CCWG ACCT Meeting #77 (14 January @ 06:00 UTC)

Attendees:

Members: Alan Greenberg, Athina Fragkouli, Becky Burr, Bruce Tonkin, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Izumi Okutani, Jordan Carter, Jorge Villa, Julia Wolman, Leon Sanchez, Mathieu Weill, Pär Brumark, Robin Gross, Samantha Eisner, Sebastien Bachollet, Steve DelBianco, Thomas Rickert, Tijani Ben Jemaa   (18)

Participants: Aarti Bhavana, Andrew Sullivan, Avri Doria, Barrack Otieno, Brett Schaefer, Cherine Chalaby, Chris Disspain, David McAuley, Edward Morris, Finn Petersen, Gary Hunt, Jonathan Zuck, Jorge Cancio, Keith Drazek, Lousewies van der Laan, Malcolm Hutty, Markus Kummer, Martin Boyle, Mary Uduma, Matthew Shears, Maura Gambassi, Megan Richards, Mike Chartier, Niels ten Oever, Paul Szyndler, Pedro da Silva, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Sabine Meyer, Seun Ojedeji, Steve Crocker, Suzanne Woolf, Tatiana Tropina, Tom Dale, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben   (34)

Legal Counsel: Edward McNicholas, Michael Clark, Nancy McGlamery, Rosemary Fei   (4)

Observers and Guests: Asha Hemrajani, Bruno Lanvin, John Poole, Jonathan Robinson, Lise Fuhr, Manal Ismail, Navid Hayrani,

Staff: Alice Jansen, Bernie Turcotte, Brenda Brewer, Grace Abuhamad, Karen Mulberry, Laina Rahim, Nigel Hickson, Theresa Swinehart

Apologies: Mark Carvell, Eberhard Lisse, Julie Hammer

**Please let Brenda know if your name has been left off the list (attendees or apologies). **

Transcript

- [Transcript CCWG ACCT #77_14 January.docx](#)
- [Transcript CCWG ACCT #77_14 January.pdf](#)

Recording

- The Adobe Connect recording is available here: https://icann.adobeconnect.com/p6q5rdk0qpo/
- The audio recording is available here: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ccwg-acct-14jan16-en.mp3

Agenda

1. Welcome, roll call, SoI (2 min)

2. Rec 1 - Inspection rights – Second reading – *see http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009428.html* (30 min)

3. Rec 2 – Escalation timeframes – Second reading – *see http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009479.html and http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009545.html* (30 min)

4. Rec 4 – Budget (IANA) - Second reading – *see http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009429.html* (30 min)

Break (10 min)

6. Rec 3 – Fundamental Bylaws – *see http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009550.html* (15 min)

7. Rec 4 – Scope of community IRP & separation power – *see http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009551.html* (30 min)

8. Rec 5 – Mission – Update on ongoing discussions (30 min)

Notes

These high-level notes are designed to help you navigate through content of the call and do not substitute in any way the transcript.

Jordan Carter is on audio bridge only.

Rec 1 Inspection rights - Second reading

Board input: Board agrees with inspection right that are limited to accounting books and can be invoked by single SO/AC. They should be a community right and not reserved to the Sole Designator. The Sole Designator can enforce the right. When invoked, demand should go to and through ICANN i.e. a community process. Giving the Sole Designator an inspection right gives the model an inappropriate change. Text proposal:

Paragraph 20: "*the CCWG-Accountability recommends including in the ICANN Bylaws the right for SOs or ACs to inspect as outlined in California Corporations Code 6333, although this specific article reference would not be mentioned in the Bylaws.*" Paragraph 21: "*This inspection right is distinct from the Document Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP). While any eligible party can file a request according to the DIDP, Inspection Rights are only accessible to SOs or ACs. The scopes are also different as explained below.*" "*Unlike the exercise of the other community powers, which require community engagement and escalation before initiating a request for action by the EC, the CCWG-Accountability recommends that a petition for inspection be brought directly by a single SO/AC or by multiple SO/ACs through making a written demand on ICANN for the requested materials. If the Board refused or ignored the request, the petitioning SO/AC(s) could then initiate an escalating community decision-making process to enforce demand on the Board requiring community consensus.*

On Investigation Rights: The Board agrees with the inclusion of an investigatory right, and notes that the language proposed in redline reflects the Board's comments.

On DIDP: The Board reaffirms its commitment to addressing improvements to the DIDP in WS2, and thanks the CCWG for the clarification in the document on the differences between the inspection right and the DIDP.

Feedback:

- It is unclear that there will be an expanded process for DIDP. Is that the case?

--> DIDP is not on agenda of recommendation 1. This discussion will take place on Thursday.

Conclusion: We will be moving forward with inspection rights section. We will reopen second item – GAC as decisional participant – once we have input from GAC.

Rec 2 - Escalation timeline - Second reading

Edits include: timeframe lengthened for SO/ACs to make a decision and conference call step removed. Once petition is launched, it will go to Community Forum. This has an impact on threshold and overall timeframe. Rationale for giving additional time is to give more time for SO/ACs to exchange on why they would want power to be used. Extension is not available for ICANN or IANA budget.

On timeframe

Feedback:

- (1) The CF format allows for a "second or third" session if needed – because the CF is the best chance to amicably resolve an issue that makes sense but won't these added sessions need an
extension "as appropriate" as 21 days may be inadequate

---> Community Forum might take 1-
2 days. Cannot imagine it would but there could be a Community Forum where separate sessions to give a global conversation (e.g. session at 06:00 UTC - 14:00 UTC etc). We have set deadlines for when Forum should be started
but may want to set tighter limits for duration of Forum.

 - (2) Suggest step six get 3 days, not 1 – there may be communication issues or human error.

---> Board will be advised. SO/AC decision will be recording decisions publicly.

- (3) Could the "days" specified be limited to week days – remember that holidays vary widely across the globe and August is virtually work-free almost everywhere

---> Intention is not that 21 days would be business days. If we want to extend timeframe, we should have discussion but the days in this document are calendar days.

- There is encouragement to socialize other information required before the Community Forum is held. We cannot be too prescriptive on number of days (depending on difficulty of issue). We should allow for flexibility. We should not be too prescriptive on process - when resolution has been found.

Feedback:

- Use calendar days instead of week.

---> Natural days will be used.

- Community Forum is opportunity to resolve differences between community and Board. If there is opportunity for resolution of issues, there will need to be multiple sessions. It is inevitable that there will be multiple sessions.

- Escalation timeframe has been issue for some GAC members. How many days did the process have before the changes (at a maximum) and how many days will it have when the changes proposed by Jordan will be inserted? We might be compressing too much. Jumping to the Community Forum needs to be considered with care. Sessions does not mean meeting on same days. We should allow for further deliberations. If Board comes up with new solution/reasoning, we need to go back to our SO or AC. More time is needed for meaningful deliberations. By suppressing conference call, we are diminishing elements of deliberation.

---> In the previous process, we were rushing SO/ACs (conference call within 7 days). By deleting this step, we are saving two decision points. We may want to give timeframe for which discussions should happen. On formal structure, there will be informal discussions going on. We need to juggle community need for dialogue with exercise of powers.

- Our objective is to streamline the process. There are discussion steps before the Community Forum. Community will be informed for Community Forum discussion.

Feedback:

- Unclear that there will be deliberations

Board input: The Board will support the community in making reasonable adjustments to the escalation timeframes to support the community's ability to take quick action to exercise its powers, while still having the time it needs to socialize the issues appropriately. Where the community believes that some of the tight timeframes might require adjustment by a matter of days, or have flexibility to simplify some of the steps when broad community support is clear, these are all areas that the Board can support adjusting. As the CCWG works to finalize a revised proposal on this, the Board notes that it would not support an extension of the initial petition phase beyond 30 days, and urges the timelines to be drafted with efficiency and quick action in mind. On thresholds, the Board supports the CCWG modification at Paragraph 62. On Board removal, the Board does not support the change at Paragraph 64. Demonstration of full community support for the exercise of this ultimate power is essential, and the Board does not support a change to lower this threshold. The other areas where this reduced threshold is proposed (blocking budget, fundamental Bylaws changes) do not raise this same concern. A proposed redline of Paragraph 64 to address this concern is: *The CCWG-Accountability also recommends that in a situation where use of the community powers of either blocking a budget or approving changes to Fundamental Bylaws, where only four Decisional SOs or ACs participate, and the threshold is set at four in support these two powers will still be validly exercised if three are in support and no more than one objects. The CCWG-Accountability came to this decision after considering the extended escalation process now proposed prior to the use of Community Powers, and to avoid the risk of powers being un- useable (especially the risk of making changes to ICANN's Fundamental Bylaws effectively impossible.*

Conclusion: We are trying to have a process that is efficient and flexible. Documentation should be exchanged prior to Community Forum. We will continue collecting ideas and refining on the list. We will conclude this item next week.

On thresholds

Feedback:

- If at stage where SO/ACs cannot take action (3 out of 5), we will end up with situation where organization is frozen and Bylaw cannot be changed. If Community Forum is called and no one attends, the Board could act unilaterally past a defined period of time. There needs to be an escape patch.

---> Let's move this concern and suggestion to the list. If it gets traction, we will move it to the plenary.

- Disagree with suggestion above.

Conclusion: No objection to thresholds proposed in Jordan's revised document.

Rec 4 - Budget (IANA)

Board input: Paragraph 21: Board is very supportive of text - it addresses concerns. We are properly delivering services. The whole caretaker budget should be embedded in Fundamental Bylaws. *1) e. Board Proposal on ICANN Caretaker Budget. In the event that the process for community power to reject the Operating Plan and Budget is invoked, and after the preceding escalation mechanism (as described in Recommendation #2) has failed to resolve an issue, the rejection is triggered. While the rejection is in effect and being resolved, ICANN needs an operating plan and a budget so that it can continue to operate on a day-to-day basis. The notion of a caretaker Operating Plan and Budget has been defined to address this need. The caretaker budget is in substance a replacement Operating Plan and Budget designed to allow the organization to operate its basic and primary functions, while avoiding "non-indispensable" work during the period of the rejection is in effect. The conceptual definition of the caretaker budget has been formulated, but the more detailed definition of what is "indispensable" or not now must be further documented.*

The Board accepts the above described approach to the veto process and corresponding caretaker Operating Plan and Budget. The Board also recommends that the caretaker budget approach be embedded in the Fundamental Bylaws, including the responsibility of the CFO to establish the caretaker budget in accordance with the defined approach. The Board's acceptance of this approach is also predicated on the consistency of the implemented solution with the conceptual definition described above.

In paragraph between 19 and 20, the caretaker budget would be enacted and details are under development. We can have it in line with paragraph 13. Caretaker budget will be developed in implementation in line with guidelines.

Feedback:

- Valid points. In favor of Board suggestions on Caretaker Budget. We want to ensure we have alignment with budget power.
- Agree with Board suggestions

Conclusion: We will be taking Board suggestions on board.

Rec 3 Fundamental Bylaws (first reading)

Overview of comments/discussion items.

Feedback:

/

Conclusion: We will take on these suggestions for second reading.

Rec 4 Scope of community IRP & Separation Power (first reading)

Overview of discussion items.

On community IRP Thresholds

Board input: Board is concerned that there should be protections built in against ganging up and recommends higher thresholds.

Feedback:

- Some comments required approval of PDP should not be subject of IRP unless the initiating party of PDP is part of the process. We could leave threshold at 3 SO/ACs and still address Board concern.

- If appropriate carve-out, this could be acceptable subject to review of text.

- Carve-out is a sensible approach.

ACTION ITEM/Conclusion: Becky and David to work on language for carve-out that will be put for discussion on list.

On Expert Panels

Do we want IRP to resolve inconsistent outcomes? Decision-making bodies need to contemplate how to resolve issues and effects on community. It should be something that should be addressed in PDP and limited to addressing failures of Expert Panels outside of in conflict with Mission.

Board input: IRP should be used for violations of Bylaws or Articles. We do not want people making decisions over opinion of panel. There are procedures to follow.

Feedback:

- Concern that practical solution to inconsistent panel decisions.

On separation process

Feedback:

/

Conclusion: We will be moving forward with first reading. Language on carve-out will be sent to the list.

Rec 5 - Mission

On Numbers

ICANN Board has proposed alternative formulation for numbers. It has added substantive role of ratifying policy at global level that are reasonably related to IP and AS numbers. It creates a role that cannot be changed. MOU with RIRs provide alternate mechanism for changing this. We get into a disconnect between MOU and Bylaws.

Feedback:

 Online discussions with Bruce. We still feel it is important to keep this reference to ASO MOU given that we are clearly defining ICANN's role

based on an agreement between ICANN and RIRs. Board is okay with this. If no further concerns from Board, our strong preference is to keep Third Proposal language.

Board input: Alternative may be paragraph in ASO MoU.

ACTION ITEM/Conclusion: Board to reach out to ASO and come up with proposal.

On Root Servers

RSSAC has proposed that ICANN's role is to facilitate coordination of the operation. ICANN Board language indicates an operational role and considers inputs from the communities dependent on the root server system.

Board input: Would support text from RSSAC but need to discuss first.

ACTION ITEM/Conclusion: Board to reach out to RSSAC and come up with proposal.

On Consumer Trust

Robust discussions on list with respect to language. AOC creates an obligation in context of new gTLDs expansion. It is being carried over in review section of Bylaws. Significant concerns voiced on scope of ICANN's role. Suggestion that we put general consumer trust issue in Work Stream 2 for further discussion.

Feedback:

- Disagree with pushing it to WS2. Part of getting AOC in Work Stream 1 is dealing with that issue. It might be helpful to go back to original source to see if we may have any assistance on this.

- Much of what we have in AoC is already in Bylaws. This, however, was not. It is important to look at the AoC paragraph. Item on Consumer Trust is a chapeau leading into the reviews. It is something that is generally applicable, not just new gTLDs. It is within mission of contractual compliance.

- We are trying to discuss a broader issue than what was originally in the AOC. AOC review section is within our report. What is meant by market place, consumer trust etc is beyond AOC and should be discussed in WS2.

- Paragraph 3 is an introductory text. a - b - c -
d link to specific commitments in 7 - 8 - 9. It specifically relates to expansion of TLD space and calls for specific review with respect to that. Comment that 3 is only about gTLDs is incorrect. We have transposed the commitment that is referenced in 3 c and articulated in 9.

- Agree with pushing to WS2.

- Commitment to consumer trust in DNS market place means in gTLD space. Against pushing to WS2.

- Paragraph 3 of AOC is a chapeau to reviews. Inappropriate to read it as brand new.

- AOC points is for WS1. We are trying to go beyond what is in AOC and there is a lot of concern about applicability. It would be a game change if add components to WS1. This needs more work.

- Language cannot be in use. We cannot proceed with expansive interpretation

- It is obvious that goes beyond gTLDs but ok to go back to first references.

ACTION item/Conclusion: Get input from NTIA on whether it was meant to be a chapeau and share on list.

Conclusion: Incorporate the AoC as it stands as part of WS1 but continue to review the issue of extending Consumer Trust as part of WS2

AOB

/

Action Items

- **ACTION ITEM/Conclusion: Becky and David to work on language for carve-out that will be put for discussion on list.**
- **ACTION ITEM/Conclusion: Board to reach out to ASO and come up with proposal.**
- **ACTION ITEM/Conclusion: Board to reach out to RSSAC and come up with proposal.**
- **ACTION item/Conclusion: Get input from NTIA on whether it was meant to be a chapeau and share on list.**

Documents

- **Rec 1 - Inspection Rights - 1st Reading Conclusions.pdf**
- **Rec 2 - Escalation timelines - first reading conclusions.pdf**
- **Rec 4 - Budget (IANA) - 1st Reading Conclusions.pdf**
- **Rec 3 - Fundamental Bylaws.pdf**
- **Rec 4 – Scope of community IRP & separation power.pdf**
- **Affirmations.pdf**

Adobe Chat

Brenda Brewer: (1/13/2016 22:47) Hello all and welcome to CCWG Accountability Meeting #77 on Thursday, 14 January 2016 @ 06:00 UTC! Please note that chat sessions are being archived and follow the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior: http://www.icann.org/en/news/in-focus/accountability/expected-standards

Niels ten Oever: (23:52) hello all

Cheryl Langdon-Orr ALAC APRegional Member: (23:53) Hi Niels

Jonathan Zuck: (23:55) Good morning!

Cheryl Langdon-Orr ALAC APRegional Member: (23:55) hi Jonathan

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair ALAC): (23:56) Hello everyone

Cheryl Langdon-Orr ALAC APRegional Member: (23:57) hi

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (23:57) hello all

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (23:57) Hello everyone

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (23:57) and you also Cheryl

Pär Brumark (GAC Niue): (23:58) Good Morning!

Athina Fragkouli (ASO): (23:59) hello all!

Asha Hemrajani: (23:59) Hello

Aarti Bhavana: (1/14/2016 00:00) Hi All!

Gary Hunt - UK Government: (00:00) Good morning from London

Steve Crocker: (00:00) Hello, everyone

Brenda Brewer: (00:01) Barrack Otieno joined to Audio line only

Bruno Lanvin: (00:01) Hello all

Tatiana Tropina: (00:01) Hi all!

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (00:01) hello all

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (00:04) no sound

Alan Greenberg: (00:04) Waiting to get on bridge...

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (00:04) can you hear me?

Malcolm Hutty: (00:05) Good morning all

nigel hickson: (00:06) good morning

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (00:06) Paragraph 20: "the CCWG-Accountability recommends including in the ICANN Bylaws the right for SOs or ACs to inspect as outlined in California Corporations Code 6333, although this specific article reference would not be mentioned in the Bylaws." Paragraph 21: "This inspection right is distinct from the Document Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP). While any eligible party can file a request according to the DIDP, Inspection Rights are only accessible to SOs or ACs. The scopes are also different as explained below." "Unlike the exercise of the other community powers, which require community engagement and escalation before initiating a request for action by the EC, the CCWG-Accountability recommends that a petition for inspection be brought directly by a single SO/AC or by multiple SO/ACs through making a written demand on ICANN for the requested materials. If the Board refused or ignored the request, the petitioning SO/AC(s) could then initiate an escalating community decision-making process to e

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (00:08) On Investigation RightsThe Board agrees with the inclusion of an investigatory right, and notes that the language proposed in redline reflects the Board's comments.On DIDPThe Board reaffirms its commitment to addressing improvements to the DIDP in WS2, and thanks the CCWG for the clarification in the document on the differences between the inspection right and the DIDP.

Edward Morris: (00:08) Thank you Rinalia and thank you Board.

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (00:16) good night indeed

David McAuley (RySG): (00:20) Good progress @Jordan on escalation timelines – just a few remaining concerns. (1) The CF format allows for a "second or third" session if needed – because the CF is the best chance to amicably resolve an issue that makes sense but won't these added sessions need an extension "as appropriate" as 21 days may be inadequate? (2) Suggest step six get 3 days, not 1 – there may be communication issues or human error. (3) Could the "days" specified be limited to week days – remember that holidays vary widely across the globe and August is virtually work-free almost everywhere

David McAuley (RySG): (00:21) Thanks Thomas, I am not dialed in

Aarti Bhavana: (00:22) Question: When is an issue considered 'resolved' for the escalation process to be terminated? What threshold are we looking for to deem a conflict resolved?

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (00:22) subsequent sessions meant something different: it meant various sessions at different days

David McAuley (RySG): (00:23) did help yes

Keith Drazek: (00:23) Thanks very much Jordan. I think you've helped adderess concerns raised on this topic, including by the RySG.

Chris Disspain: (00:25) what is a week day?

Chris Disspain: (00:25) for some that includes Sunday but not Friday

David McAuley (RySG): (00:25) I meant Mon-Fri Chris, not very cleear

David McAuley (RySG): (00:25) Thanks again Thomas and thanks Jordan

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (00:25) can we be clear about calendar weeks

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (00:26) it is ambiguous at the moment

Sabine Meyer: (00:26) Do you mean if they start on Mon/Sun?

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:26) i think a day is a day, to be honest

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:27) and the dates are stated in days, not weeks

Gary Hunt - UK Government: (00:27) Buisness days may be different in countries arund the world.... public holidays etc...

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:28) the bylaws will need to specify how an issue is "resolved" but that's probably pretty simple

Aarti Bhavana: (00:29) But what is a 'sufficient' part of the community? I think it needs to be specified.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:29) I do think that natural days are the way to go

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:29) as per the doc

Chris Disspain: (00:29) absolutely.....unnatural days wouldnt work :-)

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:29) let's not do business days, or holy days, or working days, etc

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (00:30) Every CCWG day is an unnatural day BTW

Chris Disspain: (00:30) those were the days

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (00:30) Or is it the other way around ?

Chris Disspain: (00:30) possibly both Mathieu

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:31) I suggest a week periopd for the session/s of the Forum probably makes sense

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:31) gives flexibility without dragging it out

Matthew Shears: (00:38) The CF proposal does provide for possible second and third sessions of the CF and agree that these may not be possible to hold within the same period as the initial CF session so we are going to have to build in some flexibility - although we would not want these further sessions to be held to far apart

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (00:38) Dear Jordan: the decision-points were there for a reason, to allow for a step-by-step process of discussion. Going directly to the community forum has an important effect.

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (00:38) The fact that the steps were linked to too tight timeframes does not mean that the best solution ist to collapse the steps

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:40) jorge: that is the decision the group made at its last call

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (00:40) I think that the idea would have been to increase the extension of the steps, not the number of steps

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:40) that is why this document reflects that.

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (00:40) I thought that no decisions were made at the first calls

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:40) and the extension of time with the same number of steps is not the direction given at the last call

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (00:41) streamlining when having important discussions on extraordinary issues is not always a good idea

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:41) quite. but nor is lengthening.

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (00:42) I read the public comments as calling for more flexibility, not for suppressing steps

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (00:42) and the goal should be to allow for meaningful deliberation

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:43) there is no yes/no line between what is meaningful and what is not. I have confidence that the community isn't going to lurch into using any of these powers in a rush.

Alan Greenberg: (00:44) My question was are 2 and 3 on today's agenda or was the plan to talk about them at a future meeting?

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:44) 2 and 3 of what, Alan?

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:44) (are we talking about thresholds today?)

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (00:44) the less steps you have, the easier it is to fall into a quick escalation (instead of having a reasonable discussion). The conference call was not just a bureaucratic step, but an initial opportunity for discussion

Alan Greenberg: (00:44) The red type on page 1 of the present doc

Avri Doria: (00:45) I think we may need somethig minimal, such as a webinar so that the party making the request for forum can explain and entertain clarifying questions. and that this would need to held before the various SOAC could then start discussing their postions before the forum.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:45) ALan: I don't know - not a cochair :)

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (00:46) Alan - they are on the agenda

Alan Greenberg: (00:46) I don't mind if a co-chair answers! Apparently Bruno thinks we are talking about those sections.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:46) it appears we have gone overboard

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (00:48) efficency is not paramount Thomas - what is needed is a good balance between that and meaningful participation, discussion, deliberation etc - this is a consensus building process

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:49) yes, and where that balance lies is a matter of debate, Jorge. The debate is what the CCWG has been having.

Julia Wolman, GAC, Denmark: (00:49) Good point Jorge!

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:49) Nobody has suggeted, and the process set out does not allow, an absence of "meaningful participation, discussion, deliberation etc"

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:49) I TOTALLY disagree with Alan.

andrew sullivan: (00:52) I have to admit that I'm having a hard time imagining the case where the community is genuinely frozen this way, but where ICANN is otherwise a going concern

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (00:53) Having been in an organisation where necessary change was blocked by apathy inthe community, some form of escape is sensible

Matthew Shears: (00:53) if the bylaw change etc that is proposed gets no interest then that may be s statement on the necessity or utility or appropriateness of the proposed change

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (00:53) but it does need to be because there are a lot of people who do not see the issue as of concern

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:54) and the idea that the ccNSO, gNSO and one of the other three SOs or ACs won't act seems unlikely.

Alan Greenberg: (00:54) iI wasn't really proposing a solution to the problem I saw.

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (00:54) @Jordan: yes, I agree!

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:54) """unlikely""" even

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (00:55) It will be a case of the whole organisation becoming irrelevant to certain stakeholder groups

Alan Greenberg: (00:55) Unlikely is not an issue. If it never happens, it is moot.

Alan Greenberg: (00:55) I support the change

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:58) I would just like to state for the record that it's excellent getting these Board comments in writing, but it would be amazingly helpful if they came in advance of the calls :)

Matthew Shears: (00:58) agreed

Brett Schaefer: (00:58) + Jordan

Brett Schaefer: (00:58) +

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:58) i can't talk and read at the same time...

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:58) (don't know about the rest of you)

Brett Schaefer: (00:58) Dang it, +1

Asha Hemrajani: (00:58) 1)e. Board Proposal on ICANN Caretaker BudgetIn the event that the process for community power to reject the Operating Plan and Budget is invoked, and after the preceding escalation mechanism (as described in Recommendation #2) has failed to resolve an issue, the rejection is triggered. While the rejection is in effect and being resolved, ICANN needs an operating plan and a budget so that it can continue to operate on a day-to-day basis. The notion of a caretaker Operating Plan and Budget has been defined to address this need. The caretaker budget is in substance a replacement Operating Plan and Budget designed to allow the organization to operate its basic and primary functions, while avoiding "non-indispensable" work during the period of the rejection is in effect. The conceptual definition of the caretaker budget has been formulated, but the more detailed definition of what is "indispensable" or not now must be further documented.The Board accepts the above described approach to the veto process an

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair ALAC): (00:58) @Jordan do you mean to read out loud?

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair ALAC): (00:58) :P

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:59) I agree with these two latest comments by the Board

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (00:59) (text by Bruce on the list)

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (01:00) and I agree with Asha's suggestion that this is intended to apply to the ICANN budget as well as the ICANN Budget, and the ref to Para 13

Jonathan Zuck: (01:01) Agree as well

Keith Drazek: (01:02) Progress!!

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (01:03) let's keep going :D

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (01:03) Just a note that 3 out of 5 main Board concerns are now cleared. Very constructive effort, special thanks to the Board for the helpful feedbacks

Mary Uduma: (01:04) Thank You Asha and the Board for this progress on this iitem.

Rosemary Fei (Adler & Colvin): (01:05) Articles of Association, or Articles of Incorporation?

Lise Fuhr: (01:05) Bye all - I listened in on the budget issues. Great to see your progress :-)

Rosemary Fei (Adler & Colvin): (01:05) Our earlier guidance concerned ICANN's Articles of Incorporation.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (01:05) Lise - get back on holiday! :-)

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (01:05) Rosemary - Articles of Incorporation

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (01:06) there aren't any articles of association :-)

Bruce Tonkin: (01:06) From articles of incorporatoin:

Bruce Tonkin: (01:06) 9. These Articles may be amended by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the directors of the Corporation. When the Corporation has members, any such amendment must be ratified by a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the members voting on any proposed amendment.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (01:06) The CCWG proposal does not give the community the status of a Member, but only that of Designator. BC support for this recommendation is conditioned upon a change to reflect that Member approval be replaced with Designator approval in Articles of Incorporation item 9.

Megan Richards, European Commission 2: (01:06) is ETNO a holiday Lise :-)?

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (01:06) [unless the holiday is finished!]

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (01:07) I agree with Bruce. (!)

Rosemary Fei (Adler & Colvin): (01:07) 3/4 vote of Board

Rosemary Fei (Adler & Colvin): (01:08) Was upped from 2/3

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (01:08) I support continuing until 8.30

Cheryl Langdon-Orr ALAC APRegional Member: (01:08) yes keep going

andrew sullivan: (01:08) At this rate, I would support pressing through & finishing!

andrew sullivan: (01:08) (hurray, all!)

Bruce Tonkin: (01:08) Ah - OK Rosemary -= also don't expect an issue of requiring 3/4 vote of the Board.

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (01:10) could we have the right doc on screen?

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (01:10) Community IRP is on the screen, Jorge

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (01:10) thanks Steve! needed a refresh

Gary Hunt - UK Government: (01:11) I don't seem to be able to download Rec 4 from Adobe Connect....

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (01:12) Gary, neither. But yoiu have it by email.

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair ALAC): (01:12) @Gary try this link please http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/attachments/20160113/b909af31/Rec4ScopeofcommunityIRPseparationpower-0001.pdf

Gary Hunt - UK Government: (01:12) Thanks Jordan.....

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (01:13) Leon's more help!

Gary Hunt - UK Government: (01:13) Thanks Leon AND Jordan!

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair ALAC): (01:13) :-)

Matthew Shears: (01:16) I think we would need to see the text for the proposed carve out to be able to fully understand the implications and how it resolves the concern

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (01:17) so an IRP carve out that is the same as the PDP carve out?

Cherine Chalaby: (01:18) the carve out is a sensible approach

David McAuley (RySG): (01:18) I would behappy to help Becky

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (01:18) i'd also want to see it to understand it

Malcolm Hutty: (01:19) Is anyone else having very intermittent connection to the Adobe chat, or is it just me?

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair ALAC): (01:19) My connection seems to be stable Malcolm

Megan Richards, European Commission 2: (01:19) me too but suspect because limited chat

Malcolm Hutty: (01:19) Thanks Leon, guess it's a local problem.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr ALAC APRegional Member: (01:19) my phone line just disconnected sorry

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (01:20) @Is it your ISP Malcolm ? ;-)

Gary Hunt - UK Government: (01:20) My connection is also stable Malcolm...

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (01:20) is it ICANN?

Brett Schaefer: (01:21) @Malcom, it froze on me early on

Malcolm Hutty: (01:21) @Mathieu: possibly. I am at home, on a domestic connection. Meeting did begin at 6am local time

Malcolm Hutty: (01:22) What is this PDP-carve out for IRP being referred to as I rejoined?

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (01:23) We'll put it in writing. It's about preventing community IRP against a Board decision related to gNSO policy of the gNSO is not supporting the Community IRP

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (01:23) (if the gNSO)

Malcolm Hutty: (01:24) Only preventing a community IRP, not an individual one? OK.

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (01:24) Absolutely !

Malcolm Hutty: (01:24) (Relief!)

Malcolm Hutty: (01:25) @Bruce: IRP is not focussed on Board's decision-making, it's focussed on ICANN action that is in conflict with the bylaws

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (01:28) will rejoin the adobe room in 10 :-)

Becky Burr: (01:29) do we need a break or should we just go on to next item?

Becky Burr: (01:29) and get done early??

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (01:29) Becky has a point

Megan Richards, European Commission 2: (01:29) too late I think

Gary Hunt - UK Government: (01:31) The discussion notes before we moved onto Rec 4 were wiped before I could note them.... when will they be sent out to participants? Thanks...

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (01:37) @Gary - notes are usually publsihed within hours of the call closing

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (01:38) Also the reason for wiping them is that there is a maximum size limitation in the note pod, and if we do not clear it at intermission we can get jammed during the second half

Gary Hunt - UK Government: (01:39) Okay, many thanks!

David McAuley (RySG): (01:44) very feint

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (01:44) very faintly

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (01:45) Very faint

Gary Hunt - UK Government: (01:45) Very low volume

Bruce Tonkin: (01:45) Very hard to hear

Becky Burr: (01:45) VERY VERY FAINT IZUMI

David McAuley (RySG): (01:45) no

Gary Hunt - UK Government: (01:45) No

Keith Drazek: (01:45) That's a bit better

Bruce Tonkin: (01:45) That is better.

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (01:45) better

Megan Richards, European Commission 2: (01:46) vezry marginally better but not adequate

jorge villa (ASO): (01:47) +1 Izumi

Becky Burr: (01:48) but the ASO MoU itself contains a change mechanism, which that approach would defeat

andrew sullivan: (01:48) The difficulty with putting the contents of the MoU directly in the bylaws is that, if the MoU needs to be modified, you have to modify a fundamental bylaw to

andrew sullivan: (01:48) too

andrew sullivan: (01:48) right, what Becky said

Matthew Shears: (01:48) Why not just say: "Coordinates the allocation and assignment of Internet addresses and autonomous system numbers as described in the ASO MoU between ICANN and RIRs."

Bruce Tonkin: (01:49) @Ah - OK.   Doesn't that mean that the mission as it relates to numbers can be changed without the fundamental buyalws approval process?

Izumi Okutani(ASO): (01:49) On Becky's point, any changes need to be agreed betwen ICANN and RIRs, so RIRs cannot change it unilaterally

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (01:50) Yes, it does mean that Bruce.

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (01:50) @bruce not if that infringes on the 1st paragraph

Malcolm Hutty: (01:50) Or, instead of referring explicitly to the MoU, we could say "as agreed with the RIRs"

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (01:50) "coordinates... and ratifies..."

Becky Burr: (01:51) correct Bruce and correct Mathieu

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (01:51) I am fine with RSSAC text

andrew sullivan: (01:51) ICANN does operate one of the named roots

andrew sullivan: (01:51) the question is whether that could be subsumed under "facilitates"

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (01:52) Agree Andrew L-root must be covered

Suzanne Woolf: (01:53) @Mathieu is operation of L-root part of ICANN's mission?

Athina Fragkouli (ASO): (01:54) about the ASO MoU: This was an ASO requirement from the very beginning of the descussions and the numbers community support that as well. we would really like this to be explicitly mentioned.

Matthew Shears: (01:54) " facilitates the coordination ... as well as retaining an operational role (L root)"

Suzanne Woolf: (01:54) (not expressing an opinion on behalf of RSSAC, further discussion as just proposed seems like the the correct next step)

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (01:54) @Suzanne : should it NOT be ? I don' t think it's the intent of anyone to remove L root from Icann

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (01:54) I don't see how ICANN's mission should be able to be determined outside ICANN processes, which is the effect of this language if done wrongly

Athina Fragkouli (ASO): (01:55) the ASO MoU is the document that describes ICANN's role in the numbers policy development process and cannot be changed unilaterally. ICANN board also expressed agreement with our requirement.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (01:55) on a ifferent point I sure don't want our language to accidentally open the doors for ICANN to be, for instance, the RZM, without proper community debate.

Megan Richards, European Commission 2: (01:58) but wasnt integration of AoC a WS1 issue ?

Megan Richards, European Commission 2: (01:59) agree with Avri's proposal - typical legal interpretation approach - go back to "legislator" - perhaps there are other background documents etc that might help too

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (02:00) AoC has been in force since 2009.   Does ANYONE recall ICANN taking on consumer trust in ccTLDs and legacy TLDs in the last 7 years?

Bruce Tonkin: (02:00) One method of dealing with the MU with ASO coul dbe to be more exdplicit - ie the mission as in the ASO MOU of

Alan Greenberg: (02:00) 3. This document affirms key commitments by DOC and ICANN, including commitments to: (a) ensure that decisions made related to the global technical coordination of the DNS are made in the public interest and are accountable and transparent; (b) preserve the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS; (c) promote competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice in the DNS marketplace; and (d) facilitate international participation in DNS technical coordination.

Avri Doria: (02:00) if we do not include the AOc and thus are not able to mutually coancel the AOC, the US government retains a special role in ICANN oversight.

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (02:01) agree with Avri's points - we would need more clarity at least that there is no disparate treatment of similar AoC provisions

Bruce Tonkin: (02:01) That was garbled.   I think we could define the mission as it relates to RIRs to refer explicitly to the ASO MOU of 29 Oct 2004.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (02:01) AoC items 3a, 3b, and 3c map directly to AoC reviews 9.1, 9.2, and 9.3

Izumi Okutani(ASO): (02:01) Let me discuss further with others in the ASO, on Mathieu's suggestion.

Bruce Tonkin: (02:01) If the ASO/RIRs and ICANN want to change the MOU as it relates to misson - then it woud hten be ratified by the communiyt approval process before it ends up in the ICANN mission.

Bruce Tonkin: (02:02) Or put another way - ICANn couldn't enter into a new agreement with teh ASO unless it was consistent with the rest of the ICANN mission if that makes sense.

Becky Burr: (02:02) No one has EVER said that 3 only applies to the new gTLDs. But 3 refers out to the relevant sections of 9, and 9c is ONLY about new gTLDs.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (02:02) No, Alan. The point is that 3c referes only to new gTLDs.   3a and 3b refer to the other two AoC reviews, which apply to all TLDs

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:02) that's a nice concept Bruce.

Becky Burr: (02:03) are ccTLDs comfortable that ICANN has a consumer trust role with respect to ccTLDs??

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:03) It sounds like ALAC has just not applied usual textual interpretation techniques. But anyhow. -- to Becky's question -- no, I don't see ccTLDs being at all of the view that ICANN has any such role.

Alan Greenberg: (02:03) Article 1 is a fundamental Bylaw. By pushing this to WS2, we virtually guarantee it will not change in ws2.

Keith Drazek: (02:04) I agree with Becky's assessment. The AoC language is specific to the New gTLD expansion. I have no problem carrying on this discussion in WS2, but it would be unacceptable to expand ICANN's mission using this language. The question of ccTLDs is a very legitimate one.

Alan Greenberg: (02:04) i AM HAPPY IS WE LIMIT CONSUMER TRUST TO THE ISSUE OF GtldS

Izumi Okutani(ASO): (02:04) As Bruce as described, it would also be possible for ICANN Board to consult the ICANN community, before entering an agreement to change ASO MoU. In anycase I'll discuss more within ASO can get back to the list ASAP.

Becky Burr: (02:04) I agree, the textual interpretation rules are being totally disregarded

Becky Burr: (02:05) ALAN - it IS already in there in the review section.

Keith Drazek: (02:05) Totally disagree Alan. Work Stream 2 will lead to all sorts of new developments after appropriate discussion and consideration.

Izumi Okutani(ASO): (02:05) On the issue of consumer trust, I agree with this suggestion, interpretation of what is meant by market place consumer trust should be discussed in WS2 (speaking personallY).

Alan Greenberg: (02:06) The review is very explicit as to it being only applicable to the expansion. That omits the legacy TLDs which are the vast majority of those in use (and I am talking about only gTLDs)

Megan Richards, European Commission 2: (02:07) ICANN is committed to "promote competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice in the DNS marketplace;" - seems to me that that is an overriding principle that applies to all DNS marketplace related activites

Keith Drazek: (02:07) I also totally disagree with limiting this to gTLDs alone if we're talking about the overall "DNS marketplace" and not just the expansion of new gTLDs.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (02:07) Could staff please display the AoC in Adobe? https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/affirmation-of-commitments-2009-09-30-en

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (02:07) +1 Megan

Bruce Tonkin: (02:07) Section 3 o the AoC would certainly not be resticted just to new gTLDs, nor restircted just to gTLDs (whtehr new or OLD). I would asusme they are referring to TLDs in general.

Avri Doria: (02:07) I agree Megan

Suzanne Woolf: (02:08) It does seem like a good idea to have an explicit scope and not just assume inherited context from the AoC....

andrew sullivan: (02:08) I totally agree with Becky. And as I pointed out on the list today, "the DNS marketplace" doesn't seem to be defined narrowly enough to make this work

Thomas Rickert, CCWG Co-Chairt: (02:08) Thanks, Malcolm!

Keith Drazek: (02:08) @Megan and Jorge: Then ICANN has consumer trust authority over ccTLDs and non domain name DNS providers?

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:09) It does not.

andrew sullivan: (02:09) If you don't think anyone will require that, then don't try to put such words in the bylaws

Megan Richards, European Commission 2: (02:10) not authority obviously but to the extent that ICANN actions/policies etc have impact on DNS marketplace then seems to me that "promotion of competition, consumer trust and choisce" are part of the overall picture to be looked at

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (02:10) @Jordan +1

andrew sullivan: (02:10) @Megan: what is "the DNS marketplace", please?

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:10) ccTLD managers and sovereign States have responsibility for that subject

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:10) ICANN does not.

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (02:11) +1 Megan (again)

Malcolm Hutty: (02:11) I disagree with Alan. Clearly, some aspects of consumer trust are within ICANN's role. Nobody would ever deny this. But with the term so broad and so many different views of what it means, we can't simply insert this as a whole new field in the Mission without careful deliberation and, I believe, definition and limitation

Matthew Shears: (02:11) + 1 Malcolm

Keith Drazek: (02:12) @Agree Malcolm, which is why it needs to be a WS2 issues. It needs further work.

Alan Greenberg: (02:12) Malcolm, unfortunately there ARE people who beleive that ICANN should stay out of this space completely.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:13) ccTLDs can't approve a mission that purports to give ICANN a power it does not and should not have

Matthew Shears: (02:13) Also agree with Steve's read - AoC was forward looking

Malcolm Hutty: (02:13) @Alan, I really don't think there are. I think they just similarly oppose introducing a new unbounded term on top of areas that already cover some aspects of it, in their view sufficiently

andrew sullivan: (02:13) Not only what Jordan said, but the rest of the Internet can't approve a mission that purports to give ICANN that power either

Megan Richards, European Commission 2: (02:14) can we not clarify intent with the "legislator" ?

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:14) we also said that the AoC commitments would be put in the bylaws - not that chapeau text dealt with elsewhere in the AOC would be made fundamental bylaws and put in ICANN's mission.

Bruce Tonkin: (02:14) The AoC still stands as a stand alone document that ICAN has agreed to.

Avri Doria: (02:14) Disagree. this is part of incopratiing the AOC in the by laws. i do not agree that we have done what is required in WS1

Bruce Tonkin: (02:14) I though the aprpaoch was to incorp-orate the AoC reviews into the bylaws - nto try to incorporate every word of the AoC.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:15) Bruce: the commitments and the reviews.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:15) The para being mentioned is an intro to the reviews.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (02:15) @Avri -- do you believe that 3c is more than a chapeau for review 9.3 ?

Avri Doria: (02:15) i object to eh characterization of this being an expansion of scope

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:15) it would be, if it was uninterrupted and applied to ccTLDs

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:16) there is no question of it being interpreted any other way

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:16) I welcome Alan's point in chat that the issue could be practically restricted to the new gTLDs

Keith Drazek: (02:16) I do not.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:16) but in any case, I thought that the lingo applied to the root per se

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:17) not to the domains delegated within it.

Becky Burr: (02:17) Jordan, neither do I, nor are the commitments and core values an appropriate place to put that kind of granularity

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:19) why don't we ask NTIA?

Brett Schaefer: (02:19) If people re interested in AoC intent, you could just ask NTIA. I assume, even if the particular individuals have moved on, NTIA will have internal memo and deliberations that would clearly reveal what they intended.

Matthew Shears: (02:19) well, the AoC was agreed with ICANN - what did ICANN think it meant?

Becky Burr: (02:20) BUT ALL OF THOSE TERMS ALREADY APPEAR IN ARTICLE 1 SO WE HAVE TO LIVE WITH THEM

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:21) so let's close this with "ask NTIA"

andrew sullivan: (02:21) But as a practical matter, then, we either have to accept a dangerous assertion of ICANN's authority or else we have to start drafting all new language

andrew sullivan: (02:21) (in the case where NTIA doesn't say "yes, chapeau")

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (02:22) Andrew, we would have to confront the discussion then indeed.

Becky Burr: (02:22) indeed, and i would agree with you Andrew

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (02:22) So we're done early !

Avri Doria: (02:23) We can also ge tht ereading from the ICANn folks who were part of the negotiations.

Brett Schaefer: (02:23) @Steve, surely we can come up with things to fill the remaining time? :-)

Becky Burr: (02:23) no, we are asking for input

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:23) Brett: shhhh

andrew sullivan: (02:23) so if we disagree with them, then what?

Becky Burr: (02:23) @Brett, i need to go back to sleep

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:23) and the "conclusion" in the notes isn't quite right?

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (02:23) Like sleep you mean Brett ?

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:23) andrew: then then

Avri Doria: (02:24) Andrew, for me those answers will add an aspect of fact based decison making.

Chris Disspain: (02:24) I suggest there is none!

Keith Drazek: (02:24) thanks all

Becky Burr: (02:24) none what chris?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr ALAC APRegional Member: (02:25) Good Call LOTS of progress...Thanks eveyone talk soon Bye for now...

Matthew Shears: (02:25) thanks all

Bruno Lanvin: (02:25) THx. Good bye all !

Avri Doria: (02:25) bye

Brett Schaefer: (02:25) Me too Becky

David McAuley (RySG): (02:25) thatnks all

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (02:25) bye all

andrew sullivan: (02:25) bye!

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:25) good work team

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (02:25) bye

Athina Fragkouli (ASO): (02:25) bye all

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (02:25) til next time

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (02:25) bye

Gary Hunt - UK Government: (02:25) Good bye from London