking of the process between chartering organization, consultation, and approval.

>>JORDAN CARTER: That's a really good question. But what I'm talking about here is what happens after that? This is based on the assumption that the chartering organizations do approve their recommendations. And correct me, if I'm wrong, Thomas or Tijani, the agenda item that's next is going to talk about the approval process because it's about finalizing the report. We will come to that question. It's on the diagram that was just up before. I'm going to deem it as consensus by the group that this statement in terms of the approach to implementation is agreed and that the co-chairs and rapporteurs formed that small implementation group. Thank you for the consideration and discussion. And I will hand now over to Thomas to say a bit more about the next steps and that because he's had some chats with Cherine that he's going to share with us.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Jordan. And it's great that we can take stock and have consensus on this implementation oversight, or whatever you might call the team, consisting of co-chairs and rapporteurs. Because, as you know, beyond ICANN62 we don't have

any funding. Nor do we have any mandate dealing with the implementation. So we will recommend, as you see on the screen.

But the subsequent question then is how can the implementation workgroup, Work Stream 2 recommendations be operationalized? There's a big difference between Work Stream 1 recommendations and Work Stream 2 recommendations.

Workstream 1 recommendations needed to be implemented so that the transition could take place. And, therefore, it was intertwined.

ICANN needed to come up with an implementation plan, a roadmap. Tick off the box they had delivered on certain things. This is why we had this group working like crazy to draft revised bylaws and get them ready. Because they need to be ready to the transition taking place.

The mechanics for Work Stream 2 are different. Neither do we have the budget nor do we have the mandate to get the Work Stream 2 recommendations implemented. We can lean back and say well, this is not our duty. And come ICANN62 we throw our report over the fence and let somebody else deal with it. We think this is just not appropriate.

This is why we're suggesting that ICANN put aside some budget to help fund the group of co-chairs and rapporteurs. We need to make sure that the work stream is done in the Work Stream 1 and 2 even Work Stream 1 recommendations. How do you structure this process? It's something that we've discussed earlier. And then I had a preliminary chat with Cherine on the phone about that. And he said that typically, when it comes to implementing these things, he would ask Goran and his team to come up with an implementation plan.

But he also asked us for help in how this process could be structured. Certainly nobody in this room wants ICANN staff just to take the recommendations and do whatever with them. So we might be able to offer some guidance. And I think parameters for that guidance we can provide. Although this is not in our mandate we have a lot of knowledge in this room. So let's spend the next couple minutes on that topic

So I guess nobody should expect Work Stream 2 recommendations to be instantly implemented. It is virtually impossible to do everything at the time.

So ICANN will be forced to sequence that. I guess the starting point for that would be that we encourage ICANN the organization to put aside a certain budget for the next three or five years on an annual basis to get Work Stream 2 recommendations implemented.

So that makes clear that there's no expectation in the community to be -- that of the community can be done at once. But then the question is: How do you work off the recommendations? Do you start with subteam's recommendation and work to the next? Probably not.

Do we have clever ideas that can inform ICANN in producing a matrix, a proposed roadmap for implementing Work Stream 2 recommendations? I guess the trick is that everyone in this room has their own favorite subteam or their own favorite recommendation that they're passionate about. But what you're passionate about might not be something that somebody else is passionate about. So, in coming up with proposals, we can probably help ICANN come up with a matrix that is not based on emotions or personal preference. So can we come up with criteria that are as objective as can be so that ICANN can produce a proposed implementation plan that they're going to share with the community for their comment and input that can then be rolled out over the next couple years. So let me pause here. This was just to set the scene for debate. And I'm sure that many of you have ideas on how this can be approached. Steve, over to you.

>>STEVE DELBIANCO: If we were to investigate the answer to your question, suppose I would propose two lines of thinking. The first would be just to assess whether we share priorities with regard to the nine projects. The priorities are usually formed by solving a critical problem or seizing an imminent opportunity. If we had priorities we agreed on, that would be part of how we would order the implementation. Second element is dependencies. For instance if we needed to do ombudsman and changes for the accountability -- that's not true. Just giving you an example. If we had dependencies, that would be the second method.

So this group could debate the priorities either in response to challenges and priorities. And this group could also have a conversation about the interdependencies about the projection and the recommendations.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Good point, Steve. Thank you so much. Sebastien.

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Thomas, if it's not too much. I agree with Steve and they think that the question must be one of our next topics to discuss because it's one important point that we need to discuss before we release our final report, global final report. But the other element we need to take into account of the complexity and implementation, there may be something not for your general purpose. Easy to work with. And good first reading or second reading. And maybe we can observe as a priority because it's easy to do. Therefore, I think we need to find a matrix with -- those questions raised by Steve and myself to decide in which way to go and how to order the implementation. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Follow-up question. Question for you, Sebastien. Are you saying that things that are easy to implement should be done first or the complex things should be started as early as possible so you can get them done quicker?

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I will not the answer your question like that. It's important to get this and to decide with the information. And, once again, maybe something easy to implement. Even if it's not so hurried, it will be a good first win. And, therefore, it's -- as an image important to do it, even if we could have done it in five years. And then the second question about, if we start the more difficult things now, we have a chance to have that achieved in one setting that framework. But maybe some very difficult things started in one year.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thank you Sebastien. David McAuley is next.

>>DAVID MCAULEY: David McAuley speaking for the record. There's one of the things we should do as we consider all this is look at bylaw 27.1 because it talks about Work Stream 2 and how it works. In fact, it even contemplates what CCWG accountability group continuing on to get into a discussion with the Board over recommendations that the Board might not accept. And they have a high burden to go through something like that. But there's also an implementation that there will be -- bylaws talk about -- ICANN actually did a very brief session. Bylaws say in subsection D, ICANN shall provide adequate support for work in Work Stream 2 matters within budgeting processes and limitations reasonably acceptable to the CCWG accountability. And Work Stream 2 isn't available, limited at the time. All I'm saying is that bylaw addresses some of that and we should keep it in mind to help the user support our efforts. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thank you. Steve is back in the queue.

>>STEVE DelBIANCO: Thank you, Steve DelBianco. Dave is right about that bylaws point but that is mostly with respect to the board's acceptance or rejection of our proposal as approved by the chartering organizations. That doesn't actually address prioritization and dependencies, unless we make it part of our recommendations. And I think Sebastien said the same thing, that our recommendations as approved by the community should include the order of implementation that we determine through our priorities and dependencies. So we have got to make it part of our report that gets approved. Therefore, the order of implementation, however we came up with it, the order of implementation then becomes subject to the board needing to implement it unless they come up with a two-thirds majority to say no twice. So the bylaw that Dave has just quoted is true enough, but it only works for us in the notion of the order of implementation if we make that part of our final report.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks, Steve. I should note that so far this group has not had in its work plan any prioritization. So this is something that we would need to discuss because what we discussed so far is that we would check our assembled report for inconsistencies and we're going to discuss this a little bit later on, but we have not foreseen, so far, any recommendations coming out of this group with respect to prioritizing the outcome of one subteam over another subteam's work product. Lori, your hand is raised, please.

>>LORI SCHULMAN: Yes, to both your points, I'd like to second that, particularly in view of the fact that ICANN is facing super difficult budget choices, and so I think it would probably in the best interest of the community for the group that worked on the plan to at least recommend priorities so that they coordinate with however the budget will be prioritized. I think, you know, we're at this point now because of the concern with the reserves and budgeting in general that I would hate to your point see this one over the fence and then in the name of the budget somehow not implement it or not implement it timely or -- I think there's an important advisory role we could continue to play on the priorities.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Lori. Fiona's hand is raised.

>>FIONA ASONGA: Thank you very much, Thomas. This is Fiona, for the record. I think what we need to consider moving forward as next steps is seeing if we can have a group look at all

the recommendations once done and discuss on prioritization. Because I think in the subgroups we may not have spent time on the discussion on prioritization so we'll need to go back into the subgroups for a brief discussion on prioritization of the agreed recommendations. And once that is done, have a conversation on what should be a priority, what has been spoken by us because it's very important, especially feedback that Sebastien has given. There may be things that may be easy and may not cost much. It's important to classify those and highlight those and allow -- maybe we put the recommendations into classes of groups based on how the more complex ones, the easier ones, and allow then room for a conversation with the board on how long they think it will take to implement the more complex or costly recommendations and see how that works. Because the challenge is we are likely to achieve the easier non-costly recommendations but have a challenge moving forward with the more complex ones. And yet, some of the easier recommendations may be dependent on the more complex recommendations in order for us to achieve the big picture we've been working towards. Thank you.

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Fiona. Before we move further down in the queue, just a word of caution. This prioritization effort that you're now starting to engage in has not been part of our mandate. We were mandated with coming up with recommendations on the list of subjects that we had in our work plan. If you now want to discuss priorities in which this has to be worked off and if you put that into our report, then you make it a whole lot more difficult for people to comment on the final report where we are just asking for identifying inconsistencies. So if you're asking them to comment on priorities as well, this will make the thing a lot more complicated. So I think this needs to be treated as a -- as a separate discussion, and this is why we've asked you to come up with ideas on objective criteria that can inform a debate about coming up with a roadmap for implementation. But we have a queue. Next in line is Jordan, then Julie and then Steve.

 >> (Off microphone).

 >>JORDAN CARTER: Look, it is useful to get some criteria that have been -- some of which have been suggested already. One of the -- the fact of the need to do prioritization has been mentioned and the dealing with complexity is one of the issues to effect that prioritization has

been mentioned. And dependencies has. I want to be really clear that the actual working out of all the dependencies and priorities of implementation is beyond the scope of this group. And possibly more significantly, in no part of the timetable that's been developed for our work to hit the June meeting have we allowed for or resourced for or even thought about an appropriate prioritization and implementation strategy approach. If we're going to be going to public comment on the final report in the next couple of weeks, I can tell you now, just based on the discussions that we have and have had over the years, there is zero chance of this group agreeing by consensus a prioritization framework, let alone the outcomes of it. And we are not going to get an extension beyond June. The community is not going to keep this work going. That is why we have suggested exactly what's on the slide in front of you, that there needs to be an implementation team to do it and that ICANN needs to consult the community on those prioritizations. And it can't be ICANN that comes up with them by themselves. And because of where we are in this process now, it isn't our group's job as the CCWG to come up with it by ourselves either.

So I predict failure of the work altogether if we go down the prioritization approach now. I don't think that we should do it. I think we should continue to get suggestions from people about how to do it, and I think that we should then focus on getting that group going and getting a clear understanding with the board that I hope we'll talk about later in this -- this afternoon, that there is agreement that it can't just be the organization and the board determining what those priorities are.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks, Jordan. Julie.

>>JULIE HAMMER: Yes, thanks. Actually I agree with a lot of what Jordan was saying in that what would be helpful is for this group, which has sort of lived and breathed this stuff for the last couple of years, to just put some thoughts as input to the implementation group going forward and not try and complicate the final report. But the main thing I wanted to make a point of was that we've been talking in the last few comments about this being implementation by the board and workload being primarily focused on the board or ICANN organization. But a lot of the groups that the workload's actually going to fall back on the SO and ACs. It's a huge amount of work that's rolling down the path to implement a lot of these recommendations for

the SOs and ACs themselves. So that's a big factor that comes into play. What's the capacity of the groups within the ICANN community to actually do a lot of these things that are being recommended.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Julie. We have Steve and then Michael, and then we're going to close the queue.

>>STEVE DelBIANCO: Thank you, Thomas. Steve DelBianco. In response to your question, I responded that we would only indicate what is the order of implementation. I propose two frameworks for us to determine the order of implementation, one of which could be priorities and the other being dependencies. So we are not proposing -- I wouldn't want the words "priority" to show up in our final report. That is not for debate. We simply could use prioritization and dependencies in order to determine the order of implementation. So the final report would only contain the order of implementation. And if that were approved by the chartering orgs, it has that very high bar where the board would take a two-thirds vote to reject that order of implementation. So being aspirational about if we could agree on the order of implementation. Priorities are only some part of that consideration. Dependencies would probably be where we would start. A quick examination amongst the teams to determine whether there are teams that have to be done before the other. That is what I mean by dependencies. But let's not get into a debate with the broader community about priorities because you're right, that would go nowhere. But only if our final report, we indicate nine projects and then throw it out there for ICANN staff, ICANN org to decide on the order of implementation. That's one way to go. A better way is if we knew an order of implementation that we should make it part of our final report.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks, Steve. Michael.

>>MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. So Michael Karanicolas, for the record. Oh, I see I'm Micah on the screen. That's good. So I was chatting with somebody from ICANN's open data programming recently and they mentioned that in terms of their own prioritization they basically develop a matrix between impact levels of low impact and high impact and then ease of doing things in terms of easy and difficult and complicated. And so he was mentioning how they would target the low difficulty, high impact stuff first and work their way through it. And

so basically in terms of plans for developing prioritization, I thought that was an interesting approach that we might want to consider, especially in terms of guarding against working groups saying well, everything is a super high priority. We have to do it all at the front end. If you created that kind of a matrix and had a requirement to fill it out relatively evenly, that might force better critical thinking about the decisions. I do think that it's going to be really difficult to have a -- a consultation or to include something like that in the final report that's going out to public consultation because as somebody mentioned previously, everybody has their own pet projects, everybody has their own theme that they want to see done at the front end. And I think if you open it up to that then you potentially are just going to get a bunch of comments back saying, why is this thing that I care about number 7 when it should be number 2. And I think it does potentially complicate the consultation process. So my inclination is this should be done as part of that implementation phase mentioned behind you after the recommendations. That's just my thoughts. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Michael. So I think it's time for us to take stock now. The queue is clear. So I guess that has been great advice from this group. I understand that the criteria that we could suggest our priorities, dependencies, complexity, impact and we will go through the transcript of this meeting subsequently in order to tease out the respective buzzwords and approaches.

So I think that's as much as we wanted to get out of this group in terms of advice, so that's great. Most important point is that we have agreement on the implementation oversight team. Let's now talk a little bit about the approval process that's been mentioned earlier. We have a slide on that. I'm not sure, do you want to come up here for the approval process discussion? No? As you wish. So there's one visualization of the approval process.

>> It's the previous slide.

>> It's one slide up.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: That's great. And this is something that we need to discuss and we need to be perfectly clear on what's -- what's happening. Let's work through this from left to right. So we have the subteams that come up with their recommendations. They have put these out for public comment. That's what we've done already. And then we're sort of in this process

now where we put together the subteam's recommendations and amalgamate them into a final report, right? And this is something that Bernie's heavily involved in. So he's not only -- is he assembling the subteam's web products but he's making everything nice. I think we'll have some graphics in the final report, illustrating the recommendations that we have. What else do you have in there, Bernie?

 >>BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, we could get into details, but I think you've covered the majority of it. I mean, basically as we discussed in a previous meeting, we'll be using the Work Stream 1 approach. So basically executive summary, background, and then it's just the recommendations. Just the recommendations, ma'am. Nothing else. So we will have a summary of all the recommendations. And after that we'll follow an integral copy of each of the final reports from each of the subgroups. That's going to be our approach. With the added -- as we agreed in Joburg, we will be adding that part of the transcript and the minority opinion from Brazil to the jurisdiction annexes. Thank you.

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: So we collate all that. It's being put into one document. And then we're going to put it out for public comment. And just to manage expectations, we're not going to have a consensus call by this group on the final report because it's just an accumulation of all the individual paths that you guys have already signed off on. If we're not following that route, we're going to be in trouble time-wise. And this is why it would be so difficult to add more topics to the report at this late stage. Right? So we're now pretty much in the middle. We're putting everything together. Hopefully we're going to have a successful second reading on jurisdiction in a moment. And then it's going to be put out for public comment. And only if the -- if we get some feedback coming out of the public comment that suggests that we have some inconsistencies in our report, because that's all we're asking for during that public comment period. You're looking at me, Bernie? The final report we're going to ask for consistencies.

 >>BERNARD TURCOTTE: Our original thinking on that, I believe, was that the final public consultation would address inconsistencies and propose them to the community to see how they reacted to them. That's what I seem to remember.

 >>JORDAN CARTER: And just to draw you out a bit, your analysis today doesn't show any inconsistencies, does it?

>>BERNARD TURCOTTE: There are a few interdependencies. There are no inconsistencies, and I have a slide for that later.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Basically we're not soliciting for feedback from the wider community on the subteam's recommendations. That's done. Only if they have an issue with interdependencies, you know, they can speak up. But we're not asking for public comments on the individual recommendations. I think we've discussed this earlier, but just to be abundantly clear with that, should there be new ideas on individual recommendations, although we haven't asked for those comments during the public comment period, we would put it on the record and then some ATRT can deal with it if they want to, right? But that's nothing for our group to work on.

So basically, once we go out of that public comment period, if there are no changes warranted, then we will finalize our report and send it to the chartering organizations for their approval. And this is -- this is the phase that Steve mentioned earlier. This is where I think I fully agree with Steve that we need to replicate what we've done before we get the Work Stream 1 report approved, i.e., the co-chairs from -- including the rapporteurs -- need to do a road show to drum up support for chartering orgs timely approval of our report. And you can help us with that. You know, you are members, you are participants of individual component parts of the ICANN community.

We need to make sure that we do other webinars or on-site meetings at the next ICANN meeting so that you guys can sign-off on this.

Right? Once we have that -- once the chartering organizations say yes to it -- which we do hope will be a formality, then we need the Board's formal adoption. That's the part where David's reference to 27.1 come into play because the Board will only have the possibility to reject recommendations based on the mechanisms described in the bylaws.

So are there any questions or comments? I see there's a queue forming. First in line is Sebastien. Please.

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. Sebastien Bachollet speaking.

Yeah, I was really thinking that we would have and we will discuss any interdependencies here before we left this room today. Because it will be -- if decided or if there are some questions to

be worked out and to be addressed in the final report to be sent to a public consultation, that's the first point.

Second is that, yeah, we are not asking in the final public comment any comments on specific subteam reports. But now that we have the full report and they may have some people who have another view and ideas about this overall document.

The other point is that I agree with you that it will be good to go and discuss with any supporting organization or chartering organization. May I suggest that we ask staff to set up one single meeting to make for you a presentation? And that we just go to each and every chartering organization to discuss the question with them, not to make the presentation five, six, seven times. It will be better for your time and it will be better for the time of this organization.

Multiplying the same type of organization, it's costly for all of us.

And my last point it's a question we want to have finished at the next ICANN meeting. Is it the intention that we get the approval by the chartering organization and by the board by June? Or we deliver the report. We deliver the questions. And we ask any question. And then is there a call to decide when they will take this into their work load and decide for the chartering organization. And do we have a timeline for this last part, please?

>>THOMAS RICKERT: That's been quite a lot of points, Sebastien.

I guess that we will take good note of your suggestion to have one presentation of the report. Maybe we can do a webinar that's reported -- that's recorded that can be reviewed asynchronously by those who are interested in it. That's something that maybe Patrick can take note of so that people can digest it if and when they want.

About the dependencies, we have another session today talking about the structure of the report. That will be your opportunity to speak about dependencies. And we can have a discussion about that during the next item.

As far as timing is concerned, I think it's unrealistic to expect everything including board approval to take place by ICANN62. I think that's not happened. Did you get word from the Board in terms of their planning? Bernie, maybe that's one for you to take.

>>BERNIE TURCOTTE: No, simple answer. If we just reviewed the timing a bit, as you saw, from the proposed plenaries, we're starting plenaries again after this meeting in early May. And why is that? Because that's when we expect the public consultation to be finished and staff to be able to put all of that into a document so we can look at it. So you have to imagine that, if we're starting to look at the results of the public consultation in early May and that the ICANN meeting is June 24th, somewhere around there, middle/end of June and for any organization to consider any document for approval at an ICANN meeting, the absolute tightest deadline you can provide is two weeks before, right? So having done this quite a number of times, that's unrealistic. We will have finished getting our stuff ready and preparing our presentations and walking in to the next ICANN meeting ready to have our final approval. Maybe our final approval will already have been given if things work well. And then doing what we call the road show.

And, as far as Sebastien's comment that it's costly and we should only go answer questions, I agree with you. However, what I find is more important is that we should offer it to the SOs and ACs who are chartering organizations and give them what they want. If they want the presentations and questions, I think we should go in and give them the presentation and the questions. We're there to make sure that our chartering organizations are comfortable with approving this. And I think after the work that we all put into it, the notion is that little extra bit, if that's what they want, that's fine. This being said, as Sebastien said, if we want the simple framework, a canned presentation we just go in and answer questions, that's great also. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thank you very much.

>>SEBASTIAN BELLAGAMBA:

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastien Bachollet speaking. If I understand well and agree with that, we will make our final decision about the report maybe all year, but it's planned to be at the face-to-face meeting in June. That means that chartering organization and the Board will do enact after that. Do we have any plan to tell them you have three weeks, 10 months, three years to make a final decision on that? Because I think it's also important that we -- as we finish our work, it will be really finished when they will approve our report. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks, Sebastien. I guess what we can do is ask them for an expected time frame. I think it's not our -- in our mandate to impose pressure or set deadlines. But I think what we will do is we will ask them so that we can hopefully come up with a plan where the community can expect everything to fall into its places. Bernie, you wanted to add to that?

>>BERNIE TURCOTTE: Yeah. Let's not get carried away by the power we were handed in Work Stream 1. There was a deadline that was being adhered to by the entire community. We weren't imposing a deadline on the community. The community imposed the deadline on itself. This is a different story here with Work Stream 2. I don't think it would be favorable for us come in and try and push the SOs and ACs that are our chartering organizations into approving this. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thank you very much.

Now it's time for you to speak, Robin. Go ahead.

>>ROBIN GROSS: Thank you. A few minutes ago we were talking about the structure of the report. It was mentioned that the minority opinion on the diversity subgroup would be included appended to the report. I just wanted to remind and confirm that that's also the case for the transparency -- minority report on the transparency recommendations. That would be treated the same way. Thanks.

>>BERNIE TURCOTTE: It's on there.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: David.

>>DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Thomas. David McAuley speaking again, for the record. I got lost a little bit on what exactly we'll be inviting public comments on. And it has to do with inconsistencies and interdependencies. I got lost in that part.

It's my expectation or my understanding, rather, that the request for public comments will ask for identification of inconsistencies amongst the subgroups and interdependencies both. Is that right?

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Correct.

>>DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: We just want to strongly disencourage comments dealing with substance of the recommendations as such. We don't want to have these redelegated.

>> Can I -- strike that. There's an interplay, isn't there, David? We will be identifying everything we see. And, as a group, if we saw conflicts from recommendations, we'd iron these out in the next phase and make sure that the final report doesn't have them. And we'll ask people to validate our take on that. If we say we don't see any inconsistencies and see these four interdependencies and we ask people to say yeah that's right and we see that as an inconsistency or interdependencies, they'll add any additional analysis.

>> Fair point. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: So there are no hands raised. No questions. I think then we can move to the next agenda item. And that is dealing with the report structure, right? Bernie, I think that's something for you to discuss a little bit.

>>BERNIE TURCOTTE: Thank you, Thomas. We're past the lunch break. Review of overlaps and conflicts, yes. The Sebastien section. I listened.

All right. So maybe I'll skip over that one. I promise I'll come back to it, Sebastien.

The global approach we discussed in the previous section. As per workstream 1, what we'll do is we'll be crafting a background piece, a new background piece. Because Work Stream 2 is new stuff. Just can't copy over the Work Stream 1 stuff. We have to say what happened. And then we have to have some sort of executive summary as to what we're asking for in the public comment.

But, as Thomas has said, there's no new material in here. We're just being very clear about what we're asking. And then we're appending the recommendations and the full reports. It gets to be a very big document. So that's our global approach. And I didn't see any objections to that. And I'll just double-check that again.

I'm not seeing any hands. And I'm not seeing some glares. So I'm happy with that. So that's the global approach and the structure.

The draft executive summary is not ready. I've started working on it. But the reality is that some of the things we decided today will impact how we're going to structure that and what we're telling the community and what we're asking for the community in the public comments as noticed in the last few minutes of discussion. I see Steve's hand.

>>STEVE DELBIANCO: First bullet, if we had to do review of overlaps and conflicts.

>>BERNIE TURCOTTE: That's coming up.

>>STEVE DELBIANCO: In this meeting?

>>BERNIE TURCOTTE: Right after I finish this bunch.

>>STEVE DELBIANCO: If we do that, presumably, we'll also try to resolve it by indicating the order of implementation?

>>BERNIE TURCOTTE: I'm told by my attorney I don't have to comment on that.

So, basically, before we go into overlaps and conflicts, are we all comfortable with this approach? Sebastien?

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: First a question to make sure I understand. You say it will be a very big document. But the idea is to have everything in one single document. Or you will, as you described earlier, have the executive summary and the recommendation in one document and, therefore, appendix for each and every subgroup report and appendix for other document we want to have. Because, if there are still people who print our report, there are still people who are reading it in a very small handset and with very few memory, it may be better if I can suggest that you do a shorter document as possible, the shorter document possible for the main ideas and then report to the others.

>>BERNIE TURCOTTE: I think that's an implementation thing. Just from the point of view of how we will actually finally distribute it, it'll probably be separate files. It will be the main report. And then the annexes will probably be separate files. Because I started plowing it together. And it was around a thousand pages, and that's just a little big, right? So the main report itself, if we look at it with the summary of recommendations, will probably come in at 60-70 pages from what I've calculated. So already that will be a pretty big document, not to mention the list of annexes. Does that answer your question? Thank you.

So from that point, I gather we understand how we want to tackle this thing, what we're going to present. And now it's time to look at overlaps and conflicts. I wonder if Brenda could put up that slide I sent you. Please.

No, I don't want us getting anything fast. Excellent. If we just blow it up a bit. Basically, what we did here -- and this is about -- this was done after end of year break. So it needs to be redone. But I don't believe there are any significant changes that will impact it. The lines and

columns are the same groups which is why you see the darkened squares because diversity doesn't have any diversity impacts, obviously. So then, if we run on the first line, it's diversity versus guidelines, diversity versus human rights, jurisdiction, et cetera. I won't bore you with the details.

So what I did is I actually took each report and scanned it for conflicts and overlaps. And I'm not saying this is an absolute final. I will have to redo it. But I think it's pretty good.

So, if we take diversity against the other groups, I could not find any serious overlaps. And I could not find any conflicts. And I know we have Lori here, there she is. Hi, Lori. Do you think that's okay?

>>LORI SCHULMAN: I'm not paying attention. I'm not going to lie.

>>BERNIE TURCOTTE: Sorry to put you on the spot.

>>LORI SCHULMAN: I apologize. I was typing something as you were speaking.

>>BERNIE TURCOTTE: The question is, just to be clear, is are there any overlaps with the other groups -- sorry. I was doing diversity. Good God. >>LORI SCHULMAN: Yeah, I was going to say you weren't doing guidelines but okay. Fiona.

>>LORI SCHULMAN: Maybe I get a pass then for not paying attention.

>>BERNIE TURCOTTE: All right. Fiona.

>>LORI SCHULMAN: Maybe I get a pass.

> BERNIE TURCOTTE: You get a pass. I couldn't find other groups. Does that seem reasonable?

>>FIONA ASONGA: Thank you, but not for the spreadsheet. It's quite clear. Yes, you're right. I'm not having issues with any of the other groups.

Just a comment on the matrix. I think the intention was the way you've explained it is, for example, if you went to the next level, you'd have guidelines and diversity showing instead of blank square. And the next square of guidelines is empty. So thinking it's fait accompli, but I understand the concept.

>>BERNIE TURCOTTE: Okay. Thank you. We'll walk through it. As I said, this is our first draft. So it looks like for diversity we're doing okay.

Guidelines, Lori. Any inconsistencies or interdependencies that you see with some of the other groups?

>>LORI SCHULMAN: I don't think so. I mean, we talked about this early on. And the reports have gotten a lot further since our group last convened. But I don't think so. We thought there may be on some of the SO and AC accountability issues in terms of having the SOs and ACs set up structures within themselves. But I don't think so. It might just bear a final, final, final look.

>>BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right. Thank you. That's my thinking also from that report. And as you see we start going down there less and less.

Human rights. Niels was online earlier. I don't know if he's still online. Or do we have -- we have Greg. I'll pick on Greg. Niels is online? Can you speak, Niels? Back to Greg. Okay. All right. So Niels doesn't see any issues. Greg, do you see any issues?

>>GREG SHATAN: I fully support Niels on this matter.

[Laughter]

>>BERNARD TURCOTTE: And amazingly enough, the next one is jurisdiction. While you have the mic, Greg.

>>GREG SHATAN: Well, in this case, it might be -- no, I don't think that there are any significant interdependencies with any of the other recommendations. Obviously this is a critical and delicate and overarching subject, even to the relatively constrained extent that we dealt with it. But I don't think it actually impedes or is a necessary predicate to any of the other bits and pieces.

>>BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you for that succinct answer. So we will --

>>GREG SHATAN: Sorry. Was that excessive?

>>BERNARD TURCOTTE: I didn't say that.

>> Yes.

[Laughter]

>>BERNARD TURCOTTE: Given the ombudsman is the one where I found some interdependencies, let's have a chat about those right now. I'll describe them and then hand it over to Sebastien to see what he thinks of it.

The first one is in tract 3 versus SO/AC accountability. You'll remember the third recommendation or block of recommendations from SO/AC accountability was saying that the IRP should not apply to SOs and AC's decisions. And that was rather very clear. However, it did

say that existing mechanisms, including the ombuds, should be able to handle those. Now, my reading of that is that there's no changes required but there is a reference to the ombudsman and none of the work in the ombuds group I think goes against that. So that just stayed green as a notice.

If we look at ombuds versus the staff accountability, there was the staff accountability panel but that doesn't exist anymore. So now that would be replaced by none. And finally, ombuds versus the new DIDP from the transparency recommendations, right? And so we've got a yellow there. And basically there was various ombuds or a conflict officer which there was sort of a choice to be made as to where this could go. It's certainly not a conflict. It's a slight overlap. I don't see it as an overlap of any kind of concern. I don't see it as an overlap that is affected by the work that was done in the ombuds group. And I -- I've got both rapporteurs here, so I'm sort of happy. Maybe I'll go to Michael first and then we'll hand it over to Sebastien for some comments.

>>MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. Michael Karanicolas, for the record. Thanks so much for that introduction to the issue. Yeah. So Sebastien and I have been in touch through the process. I think we spotted that there was a potential area of overlap fairly early on and had a few back and forths about it. I don't necessarily see this as a conflict in the sense that, you know, as part of the development of the transparency recommendations we had a few areas of oversight over the system that we were looking for an appropriate body to implement. And we, in two of those three cases, said it should either be done by the ombudsman or the complaints officer and left it a little bit open. And one, we said specifically it should be the ombudsman doing it. You know, I don't think that having the ombudsman do that is against anything that the -- that the ombudsman group came up with. I think that it's -- I don't think that it's a problematic overlap and that it's really dealing with -- specifically with oversight of the transparency system. So I, you know, I think that it's accurate but I don't think it's necessarily problematic. But I'd be very interested to hear from the other -- from Sebastien.

>> Over to Sebastien.

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I think it's something we have taken into account from a long time and I don't think there is any inconsistency. It was even taken as an example by the

excellent reviewer to set up the recommendation 11 to talk about what is outside of the non-complaint work and could be followed by some of the road to setup. And if it's a complaint, definitely it's within the ombuds office capacity. Thank you.

>>BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. Apart from that, do you think I missed anything when I was looking at this for overlaps and conflicts? From the ombuds point of view.

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Bernie. I think -- Sebastien Bachollet speaking. We have taken -- that's how you've seen our report, it's included and we have tried to follow what's happening in the other groups. And you have cover SO/AC accountability, you have covered transparency. I don't -- we didn't raise any other issue. But I think I would like to introduce a little different point of view who is -- as now I am released from my reporter role as ombuds is a done deal for our group. I think the question raised about how to deal with -- with diversity and the question of the so-called office of diversity could have been and as I was reporter of the ombuds group I didn't submit that to my group because I didn't want to mix my hats. I think that way to do in a better independent way is maybe to raise the bar of the obligation of the ombuds office regarding diversity and therefore it doesn't need too much changes in any of those to report. But I think it's something we need to think about and decide upon if so you are willing to do. Thank you.

>>BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Sebastien. I'll hand that over to Thomas, given both those records have gone through second reading now.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Okay. So no questions about the report? Then I think we can declare that agenda item closed, right.

>> (Off microphone).

>>THOMAS RICKERT: I'm sorry.

>> Christopher.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Christopher, please, go ahead.

>>CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. Christopher Wilkinson, for the record. I'm no longer on Adobe. I hope my computer charger is somewhere over the mid-Atlantic. The -- it's a beautiful matrix and it tells us a lot, but perhaps not quite enough. Sometimes I feel as if you

ask a question with so few answers, either you declare a success or maybe the question was not the right question.

 I think that there is a third dimension to this matrix which is time and resources. And I think in the next year or two the real problem of inconsistencies and of interaction between the implementation of these recommendations will not be the -- this matrix, but the other matrix in terms of the conflict of resources. I give you a specific example. Let's suppose that everybody agrees that the diversity question has absolute first priority but as a matter of fact, there's so many procedural and human dimensions to the implementation of the diversity recommendations that it would take, in my judgment, several years to satisfy everybody that the recommendations have been achieved whereas there are other recommendations which give or take a few board meetings could be implemented quite quickly. So I don't ask you to do it now, but I do think that the -- it's necessary to consider how deep each of these boxes is in terms of the time and resources that would be required to implement them.

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Christopher. I guess the implementation is something that will need to be discussed elsewhere. Fortunately, unfortunately, who knows. So let's see whether there are any further hands raised that --

 >> (Off microphone).

 >>BERNIE TURCOTTE: Just to finish my line so that we've done it well, there was the two remaining lines, SO/AC accountability, and I see Steve has left unfortunately but I -- I have Cheryl. I didn't find any conflicts there. Okay? And finally, staff accountability, and I'll look to Jordan for that. I didn't see any conflicts there, either.

 So yes, I understand Christopher's point, but I don't have that data and that may well be a new matrix once we get into implementation, as Thomas has said. So overall, I think as we present our final report for public comment, we may note some of these things and we will be asking if we missed some. And I'll be redoing this matrix and resending it out. But I've worked on about every single report here, and I think we're -- it's going to look pretty much the same. And I don't foresee any significant issues that will be brought up. So that's it for me for this section, Thomas. Back to you.

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Bernie. I see David's hand is raised. Over to you.

>>DAVID McAULEY: I did, Thomas. It's David McAuley speaking. And I put it down. I was just going to ask Bernie what we're doing. I think there may be a potential issue on one of these blocks, but I need to go and look. I mean, I don't know if it's worth mentioning now.

>>BERNARD TURCOTTE: You know where to get me.

>>DAVID McAULEY: Sure. It was an inconsistency that existed, and I think it's been taken care of.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: So that's going to be the secret (indiscernible) regarding inconsistency.

>>DAVID McAULEY: Let me mention it just for -- just to be transparent about it. But I was in both groups that dealt with transparency and human rights, and the human rights group maintained the bylaw direction that we will apply human rights that are internationally recognized as required by applicable law. In the transparency report, at one point we were saying something -- and I'm paraphrasing -- along the lines that ICANN should adopt this particular whatever it was, transparency practice based on a human right as expressed in X, and I don't know what -- I can't give you anything more specific. And so I just wanted to look and make sure that X was one of those documents that would fit within internationally recognized human rights as required by applicable law or if it wasn't, that we simply say that that transparency practice should be expressed in terms of we've looked at this and our -- and are persuaded that this should apply in this circumstance. Not that ICANN is bound to by its bylaw. And so it's a little bit complex, but it was in the nature of that kind of an inspection. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: So let's see whether Michael can demystify that topic.

>>MICHAEL KARANICOLAS: Hi. Michael Karanicolas, for the record. Yeah, we edited that language out, I think. There were -- I know that there were -- I remember this coming up. I remember we had a bunch of discussions based on it, and I remember that the language was edited as a result. And I think I recall that we went back and forth and both considered it resolved, but by all means, I'll check that out.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Now, every good piece of software has some Easter eggs in it. Shall we build this as an Easter egg into our report, just to see whether people are reading it properly.

>> (Off microphone).

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Okay. Bernie, great work on the matrix. I think this clearly shows that --
that a lot of thought has been put into the question of whether there are inconsistencies, so I
think that at least I am, and I'm sure you are also quite confident that we can put this out
without being a big risk of being called out by the community for not having done our
homework properly. So that's excellent. Thanks so much. I think you can stay here for the
next agenda item, which is going to be the preparation for the board meeting. Right? That's
you or Tijani.

>> It's me. Thanks, Thomas. Hi, everyone. This is exciting. Oh, Sebastien's hand is up.

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. It's -- I have the impression, Thomas, you wanted to answer
to my previous intervention but you didn't because we skipped to other topics and to finalize
this. But I just want to underline that we are talking here about some link in inconsistency. I
think we need also to see if there are what I call, and maybe it's the wrong word in English, but
overarching issue or issue which deals -- could deal when we have the full package with
different subgroup report. And one of them is what I was saying about diversity and the role of
the ombuds office can play in that. But maybe there are others. And I think it's important not
to close this door because we have work in silos, even if we have done quite well, some cross
pollinization. But now that we have the whole document, it will be a good time to look at that
also. It's not inconsistency. It's not (indiscernible) written in one or the other. But it could be
something coming out after reading the whole document. Thank you.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Sebastien. I feel quite confident that when we have
Bernie who has been co-authoring all the subteam's reports and if he's doing the double-
checking that we hopefully won't face any overarching structure or systemic issue with the
overall report. But I trust that -- and maybe this is an agreement that we can make today,
Sebastien, that should something come up we will call for an emergency meeting of the group
in order to fix it, you know, and for the unlikely case that something's coming up that we didn't
envisage to take place. Bernie.

>>BERNARD TURCOTTE: That's not what Sebastien is asking about.

[Laughter]

He's -- he says that when you're looking at the overall package the way it stands, he has found an inconsistency because he thinks it makes sense to sort of link the issue we talked about -- I'm trying to frame it for you and you can go back in. As we look at the whole report, he feels that there's an inconsistency in that there is a gap which touches on diversity, slightly related to the office of diversity and what the ombuds could do. So he is looking at us under the heading of inconsistencies, trying to address what he perceives as a gap. Did I get that right, Sebastien?

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's really what I call cross something. I called it overarching issue. But it's something -- when you have the work done in a project with nine team, even if we talk all together, when you have the final document or you have -- if you do that for software, when you put the nine software together, you might have some trouble to -- to leave it together and then you need to have some work done. And I was thinking that it's a good time to do that, to say hey, guys, maybe if we put this idea from report A and this idea from report C, it could be even better to a new way of doing things. It's -- it's to announce the global document and not to try to find if there are some mistake or if we do something wrong. It is sort of is a reverse. It's using that as a possible announcement of the overall document.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: Okay, but -- yeah, sorry. Thanks for helping. Then I got your concern quite slightly differently. If I understand you correctly, then we're talking about the individual path probably not being interoperable or that there are patches, you know, that there are blank spots that need to be filled. I think for both instances additional work by the subteams would be required in order to fill the gaps. And I think that during this phase pretty much all we can do is look for inconsistencies. So if we find blank spots where we see there's a hole in our accountability patchwork, if you wish, coming out of the subteams, I guess that's something that we can identify and then hand over to ATRT or some other place for future accountability improvements. But that's nothing that we can do on the fly. Jordan.

>>JORDAN CARTER: Just to add, I think one of the points that Sebastien is making is when you bring bunches of work together you might derive new insights or opportunities from it. So better ways to solve the problem and so on.

The challenge that we've got is that we're bringing it together and putting it out for the final consultation at the same time. So really -- right now, during the course of this week, and if you

see opportunities like that, to bash them on the leg straight away. Because what we can't, I think, do is get that stuff in response to the public comments to the compiled report and then do another turn.

 So in a perfect world we would have gotten to the stage a year ago or have another year to go to really test and so on.

 But we don't, unfortunately or fortunately, have that time.

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much. Anything else to add on this point? Or on the final report as such? And let me read Greg Shatan's suggestion.

 "I suggest we translate the entire report into German and back again." Let me say with what's been going on I'm happy with the first part and not with the second part. What's that? But you support or not? I support translating it into German.

 >> But you need to support or not. You don't have the choice.

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: Okay. Jordan, next agenda item over to you.

 >>JORDAN CARTER: Thanks. Topic change. We are now up in the agenda to the item that is about a meeting with ICANN board members.

 And I can't remember why we thought this might take an hour. But, if it does, I will be sad for us all.

 The proposal that we made to the -- to Cherine and Chris Disspain, chair and vice chair, is that we should just make an informal opportunity for the co-chairs and rapporteurs to meet with whatever relevant board members are here. I don't think it's all of them. I don't think it will be a full meeting of the board. To be able to answer any questions that they've got about the recommendation and to just sort of keep a more informal conversation going as we move toward finalizing during the final public comment. So that, if there are any misunderstandings that were shown to the Board's final comments or anything that they can be teased out and we can update them briefly on where this meeting got to. And we can kind of confirm where this meeting got to with respect to the implementation process that we're looking for and just have a dialogue back and forth.

 That is what is hopefully scheduled for some time next week. Next Wednesday at 10:30 or 11:30 or something like that. It's really just to signal that that's happening. One thing that I

guess is proper to say and to assert is that, if anyone here is meeting with board and then suddenly pricks up with concern about there being some kind of a negotiation or a dealing process, that isn't what's going to happen. And it's not what anyone is interested in. It's just a clarification and implementation process discussion.

So I think I've captured that right. Thomas or Tijani, is there anything to add to that approach to the meeting? No? Doesn't look like it. So really, if no one has any questions about that, we can move on. The meeting will be recorded, so you'll be able to listen to it to your heart's content afterwards, if you like. Sebastien, your hand is up.

>>SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, sorry. All the people who are supposed to be at that meeting received an invitation already?

>>JORDAN CARTER: I don't think so. No. I was looking for it in my diary before. That's why I didn't know when it was. But, if you get an invite sent out --

>>BERNIE TURCOTTE: We'll be sending them out today.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: From what I understand, it won't be the full board. But the Board has board members that are allocated to the work of subteams in the Work Stream 2 and CCWG. It will be a good caucus consisting of Cherine and others and maybe some of these board rapporteurs for the subteam's work. And we want to sort of mirror that by having the co-chairs and the rapporteurs in the room.

>>JORDAN CARTER: Okay. I won't take responsibility for it. But I will apologize for the late scheduling of the meeting. We didn't consider the fact of the meeting only came up last week. Still, more time would have been better than none. So I'm sorry, Cheryl and others.

And now I'll hand over to Tijani for the next agenda item.

>>TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Jordan. Our next agenda item is about the second reading of the jurisdiction subgroup. So I invite Greg to come here.

I would like to remind you that this morning we had the first reading. There we would direct these under the recommendations of the subgroup. And then Thiago reminded us that he had comments that hadn't been taken into account. And there was a discussion here. And at the end we reached a consensus language between Brazil and Greg. And this was approved by the

plenary. I will present this report with what we did this morning when I will make the second reading for approval. Greg, please.

 >>GREG SHATAN: Thank you. Greg Shatan, for the record. I sent around a little while ago a revised version just in red line. So, when we get to the appropriate point in this second reading, we can look at that and see if I captured it correctly and if lunch improved or did the opposite to what it was.

 Do we need to go through the three things point by point or just go directly to that point?

 >>THOMAS RICKERT: Let's go through it just for fun. No.

 >> It is a second reading so we have to --

 >>GREG SHATAN: The first change of note is on page 3 as noted before. The similar sanctions. We've changed the title to recommendations relating to OFAC sanctions and related sanctions issues.

 In the first sentence after the word "particularly," we've added a footnote which reads, "In the future if ICANN's activities are affected by other similar sanctions, e.g, similar in scope, type, and effect and with similar methods of relief, for entities not specifically sanctioned, the spirit of these recommendations should guide ICANN's approach."

 The next change -- with our comments on that. The next change is the footnote number 3 which comes after the term "best efforts."

 That footnote reads, "The term 'best efforts' as used throughout this report, should be understood to be limited by reasonableness. Meaning that an entity, here ICANN, must use its best efforts except for any efforts that would be unreasonable. For example, the entity can take in account it its fiscal health and fiduciary duties and other relevant facts and circumstances. In some jurisdictions this limitation is inherent in the use and meaning of the term. However, in other jurisdictions this may not be the case. And, thus, it's necessary to explicitly state the limitation for the benefit of those in such jurisdictions."

 Next, on page 5 we have the change from "is otherwise qualified" to "would otherwise be approved."

 And this is with regard to approval of registries.

After some internal deliberation with myself, I just kept the approved and qualified but just made sure they're used consistently with each other. In other words, the "qualified" was used with regard to registrars and "approved" with regard to registries. One place that was not done.

Next change after that on page 6, the sentence after the heading choice of law and venue provisions in the registry agreement, sentence has been added to the chapeau text. The body of the report discusses the advantages and disadvantages of each approach.

Next, at the top of page 7, change from recommendation to no opinion on how the menu choice should be made between the negotiating parties. There is now an opinion. It reads now, "The subgroup recommends that the registry chooses from among the options on the menu." I.e., this would not be -- the choice would not be negotiated with ICANN.

After this I believe the next change is on -- is in our favorite section, the overview of the work of the subgroup.

There are a lot of false changes here just because of the quirks of red lining.

The change that was -- existed or the section as it existed as of this morning is in blue. And the change that resulted from this is in red. And this appears on pages 12 and 13,

at least in my copy.

Here is the existing part first. The subgroup's proposed recommendations were submitted to the CCWG accountability plenary. The plenary meeting on 27 October 2017 included a discussion focused on jurisdiction issues. The draft report was approved by consensus as defined in the CCWG accountability charter and not by full consensus. Then there's a footnote to the charter's discussion of consensus. The government of Brazil, which did not support approving the report, prepared a dissenting opinion which is supported by several other participants and can be found in annex E of the report.

Sorry. I lost my page for a second.

A transcript of the plenary discussions is included as annex F to this report. "As a result of these discussions, the section further discussions of jurisdictional-related concerns" was added to the draft report suggesting a path forward for these concerns beyond the CCWG accountability for a further other multistakeholder process.

The draft report was published for public comment on November 14, 2017. The public comment period closed on January 14, 2018. 15 comments were received. These comments will be found at citation. These comments were summarized by ICANN staff in a, quote, unquote, comment spreadsheet which may be found at -- needs to be inserted. These comments were each duly considered and discussed by the subgroup where this led to a change of the subgroup's consensus, the draft report was then changed to reflect the new consensus. Here is the added language.

Of course, we need to double-check if I captured it accurately.

For example, the suggestion added to the report that further discussions of jurisdiction-related concerns are needed was echoed in several comments subsequently received. But these comments did not bring any changes to the report since existing support for further discussions to address unresolved concerns including other fora had already been acknowledged.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: There's only one inaccuracy, which is the word "since" is to be replaced with "recognizing that."

>>JORDAN CARTER: Ah yes, .I now recognize that .and I see that in the chat as well from Thiago. Is that the sole discrepancy, or is there anything else?

>>TIJANI BEN JAMAA: I would say there are discrepancies. I would call your attention to the language in the chat, which is exactly the language that was agreed to in the plenary this morning. So, if there's any doubt about what was the language that was agreed in the plenary, we should go to the transcript and copy and paste what was agreed at that time. The language was repeated several times after it was agreed, including by one of the co-chairs of the CCWG. Thank you.

>> Just taking advantage of the colleague. This would be removing the phrase "for example." It would just begin with the suggestion added to the report.

>>THIAGO JARMID: Can I comment? This is Thiago speaking, for the record. The language is exactly the one that Jordan just placed it in the chat . And I'll read it out loud. The suggestion added to the report that further discussions on jurisdiction-related concerns needed was echoed in several comments subsequently received. These comments did not bring any change

to the report recognizing that the need for further discussions to address any unresolved concerns would already be acknowledged, .thank you.

>> Thank you, Thiago. I think splitting other changes into two sentences in the middle -- so I've captured the average section, language in the ready line? And I'll recirculate that after this.

>> If I maybe gain the floor for a second. I'll just ask for the exact language in the chat with the correct punctuation to be placed into the report. Because, to my understanding, there is more than the changes that you seem to acknowledge. Thank you.

>> What other changes?

>> I don't think that kind of back and forth -- I think the language is in the chat. I repasted it twice now, once in capitals and once with small letters and punctuation around the section that got added .so it's easy to read. You'll find that in the Adobe room. And I suggest you copy and paste that in.

>> It will be copied and pasted.

>> I appreciate that.

>> Jordan, the reason I was looking at this was to figure out if there any were any unintended consequences that I didn't see earlier. So that's why I'm trying to understand the differences between what was my last suggestion and the language we ended up with.   I think primarily it doesn't say "for example" at the beginning. But I'm thinking in the grand scheme of things I can live with that.

I've now pasted the language in the chat in to my working copy of the document .and that's what will be in there.

Moving right along, unless there's any other comment in this section. I see none.

We are now into the main body of the report section on the actual recommendations.

The first change here is on page 20. In the sentence regarding best efforts which now reads, "The last sentence should be amended to require ICANN to apply for and use best efforts to secure an OFAC license if the other party is otherwise qualified to be a registrar and is not on the SDN list."

This one had been changed to approved. But approved is the language we're using for registries qualified for registrars. So this has been changed for consistency's sake.

The next change, not a new change, is on page 21 in the recommendation.

Where here it does say, "ICANN should commit to applying for and using best efforts to secure an OFAC license for all such applicants if the applicant would otherwise be approved and is not on the SDN list."

And thankfully we have no more changes till page 24 when we have the following text after the three diamonds. "When implementing each of the recommendations in this section, their utmost importance to ICANN in carrying out its mission and facilitating global access to DNS should be considered. Taking into account this importance, the implementation phase should start as soon as possible but in no event later than six months after approval by the ICANN board."

This brings us into the choice of law section of the recommendations. And the first change here is on page 29 and reads, "The method of choosing from the menu also needs to be considered. The subgroup recommends that the registry choose from among the options on the menu, i.e., the choice would not be negotiated with ICANN." And the next change is on page 27, the addition of the sentence, after the bolded text, "The subgroup recommends that the registry choose from among the options on the menu, i.e., the choice would not be negotiated with ICANN."

A brief musical interlude, and last we have the stress tests which have -- you can read at your leisure. I will not read through them. They add the stress tests in three examples, all relating to government sanctions. I've made one small change here. At least I thought I did. In one place -- well, maybe I didn't. In any case there's one place where "qualified" was used and it should be "approved" with regard to registries, and I'll find that and I'll fix that. Probably will be better to make this into two-column text rather than using tabs to space them out, but that's neither here nor there. And that takes us to the end of the second reading of the jurisdiction subgroup report.

>>TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Greg. Any comments? Okay. If there is no comments, is there any objection to adopt this -- these recommendations? This is second reading. Okay. Brazil, I see you. Okay. Any other objection? Okay. We can consider that the

recommendations have been approved by the plenary with only one objection. Yes, Brazil, please.

>>BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: I think maybe just a suggestion that you should just consult with those who object in the first reading, for example, Kavouss who is not now -- he made a point he will have difficulty in attending that part of the meeting, so I would suggest that those who expressed objections should also be consulted. Thank you.

>>TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Benedicto, I am afraid he objected before we made the consent on the new language but after that I don't -- I don't think he objected with the new language.

>> (Off microphone).

>> He did? Okay. So you're right, he did. So thank you very much. Two objections.

>> Please.

>> Please.

>> Sorry. I thought objection of the morning was taken into account. Of course, France objects to this, too.

>>TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much. Three objections now, Brazil, Iran, and France. Any other objection? Okay. So we can -- we can -- Thiago? Thiago, please.

>>THIAGO JARDIM: Thiago speaking, for the record. Just to remind us all that in the morning Argentina was attending the session did object, if I'm not mistaken. But we can obviously always double-check.

>>THOMAS RICKERT: The opposite to what Kavouss has done this morning, he has asked us to put his objection on file. So I think we can't just take, you know, the -- the fact that Olga may have objected, so she -- she can add her objection to the record later. But I wouldn't want to speculate over what Argentina wants or not.

>> It's --

>>THIAGO JARDIM: Totally in agreement. Just -- was just describing what happened this morning so have that in the record.

>>TIJANI BEN JEMAA: But it was the first reading, Thiago, and she didn't say she would object for the second reading. So I cannot count her. I have Cheryl in the queue.

>>CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Tijani. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record. And with the greatest respect, I think we need to recognize that even if there is four or dare I say five and particularly noted, we need to note that there is that number of objections. And if you so desire, we can name those objections. But it still does not change the fact that we will have a consensus to have this second reading approved. So happy for the text to reflect it accurately, but particularly since we do run with a system here that, of course, if you had four ACs and SOs objecting that would carry a different weight. We just need to recognize in the text where the objections come from and then also recognize that that does not mean it's not a consensus under GNSO guidelines outcome. Thank you.

>>TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Cheryl. This is exactly what we did for the other recommendations and this is exactly what we will do with this -- these recommendations. So first -- last call for objections. Is there any other objection? Okay.

Now we have, as we said, three objections. And with this, I will consider that those recommendations are approved by the plenary with these three objections. Thank you very much.

>> And thank you, everybody.

>>TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you, Greg, for this work. Very hard work, and thanks to all the jurisdiction members, the subgroup members. They worked very hard, and I know that it was not an easy work. Okay.

>> (Off microphone).

>>TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Next agenda item is any other business. Is there any other business? I see that you are tired and you want to leave. Okay. Thank you. No other business? And I -- I give the floor to Jordan for the next agenda item.

>>JORDAN CARTER: A very complicated item, an adjournment. I just want to start off by thanking everyone in the room today, recognizing that we've had four second readings. We're now on track to complete our work in time for the -- the final proposal to be in front of people in the Panama meeting which is great. A lot of compromise is woven into this work and so really, thank y'all for your patience and for finishing the meeting an hour and nine minutes early, subject to any wrap-up comments that my other co-chair Thomas Rickert might want to

make. This is a real achievement and putting a lid in the end on this process three years after we began it will be deeply satisfying. I also particularly want to recognize the crafting of the consensus around the jurisdiction issues which has taken a great deal of patience and work and flexibility and intelligence on many people's parts, many countries' parts. So a particular note of appreciation on my part as a ccNSO sort of almost spectator to parts of that for making that happen.

Thomas, do you want to add anything to finish wrapping us up?

>>THOMAS RICKERT: No. I was just tempted to ask Greg to -- to, you know, just for the fun of it do a third reading of the jurisdiction report.

[Laughter]

>> Told you he was affected by his flight.

>>GREG SHATAN: I'll do it in German.

>>JORDAN CARTER: Okay. That is us. That's a wrap. Thank you, everyone. The next meeting will be a plenary sometime in May, as agreed. Sorry, Christopher, one final intervention.

>>CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I would just like to propose a vote of thanks to the co-chairs and the rapporteurs for their work over the last long period, including previous co-chairs who are not present.

[Applause]

>>JORDAN CARTER: Thank you very much. Everyone go on and enjoy the sunshine or whatever other meeting you've got lined up for when this finishes. Have a good ICANN meeting.