

CCWG ACCT Meeting #80 (26 January @ 19:00 UTC)

Attendees:

Members: Alan Greenberg, Athina Fragkouli, Becky Burr, Bruce Tonkin, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Fiona Asonga, Izumi Okutani, Jordan Carter, Jorge Villa, Julia Wolman, Julie Hammer, Leon Sanchez, Lyman Chapin, Mathieu Weill, Pär Brumark, Robin Gross, Roelof Meijer, Samantha Eisner, Sebastien Bachollet, Steve DelBianco, Suzanne Radell, Thomas Rickert, Tijani Ben Jemaa (23)

Participants: Aarti Bhavana, Allan MacGillivray, Andrew Harris, Andrew Sullivan, Avri Doria, Barrack Otieno, Brett Schaefer, Cherine Chalaby, Chris Disspain, Chris Wilson, David Maher, David McAuley, Edward Morris Farzaneh Badii, Finn Petersen, George Sadowski, Greg Shatan, Jeff Neuman, Jonathan Zuck, Jorge Cancio, Kavouss Arasteh, Keith Drazek, Lito Ibarra, Malcolm Hutty, Mark Carvell, Markus Kummer, Martin Boyle, Matthew Shears, Megan Richards, Milton Mueller, Niels ten Oever, Oscar Robles, Pedro Ivo Silva, Phil Buckingham, Philip Corwin, Ram Mohan, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Sabine Meyer, Stephen Deerhake, Steve Crocker, Suzanne Woolf, Tatiana Tropina, Tom Dale, Tracy Hackshaw, Vrikson Acosta (45)

Legal Counsel: Edward McNicholas, Holly Gregory, Michael Clark, Rosemary Fei, Steven Chiodini (5)

Observers and Guests: Chris Mulola, J. Curanarin, John Poole, Joseph Wright, Luca Urech, Navid Heyrani, Simon Jansson (7)

Staff: Bernie Turcotte, Berry Cobb, Brenda Brewer, Grace Abuhamad, Hillary Jett, Karen Mulberry, Marika Konings, Nigel Hickson, Tarek Kamel, Theresa Swinehart, Trang Nguyen, Yuko Green

Apologies: Olga Cavalli, Christopher Wilkinson,

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

Transcript

- [Transcript_CCWG ACCT_26 January.doc](#)
- [Transcript_CCWG ACCT_26 January.pdf](#)

Recording

- The Adobe Connect recording is available here: <https://icann.adobeconnect.com/p1cz2152bqi/>
- The audio recording is available here: <http://audio.icann.org/accountability/ccwg-accountability-26jan16-en.mp3>

Agenda

1. Welcome, roll call, Sol (5 min)
 2. Update on Chartering Organizations' input (20 min)
<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009866.html>
 3. Update on Board removal liability mitigation (20 min)
 4. Rec 6 – Human Rights – Third reading (45 min)
<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009959.html> &
<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009807.html>
 5. Rec 9 – AOC reviews - Second reading (15 min)
<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009796.html>
- Break (10 min)
6. Rec 5 – Mission Statement - Fourth reading (45 min) <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009941.html> &
<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009917.html>
 - Root servers and numbers language
 - Contract enforcement
 - Grandfathering
 7. Timeline & next steps (15 min)
<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/attachments/20160120/0e76810a/Timelineandnextsteps-0001.pdf>
 8. A.O.B (15 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.

1. Welcome, roll call, Sol (5 min) TR

Jordan Carter, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Kavous Arasteh and Seun Ojedeji audio only.

Have returned to original agenda order.

2. Update on Chartering Organizations' input (20 min) MW

<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009866.html>

MW:

gNSO and GAC have provided their input on the third draft proposal.

There are no formal objections in these comments.

There are qualified supports and conditions which are consistent with the minority views expressed in the third draft as well as the comments in the consultation.

Will not address recommendations that are generally agreed to.

Rec. 1 - No decision from the GAC yet - gNSO some objections regarding the balance of SO and ACs and a requirement for additional transparency.

Rec 2 ok

Rec 3 - gNSO clarify process to update articles of inc.

Rec 4 - gNSO fix escalation time frames and indemnification for removing a director

Rec. 5 - no interference with GAC being able to provide advice to ICANN Board + contract enforcement - Cont. Enf. required by gNSO.

Rec 6 - nothing from from GAC, gNSO some support for WS2.

Rec 7 , 8 ok

rec 9 gNSO – Limited support with some opposition and

potentially divergent qualifications - reviews in collaboration with SO ACs (GAC, gNSO), GAC responsible to the citizens of their countries.

Rec 10 - Limited support with some opposition

Rec 11 - no consensus or objection from the GAC. gNSO there is broad opposition as currently written.

Rec 12 - GAC requires clear time frame.

We should write to all CO's to thank them for their input and support and inform them of next steps.

AGreenberg - will be documenting the 5 specifics of the current ALAC positions and posting on list.

MW: No other updates - closes this item

3. Update on Board removal liability mitigation (20 min) TR

RoemaryFei - update from lawyers discussion - Board still strongly opposes waivers. CCWG lawyers will provide language to CCWG for consideration on this.

Idemnification - some support by Board would support for language in the rationale subject to limitations. JonesDay will draft this language.

AGreenberg - Idemnification of rationale only is too limited - what about the community forum. Who is being indemnified - individuals or councils?

RosemaryFei - Good point - tying it to the rationale would cover that language made by anyone. Other language is not covered.

Chris Disspain: Alan, perhaps you could say what you think it should cover?

Chris Disspain: content

AGreenberg - A real wide ranging discussion in the community forum will cover many topics beyond the rationale, as such this is overly limited.

Chris Disspain: so if it covered the community forum discussion and the rationale?

Chris Disspain: would that be OK

Agreenberg - Probably if it covers councils.

GShattan - Sympathetic to AG, Need to limit it by subject matter. Rationale and items related to presenting it should be ok. Want to avoid the chilling effect.

AGreenberg - not just slander,

TR - What was presented as being offered by the Board seems insufficient. What is needed is compromise language that captures those eligible as well as subject as discussed in the comments. We would need such language from Jones Day by the end of the week (confirmed by SE). If the compromise language does not meet the requirements of the COs then we would need to proceed with what is required by the COs.

TR - this closes this topic.

4. Rec 6 – Human Rights – Third reading (45 min) MW

Short set of slides of the state of play <https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=58000103>

Trying to address all concerns the CCWG counsel has proposed language to attempt to avoid the unintended consequences.

We would like to test today if this proposed language would address the concerns and still be acceptable.

Comments?

TTropina - supports text as a middle solution.

MKummer - Board has had a thorough discussion on this. I can only repeat what I said last time. We are committed to have HR in ICANN but have not moved from the comments on third draft - wait for WS2 to complete the framework before inclusion in the Bylaws. Understand the concerns wrt it not advancing in WS2. Willing to include in the Bylaws a requirement in [bylaws.to](#) do work on HR.

Chris Disspain: the key words from what Markus said: Board proposes that including in the Bylaws a requirement for ICANN to address the human rights issue, as well as a requirement to consider – after a framework is concluded – how that should be referenced in the Bylaws. The Board therefore proposes the following: In the Bylaws text referencing WS2, language should be included that specifically identifies that a recommended framework on human rights within ICANN is expected to be part of the WS2 effort. Further, the Bylaws on WS2 should specify that If the cross-community group developing the framework also makes a consensus recommendation on whether and how that framework can be reflected in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Board must consider that recommendation according to the process defined for considering those continuous improvement recommendations

MW - There has been significant work to try and address the Board issues - but unclear on what remains objectionable?

MKummer - the crux is the Board does not accept there be a ref. to HR before documenting what these are without incurring additional risk.

MW - Difficult to understand what Board concern has not been addressed with the proposed CCWG text.

NTenOever - this is not a compromise and ignores work of the community.

TTropina - current CCWG makes sense.

Agreenberg - should the CCWG go ahead there are some comments. Need examples from the Board as to what the possible risks are.

MW - This has been asked for and never provided. Language will be checked by lawyers for other points raised by AG.

KArastaeh - need to accept resolution as is or Board's new proposal.

CDispain – (repeated Board position)

LUrech (GAC - Switzerland) - supports maintaining this recommendation. We see no risk or unintended consequences. Not approving this would also send a very negative message in the overall community.

GShattan- Remarks from the Board actually confirm that the proposed text is truly a compromise. No one is happy with this - is a good sign that we have reached the compromise.

MW - The direction of discussion is clear. Much discomfort from the Board but that is it. The CCWG text seems to be the consensus position. If the Board comes up with a bylaw statement that convinces the community on its merit it could be included otherwise we should move with the current language.

HGregory - We have heard the Board concerns and addressed them. Have been trying to understand the concerns of the Board since then but are struggling as there have been no concrete examples.

MW - Action item is for staff and lawyers to move to finalizing recommendation consistent with proposal discussed and comments expressed during the session -(Alan). No further discussion planned unless, as suggested by Kavouss, the Board would come back with a concrete action or resolution that would convince the group to proceed otherwise.

MW - Item closed.

5. Rec 5 – Mission Statement - Fourth reading (45 min) MW

<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009941.html> &

<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009917.html>

- AOC language
- Root servers and numbers language
- Contract enforcement
- Grandfathering
- where feasible and appropriate language

BBurr - presentation of updated Recommendation document:

- ALAC request on WHERE FEASIBLE AND APPROPRIATE. There were two mentions of these in the original document, both were removed and one added back after Dublin.
- Awaiting Board input on RSSAC language for the mission.
- Lively discussion on ASO language. Their latest submission to be discussed today.

- Issue around regulation vs ICANN. Vast majority of commenters in third draft were supportive. Board suggested that this was not appropriate for a mission and should be moved to notes for drafters. CCWG counsel supported.
- Enforcement
- PICs
- CCWG legal raised a number of questions regarding grandfathering?

ALAC request on WHERE FEASIBLE AND APPROPRIATE. Agreed to reinsert in core value 2 but not in 4. ALAC continues to argue for its re-introduction.

KArasteh - Need to answer if feasible and appropriate.

AGreenberg - Are simply requesting what was there stay there. The example in the RSTEP process - are there competitive issues with this change. We evaluate this. Without this clause we may not be able to ask the question. Need this to be a proper custodian of the namespace.

KArasteh - We cannot grandfather elements which we do not have.

BBurr - pointing to RSTEP process points to the FACT that ICANN cannot make any determination on competition - if there are concerns they are referred to the appropriate govts. This is not an issue. However, any language in the Bylaws the authority does not rely on market is an issue.

AGreenberg - Agrees with the words of BB - but this is not what is written.

GShattan - language promotes a laissez-faire approach - let the market do its thing. This is one way to look at this. We are confusing a competitive environment and an anti-trust environment.

SBachollet - alternate options in line with AG

BBurr - ICANN does not have the authority or tools/skillset.

10 minute break

SDelBianco - does this say the market can be depended on to manage this or does it give ICANN the right to interfere into fixing it.

GShattan - does not give ICANN carte blanche- the market gets first crack, if the market fails then ICANN could interfere.

Conclusion - TR - since there is an objection from a chartering org. on this - let us try to get closer to a compromise on the list which we will consider the next time we consider this point.

ASO Language

BBurr - issues about referencing the MOU. Izumi has proposed alternate language today. There are essentially two different constructions

IOkutani - explanation of proposed text

Bruce Tonkin: Changes make sense Izumi. I have sent to the Board list.

Chris Disspain: Board needs to look at this wording and comment asap

Conclusion - TR - given there are no objections let us assume that IO proposed language is the new reference text.

Grandfathering

BBurr - Grandfathering language - Issue - can contracts with PICS in them be renewed without change - can new contracts contain PICS going forward. Are there any objections to making PICS renewable and new agreements can include these.

AGreenberg - supports continuing PICS and including in the not yet signed.

GShattan - object but not on the basis that they should be renewed - it is unclear they would go away. We are confusing the issue. Grandfathering is cheating,

CDisspain - Board has concerns about grandfathering. Also want to make certain we retain the power to contract and enforce which includes current PICS.

Becky Burr: Chris that is already in the language. Grandfathering language says FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBT to drafters. This should apply to all TLDs from this current round.

MHutty - We are not changing ICANN's mission, simply clarifying it. Some of the concerns are that it signed some PICS which are not within in mission and so could be challenged with the new version. Grandfathering would fix this to avoid disruption of the environment.

Conclusion - TR - we are close to a compromise - we will ask BB to update the document taking into account the discussions today and refine this on the list so this can be finalized on the next call

Greg Shattan: How about this; "To the extent that PICS may be out of scope, those PICS are grandfathered in.

MHutty - want to preserve the APPROVAL queue.

Contract Enforcement

BBurr - Contract enforcement - There is general agreement that ICANN has the power to enter into contracts and enforce these in the service of its mission. The ICANN Board objects to the Regulator language - and the Board proposed that this language moved to the drafting notes to be taken into account/Guidance to drafters of the final Bylaws.

MHutty - Guidance to do what in the Board proposal?

GShattan - What is the weight between our draft Bylaws language and the Notes to drafting. If they are = then there is no issue with the Board recommendation. If there is a difference, then there is an issue. We should clarify if there is a difference.

TR - our recommendations are clear instructions to drafters. Additionally, we have an implementation oversight team to ensure we are meeting the objectives. We may work more on what we are trying to express here but this may also be done in instructions to drafters.

TR - this closes this agenda item.

6. Rec 9 – AOC reviews - Second reading (15 min) SDB

<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009796.html>

<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009959.html> &

<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/009807.html>

SDB - Two questions from our lawyers - Re requirement to better define diversity. Recommend no change to current. Next question same. recommendation on participation.

RAbdulRahim - Board supports incorporating AOC in Bylaws. Discussion of operational standards vs inclusion in Bylaws. (see email by BTonkin for details):

Board Comment - Recommendation 9:

As noted in its comments on the third draft proposal, the Board supports the incorporation of the AOC reviews into the Bylaws, while noting the importance of maintaining operational standards for reviews outside of the Bylaws. While the Board agrees that operational standards should be in alignment with the provisions of the Bylaws, the Board views operational standards as a more suitable place to address multiple review-related operational items that do not belong in the Bylaws.

There are a few specific areas that the Board is flagging in relation to the operational standards -

a) The Board is concerned about potential constraints that may limit flexibility and effectiveness in the operational standards and that certain CCWG-Accountability recommendations may not be aligned with best practices or industry standards, including:

- Fixed numbers of total review team members, as well as a fixed allocation among SO/ACs, without consideration of specific issues and required expertise for a given review.
- Unlimited number of participants, in addition to the appointed review team members, potentially affecting the team's productivity.
- Exact trigger points for the commencement of reviews without taking into account the Community bandwidth, or the state of pending implementation activities.

b) To accommodate differing needs of reviews, the Board recommends leaving the number of review team members to the selectors of a specific review team, as to prescribing a specific formula for composition. This could leave to the selectors the flexibility, for example, to include more members from a specific SO or AC that is more impacted by a specific review, without hardcoding numbers into the Bylaws that might need to be changed later.

c) The Board is concerned with the CCWG-Accountability's recommendations on determinations of how consensus is applied. Imposing Bylaws requirements on allowing participants and observers, or requiring consensus calls are other examples where trying to hardcode specific requirements for reviews now might actually develop reviews that are less efficient, more resource intensive, and detract from the responsibilities of the review teams.

The Board notes that the ICANN community would benefit from a review schedule that would take into consideration community bandwidth and ICANN resources in developing a staggered or phased review schedule. These factors should determine what a workable number of concurrent reviews would be and ensure that no more than that number of reviews are scheduled at the same time.

Finally, the Board would like to highlight the work that has been underway within ICANN towards improving review effectiveness so that the CCWG and the community may factor this work in the development of operational standards. Work has been underway on the development of Operational Standards since last year, originating from ATRT2 recommendation 11 to improve effectiveness of Reviews together with Board Resolution [2015.07.28.14](#). In July 2015, after factoring public comments, the Board endorsed the proposed process and operational improvements designed to simplify and increase the effectiveness of Reviews. The Organizational Effectiveness Board Committee is currently working to finalize Policies, Procedures and Guidelines for the Organizational Reviews mandated by the Bylaws.

Conclusion - TR - RAR the CCWG will consider this Board input and we will reply to it. (SDB) there is no objection to your suggestions, please include in the next draft. TR - this closes this item.

7. Timeline & next steps (15 min) MW

<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/attachments/20160120/0e76810a/Timelineandnextsteps-0001.pdf>

Pilot test for reviewing recommendation by recommendation seems to working well. Can we get confirmation that we can keep using this process?

Conclusion - MW - we will continue with this process. This concludes this item.

8. A.O.B (15 min) MW

None

Meeting Adjourned.

Action Items

Documents

- [HR_dormant.pdf](#)
- [Rec 5 - Mission - conclusions BB 26 Jan.pdf](#)
- [Rec 9 - AOC reviews - First reading conclusions.pdf](#)
- [Timelineandnextsteps-0001.pdf](#)

Adobe Chat

Brenda Brewer: (1/26/2016 12:05) Hello and welcome to CCWG Accountability Meeting #80 on Tuesday, 26 January 2016 @ 19:00 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>

Kavouss Arasteh: (12:33) HI BRENDA

Brenda Brewer: (12:33) Hi Kavouss and all!

Niels ten Oever: (12:34) Hi all

Tatiana Tropina: (12:46) hello everyone

Niels ten Oever: (12:51) I see that the agenda on the screen is different from the agenda in the email, could we perhaps put human rights up a discussion point?

Luca Urech (GAC - Switzerland): (12:52) Hi everyone!

Luca Urech (GAC - Switzerland): (12:53) I would also appreciate moving Rec 6 up again as on the original agenda.

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (12:54) Good day everyone!

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (12:54) Hi all

Aarti Bhavana: (12:55) Hi All!

Sabine Meyer: (12:55) Hello everyone!

Aarti Bhavana: (12:55) +1 Niels

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (12:56) Hello everyone, everywhere!

Tatiana Tropina: (12:56) +1 Niels

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (12:56) Hi all

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (12:56) The Zuck man is here

Thomas Rickert, CCWG Co-Chair: (12:57) Hi all, Leon cannot join at the beginning so we hope he can join in time for the HR discussions later. This is why we suggested the change of order in the agenda.

Pär Brumark (GAC Niue): (12:57) Hi all!

Niels ten Oever: (12:58) That's unfortunate to hear, because I planned my time according to the agenda.

Tatiana Tropina: (12:58) +1 to Niels, I have to urgently rearrange my schedule now :(

Luca Urech (GAC - Switzerland): (12:59) Same here...

Thomas Rickert, CCWG Co-Chair: (12:59) Wait until you do so, Tatiana

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (13:00) Hello all

KAVOUSS aRASTEH: (13:00) pls cALL ME

Suzanne Radell (GAC): (13:00) Hello everyone

Milton: (13:01) Cheers, all

Athina Fragkouli (ASO): (13:01) hello all!

FIONA ASONGA (ASO): (13:01) Hallo All

nigel hickson: (13:01) good evening

Niels ten Oever: (13:03) Thanks Thomas

Milton: (13:03) oh too bad, I liked the new agenda

Tatiana Tropina: (13:04) sorry I disliked it :)

Becky Burr: (13:04) Hello all

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (13:04) hi all

Matthew Shears: (13:04) hello

Avri Doria: (13:04) i did not really care

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (13:06) GNSO gave a summary of comments we are already reviewing. As te GNSO letter put it, 'The GNSO Council's Response was based on a review and analysis of all of the GNSO SG/Cs' feedback provided during the public comment period on the Third Draft Report.'

Avri Doria: (13:07) does that mean that the GNSO is just an aggregation and this it really isn't a GNSO position?

Becky Burr: (13:07) I continue to take exception to the notion that the GAC has not taken a position on participating as a decision maker. To the extent the GAC is fully participating in the decision to escalate or not escalate, that is a decision making role.

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:07) If GAC can't agree that it wants these powers, we should not insist on giving GAC these powers (Rec. 1 and 11).

Becky Burr: (13:08) I am fine with that, but i don't think we should obscure what is actually going on

Becky Burr: (13:08) fine with the decision making role

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:09) GAC can't agree that is fine with having a decision making role. That is significant.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (13:09) @Avri -- yes. But we should expect GNSO to vote on a resolution regarding our Final Supplemental proposal

Becky Burr: (13:09) agree Robin, but my point is about accurate description, not (in this thread) the substance

Becky Burr: (13:11) Agenda on screen now is different from agenda in discussion notes

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:11) Becky, yes, I was just trying to slip some substance into the discussion on this issue. :-)

Becky Burr: (13:11) ;)

Brenda Brewer: (13:13) Kavouss Arasteh has joined audio bridge only at this time.

Izumi Okutani (ASO): (13:13) Thank you Mathieu for this helpful summary and to GAC and GNSO for sharing their position!

Edward Morris: (13:15) There will be a GNSO vote on the final supplemental proposal. The comment provided should alert the CCWG that the GNSO has serious concerns with 1, 6, 10 and 11 and unless there is change in the supplemental proposal any one, or all, of these may not receive final support.

Edward Morris: (13:16) (per the GNSO Council simple majority voting procedure)

Chris Disspain: (13:20) Alan, perhaps you could say what you think it should cover?

Chris Disspain: (13:21) content

Chris Disspain: (13:21) so if it covered the community forum discussion and the rationale?

Chris Disspain: (13:22) would that be OK

Chris Disspain: (13:22) OK...we can take that back and consider

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:22) I think it is a fair concern from the board that too broad of an indemnification is carte blanche to slander.

Chris Disspain: (13:23) shh Greg...you promised your lips were sealed

Alan Greenberg: (13:23) So squirrels are bad. But hampsters ok - correct?

Chris Disspain: (13:24) maybe for you Alan...

Alan Greenberg: (13:24) OOPS - hAMSTERS - NO p

cherine chalaby: (13:24) content: as long as it is in good faith and after due diligence into the veracity of the claim

Rosemary Fei (Adler & Colvin): (13:24) Eww.

Chris Disspain: (13:25) hand down

Greg Shatan: (13:25) Gerbils are the worst, apparently.

Chris Disspain: (13:25) worried about slander

Chris Disspain: (13:25) :-)

Alan Greenberg: (13:26) But presumably Chervil is ok.

Chris Disspain: (13:26) absolutely Alan

Milton: (13:26) Duvel is better than Gerbils or Chervils

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (13:26) Please mute your mike is not speaking

Philip Corwin: (13:27) Need bolierplate--no indemnification for any acts with rodents ;-)

Milton: (13:27) but broad exemption for beers

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (13:27) Empowered rodents ?

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (13:27) Alan, the point you make about damage to employment would be grounded in the claim of slander or defamation. I am not aware of a separate claim that would apply.

Greg Shatan: (13:27) Slander has to be false, factual and damaging to reputation. Opinions are protected (unless they imply false and defamatory facts). One would hope that our rationales would not go into such territory.

Samantha Eisner: (13:27) Thomas, we can meet that deadline

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (13:28) Agreed Greg.

Jonathan Zuck: (13:28) +1 Greg. Especially with the critical mass required to go forward. If someone individual or group engaged in actual slander, they SHOULD be suable.

Alan Greenberg: (13:29) @Holly, I think that IANAL covers my comment. I did get my merit badge in contracts at one point, and I am fond of a few Latin terms used in contracts, but that is as far as I go.

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (13:30) Don't know what IANAL refers to

Rosemary Fei (Adler & Colvin): (13:30) I am not a lawyer . . .

Alan Greenberg: (13:30) I am not a Lawyer

Greg Shatan: (13:31) Rosemary, I'm shocked!

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (13:31) I am very dense today. Got it. I was just trying to reassure you Alan that the harm you raised concern about would be addressed in a damage claim based on slander or defamation.

Rosemary Fei (Adler & Colvin): (13:31) I think I just defamed myself.

Alan Greenberg: (13:32) @Holly, understood. My quirky sense of humor is getting the best of me today.

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (13:32) Indeed Rosemary -- now someone might quote you!

Greg Shatan: (13:32) It was false, stated as a fact and damaged your reputation. Seems right to me.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (13:32) now on adobe, hi all

Chris Disspain: (13:32) I recommedn you indemnify yourself Roaemary

Greg Shatan: (13:33) Too late, Rosemary will have to enjoin herself.

Chris Disspain: (13:33) or waive at yourself...:-)

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (13:33) +2 Chris

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (13:35) having just started watching Suits, I am smiling

Rosemary Fei (Adler & Colvin): (13:35) Legal advice AND comic relief. That's full service.

Keith Drazek: (13:35) Agree we need to work to conclude. There is clearly more work required in WS2.

Avri Doria: (13:36) while it pains me, i can accept this compromise.

Matthew Shears: (13:36) This seems a reasonable way forward on HR

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (13:36) no sound?

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:37) Agree, Matt.

Tatiana Tropina: (13:37) I am also not fully happy with such a diversion but I think we have to compromise: there is no way to make everyone happy

David McAuley (RySG): (13:37) I think this language is good and I support it

Grace Abuhamad: (13:37) I unmuted Markus from the admin side.

Bruce Tonkin: (13:38) Hello All - confirming I have been on the call since the beginning - but now also in Adobe.

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (13:39) Option b is WS2

KVOUSS aRASTEH: (13:40) I AM NOW CONNECTED TO ADOBE

Avri Doria: (13:41) oh, well forget what i wrote about accepting the chair's compromise.

Athina Fragkouli (ASO): (13:41) I am also fine with the text. this is indeed a reasonable compromise

Avri Doria: (13:41) but if the Board is not accepting it, then it is not a compromise yet.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (13:41) I don't understand what Markus is proposing

Niels ten Oever: (13:42) Markus, could you also provide an argument for this position?

Tatiana Tropina: (13:42) This is not acceptable.

Niels ten Oever: (13:42) All concerns by the board have been addressed.

Niels ten Oever: (13:42) Point by point.

Tatiana Tropina: (13:42) I think we addressed all the concerns of the board

Tatiana Tropina: (13:42) this is just purely "we don't want this"

Tatiana Tropina: (13:43) I would love to hear the argued position.

Niels ten Oever: (13:43) In other words: The board is committed to human rights but doesn't want a commitment to human rights

Athina Fragkouli (ASO): (13:43) I also thought that Markus agreed with the suggested text.. I must have misunderstood

Niels ten Oever: (13:43) Markus did personally agree in WP4 on the text

Tatiana Tropina: (13:44) How a framework can be developed without the bylaw? what is going to be interpreted?

Niels ten Oever: (13:44) This is not in line with the lawyers advice from Jones Day or Sidley lawyers.

Milton: (13:44) +1 Tatiana

Milton: (13:45) What happens in WS 2 if there is no commitment to HR?

Tatiana Tropina: (13:45) I think that what is being proposed now is putting the card before the horse. If there is no bylaw there is basically nothing to interpret.

Matthew Shears: (13:45) we have come a long way on this matter - the support has been there for inclusion - the text in the adobe is a reasonable and measured way forward

Niels ten Oever: (13:45) +1 matt and very much a accommodation to the board position

Tatiana Tropina: (13:45) @Milton, there shall be framework of interpretation before the bylaw, I just don't understand how one can interpret something that is not agreed upon

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (13:45) but the latter route assures it will kick in, whereas the former doesn't

Chris Disspain: (13:46) the key words from what Markus said: Board proposes that including in the Bylaws a requirement for ICANN to address the human rights issue, as well as a requirement to consider – after a framework is concluded – how that should be referenced in the Bylaws. The Board therefore proposes the following: In the Bylaws text referencing WS2, language should be included that specifically identifies that a recommended framework on human rights within ICANN is expected to be part of the WS2 effort. Further, the Bylaws on WS2 should specify that If the cross-community group developing the framework also makes a consensus recommendation on whether and how that framework can be reflected in the ICANN Bylaws, the ICANN Board must consider that recommendation according to the process defined for considering those continuous improvement recommendations

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (13:46) In a material sense, there is no difference, except for the symbolism involved here and the degree of commitment.

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:46) It seems like the board is going backwards on this issue.

Brett Schaefer: (13:46) A perhaps naive question, but other than freedom of expression and freedom of association, which human rights is ICANN likely to infringe if it sticks to a narrow scope and mission?

Niels ten Oever: (13:46) +1 Robin

Avri Doria: (13:46) what has not been addressed is that they do not want a bylaw that mentions Human rights in any way shape or manner.

KVOUSS aRASTEH: (13:47) Mthieu

Luca Urech (GAC - Switzerland): (13:47) The message would be quite negative to not include any HR reference in the bylaws after the overwhelming support this important theme has enjoyed throughout this whole process.

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (13:47) I don't understand the problem with having a bylaw that affirms commitment to respect for human recognized rights. interpretation before bylaw is cart before horse.

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:47) Brett, I would add "due process of law" and privacy. But there are not many others that would apply.

KVOUSS aRASTEH: (13:47) I AM IN THE QUEUE FOR LONG TIME

Chris Disspain: (13:47) there is a significant difference Jordan..

Grace Abuhamad: (13:47) @Kavouss, everyone is in the queue in the order they raised their hand. Please wait for your turn.

Pedro Ivo Silva [GAC Brasil]: (13:48) Agree with Mark

Bruce Tonkin: (13:48) The Board has suggested including text on the bylaws that affirms that the work on human rights will be conducted.

Bruce Tonkin: (13:48) So there is a commitment to do the work.

Becky Burr: (13:49) I'm a little confused. I thought the Board proposal was to include a Bylaw that says there should be a Bylaw on Human Rights once the Framework of Interpretation work is done

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (13:49) Very disappointing Board response.

Tatiana Tropina: (13:49) This is not what will make a commitment to respect human right

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (13:49) Chris, re your chat: all the concerns the Board has raised about including something like what is on the screen have been addressed, and since the material difference is indistinguishable, why do you and your colleagues continue with this?

KVOUSS aRASTEH: (13:49) I HAVE A SOLUTION FOR THE CASE

Avri Doria: (13:49) agree with Niels, this looks like an impasse.

Brett Schaefer: (13:49) Is it too late to propose a HR bylaw that sticks to those four defined issues? It seems the expansive nature of HR is part of the Board's problem. But maybe I am misunderstanding their objections.

KVOUSS aRASTEH: (13:50) Mathieu

KVOUSS aRASTEH: (13:50) I have a legal solution for the matter

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (13:50) I will turn to you after Alan, Kavouss

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:51) Brett, We should explore finding the possible compromise language along those lines.

Greg Shatan: (13:51) Brett, I think that would be a step in the wrong direction. We have discussed and discarded the concept of "cherry-picking" human rights.

Sabine Meyer: (13:51) +1 Greg

Tatiana Tropina: (13:51) we can't cherry pick

Niels ten Oever: (13:51) +1 Greg

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (13:51) that concept is already embedded anyway, "within its mission and operations" - you don't pick off favourite human rights as well

Brett Schaefer: (13:52) Yes, I remember the discussion Greg. But there seems to be equal disappointment with the current direction of this discussion.

Edward Morris: (13:52) +1 Brett and Robin. Totally agree with that approach. Would prefer it to our current proposal.

Niels ten Oever: (13:52) We have had lawyer analysis about this.

Bruce Tonkin: (13:52) That sounds right @Becky

Tatiana Tropina: (13:52) I think the risks issues have been addressed

Malcolm Hutty: (13:52) Replace "does not create" with "shall not create" to make that clause effective

Tatiana Tropina: (13:52) with dormant bylaw there is just no risk because there is no operational bylaw

Becky Burr: (13:52) I understand the community response, but it seems polarizing. If the actual impact is not actually different (e.g., you don't have an effective Bylaw until the FOI work is done in either case) I would be interested in understanding at least why the Board thinks their approach is preferable

Bruce Tonkin: (13:52) It seemed odd to us to have a bylaw that was not operative.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (13:53) it's pretty common.

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (13:53) Instead of "in particular, this ..." use "This Bylaw provisions does not ..."

Tatiana Tropina: (13:53) Bruce, isn't it odd to develop the framework of interpretation for something that doesn't exist?

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (13:53) singular "provision"

Thomas Rickert, CCWG Co-Chair 2: (13:53) If it is just odd, then you should be able to live with it, Bruce!

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (13:53) Agree helpful too have more explanation of risks that Board envisages.

Stephen Deerhake (.as): (13:53) Perhaps the Board's bluff should be called?

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (13:53) Becky : hmm, that could work

Niels ten Oever: (13:54) +1 Mark

Tatiana Tropina: (13:54) I think the "odd" is not a good argument, We have to talk about risks if there are any. "we dislike it" is not a real argument

Tatiana Tropina: (13:55) Board highlighted the risks. We addressed them. We made a step forward and try our best to work on the compromise solution. "My way or highway" is nto really a way forward

Alan Greenberg: (13:57) @Bruce, Article XX (Transition Article) of the current Bylaws has several provisions that are not operable until something happens.

Thomas Rickert, CCWG Co-Chair 2: (13:57) The Board's position has not changed - that is the issue in our attempt to find compromise, Chris

Tatiana Tropina: (13:58) +1 to Thomas

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (13:58) it's not consistent because embedding a commitment was thought to be important for WS1.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (13:59) as opposed to embedding a commitment to do something about it

Niels ten Oever: (13:59) This risk was not formulated by Jones Day, nor in the comments

Megan Richards, European Commission: (13:59) Right Thomas. movement seems to be one sided only

Avri Doria: (13:59) it may also result in never getting to human rights at all.

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (14:00) The language expressely provided that there will be no IRP or enforcement effort since this will not enter into enforce until

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (14:00) Chris: that's precisely what the language is designed to do - to ensure there IS going to be a bylaw with a general human rights commitment.

Avri Doria: (14:00) dormant bylaw was a compromise. I still prefer an active bylaw.

Alan Greenberg: (14:00) For instance, the ccNSO could name Directors, Once it is formally constituted.

Tatiana Tropina: (14:00) +1 to Holly, there are no risks at all from this point of view

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (14:00) NO IRP or enforcement effort until the Bylaw comes into force. We have addressed this concern.

Tatiana Tropina: (14:00) :(

Tatiana Tropina: (14:01) ok I am going to type on the chat

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:01) Apologies Tatiana

Matthew Shears: (14:01) + 1 Holly - these concerns have been addressed

Avri Doria: (14:01) we need a bylaw becasue we are losing the NTIA backstop for freedom of expression and an open Internet. the promise of a bylaw was a compromise.

Tatiana Tropina: (14:02) Firstly, 1) the community has agreed that there shall be a bylaw. Secondly, 2) what the board is saying we have to go back to the square one and consider again if we need a bylaw? I do not understand the sense of this excersice

Megan Richards, European Commission: (14:02) holly has clarified important factor

Kavouss Arasteh: (14:02) Board position need to be formally contained ?put in the chat

Andrew Sullivan: (14:03) I confess that I find the argument, "This proposed bylaw doesn't have any effect anyway," to be a fairly weak reason to adopt the bylaw

Andrew Sullivan: (14:03) (But I don't have an opinion on what to do here.)

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (14:03) but it makes the commitment, is the point, right?

Avri Doria: (14:03) Andrew, it also goes beyond that indicating the action that MUST be taken to wake the bylaw up.

Edward Morris: (14:04) @ Avri. The initial language proposed was something like "free expression and free flow of information", That mirrors your, IMHO correct, interpretation of the NTIA requirements. Free flow of information is not an internationally acknowledged human right. Does the general h.r. language in your opinion meet the NTIA requirement?

Alan Greenberg: (14:04) NOTE: Language on screen should say that "until the Board adopts the Fol:, not triggered by the developed but not yet adopted.

Tatiana Tropina: (14:04) We need a bylaw for interpretation, the bylaw on respecting HR was discussed for many hours and agreed at WP4 and CCWG

Kavouss Arasteh: (14:04) Why not having the ICANN Commitment be sent to us in a Resolution and then we will see whether we could endorse it to be annexed to the transitional Bylaws

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (14:06) i hung up rather than unmuted calling in now

Avri Doria: (14:06) Ed, it does not meet it but promises to meet it. And those rightss are included in Human rights even if not explicitly in the UDHR itself

Edward Morris: (14:06) @Avri. Thanks for clarifying.

Luca Urech (GAC - Switzerland): (14:06) Agree with Avri - and that is well reflected in the term "internationally recognized HR", which goes beyond a single instrument like the UDHR.

Avri Doria: (14:06) i suggest we go with what is on the screen and deal with the Board refusal in the negotiation phase.

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (14:07) im back

Tatiana Tropina: (14:07) No. This shall be a bylaw.

Avri Doria: (14:07) except for bylaws, the Board can unmake and decsion it makes and we have nothing to say about it.

Kavouss Arasteh: (14:07) Mathieu

Avri Doria: (14:08) ... can unmake any decsion it makes ...

Kavouss Arasteh: (14:08) The Resolution from ICANN is a legal solution

Kavouss Arasteh: (14:08) Why not taking it

Greg Shatan: (14:08) The NTIA language alluded to earlier is as follows, FYI: Fourth, the transition proposal must maintain the openness of the Internet. The neutral and judgment-free administration of the technical DNS and IANA functions has created an environment in which the technical architecture has not been used to interfere with the exercise of free expression or the free flow of information. Any transition of the NTIA role must maintain this neutral and judgment free administration, thereby maintaining the global interoperability of the Internet.

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:08) Kavouss, I'm leaving this open... if the commitment convinces the group

Greg Shatan: (14:09) Holly, worth waiting for!

Tatiana Tropina: (14:09) Very much appreciated, Holly, thanks

Matthew Shears: (14:09) + 1 Holly

Megan Richards, European Commission: (14:09) thx holly !

Alan Greenberg: (14:09) Greg, Neutral and judgement free IANA is already addressed in the proposed changes.

Kavouss Araste: (14:10) Mathieu

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (14:10) thanks Mathieu

Phil Buckingham: (14:10) Thank you , Holly

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (14:10) and thanks Holly.

Kavouss Araste: (14:10) Pls ask the Board for the Resolution

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:11) I will make clear that is part of our conclusion. Traction on this was limited though

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:11) Apologies Sam was not possible to get back to debate after tha

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:11) that

Samantha Eisner: (14:11) On the human rights issue, while the langauge provided addresses issues of the timing of when the language could come into effect, there has not been consideration of the concerns raised on the actual language in the opening part of the Bylaws.

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:12) I am so sorry that this only raised now Sam.

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:12) We have had three full and long sessions + emails

Suzanne Woolf: (14:13) Re: RSSAC and root server system language, there's some discussion ongoing within RSSAC and proposed with the Board-- nothing to add at this time except we expect closure soon

Samantha Eisner: (14:13) These issues were flagged in teh Board's comments and in the remarks circulated last week.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (14:14) Sam, I guess from my reading of the comments, the concern is raised but never evidenced, so it doesn't convince.

David McAuley (RySG): (14:14) is anyone else having audio issue

Grace Abuhamad: (14:14) Audio is clear on my end @David

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:15) Sam, let(s) move this to the list if you could expand on these concerns. I am confident our lawyers will certainly be able to respond.

David McAuley (RySG): (14:16) Thanks Grace - getting interruptions, will call in

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:16) Please do launch a thread

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (14:18) "thereafter" -- does that mean a work stream 2 refinement? Or does that mean refinement/interpretation over time, via successive IRPs?

Bruce Tonkin: (14:20) I have just sent the current Board position on human rights to the CCWG mailing list.

Bruce Tonkin: (14:20) WE have quite a few Board members on this call - so we will take back the feedback we have received to the next Board call.

Rosemary Fei (Adler & Colvin): (14:20) I just sent the narrowed waiver language to the CCWG mailing list

Bruce Tonkin: (14:21) I have also sent some Board comments on the operational aspects of the AoC reviews to the CCWG mailing list.

Bruce Tonkin: (14:21) In general the Board is against setting hard values on some items such as the number of members of a review team - and suggests more flexibility depending on the topic of the review. Some reviews such as say the security and stability reviews - have managed to be quite efficient without a large group.

Grace Abuhamad: (14:22) Rosemary's email on waiver language: <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/010012.html> Bruce's email on Rec6: <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/010013.html> Bruce's email on Rec9: <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2016-January/010014.html>

Becky Burr: (14:23) that's a good question - and the answer is it is likely to be the ICANN Board. Which is why that is problematic in the competition context

Andrew Sullivan: (14:23) +1 Alan

Bruce Tonkin: (14:23) Thanks @Rosemary - I have also forwarded to the Board mailing list.

Andrew Sullivan: (14:24) (about not reviewing everything already existing)

Becky Burr: (14:24) But ICANN Board does not have expertise to determine when it is or is not appropriate to rely on market mechanisms

Becky Burr: (14:25) sorry just cut off dialing back in

Phil Buckingham: (14:26) Alan - "material" changes right. Exactly, Becky.

Becky Burr: (14:26) back now

Keith Drazek: (14:28) Becky is correct. ICANN is not a competition authority.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (14:29) ICANN's mission includes promoting competition, but that is not the same as being a competition authority or regulator

Keith Drazek: (14:29) Correct Steve

Matthew Shears: (14:29) a very specific and narrow sense of competition as well

Jonathan Zuck: (14:30) +1 Steve. We have competition regulators in place.

Becky Burr: (14:30) absolutely correct Steve

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (14:30) Current Bylaws, Core Value #6 is '6. Introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest.'

Kavouss Araste: (14:31) There is no problem to grandfather certain agreements already existed. There is no need to talk about the period during which the grandfathered agreement will continue to exist since it will do so until the waiver is introduced. I am not comfortable to grandfather a future agreement the content of which is not yet known or the exact text of the agreement is not known

Becky Burr: (14:31) I did not - I said that ICANN can refer if it has a question

Becky Burr: (14:31) IF WE DON'T KNOW

Becky Burr: (14:31) also not what the bylaw says Alan.

Becky Burr: (14:32) depending on market mechanisms and sovereign regulators?

Becky Burr: (14:33) BUT SEE CV 5 where ICANN has an affirmative value of introducing and promoting competition

Kavouss Araste: (14:34) Thomas

Kavouss Araste: (14:34) When we will have our 15 mins break

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:34) Shortly Kavouss. promise

Kavouss Araste: (14:34) Pls advise when we will have 15 mints of break

Becky Burr: (14:35) "appropriate" is always in the eye of the beholder

Matthew Shears: (14:35) there already are the words "where practicable and beneficial"

Becky Burr: (14:36) and what other way is ICANN equipped to use??

Kavouss Araste: (14:36) We need to have some degree of latitude being injected.

Becky Burr: (14:36) that's the problem

Kavouss Araste: (14:36) I have seen many area that such a qualifier was introduced

Alan Greenberg: (14:36) If we do not have ANY discretion to consider, then why are we chartering a AoC Review Team to look at it.

Greg Shatan: (14:37) I think painting any action by ICANN as "regulation" is a significant overstatement.

Izumi Okutani (ASO): (14:37) To the co chairs - are we done with discussions on any issues on the mission or just this part on consumer trust?

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:38) We will resume Mission after the break

Becky Burr: (14:38) what mechanism do you have in mind Greg - if you can identify it, i'll listen

Izumi Okutani (ASO): (14:38) Noted thanks Mathieu great to know

Alan Greenberg: (14:38) Why are we wasting a huge amount of money and volunteer resources to have an AoC review on the subject.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (14:38) 5. Where feasible and appropriate, depending on market mechanisms to promote and sustain a competitive environment.

Jonathan Zuck: (14:38) @Alan, I think there's a difference between an economic analysis of this and legal one which is meant to look at individual or collective corporate behavior. One things is the environment, the other is actions by actors

Becky Burr: (14:39) because the review is about expanding the new gTLD space which is exactly what Core Value 5 speaks to

Keith Drazek: (14:39) I'm sure the CCT-RT will provide recommendations for addressing any competition issues identified in the New gTLD program. ICANN and the GNSO can utilize the output of the CCT-RT to adjust the policies as warranted. So, ICANN has a role to support the bottom-up, multistakeholder process to help promote competition. But that's about it, IMO.

Greg Shatan: (14:39) The restated core value ties ICANN's hands.

Greg Shatan: (14:39) Ayn Rand would be proud of it.

Brett Schaefer: (14:39) Really? Are we debating about whether we should reference market mechanisms? This is a very basic disagreement. We are further behind the timeline than I thought.

Becky Burr: (14:39) Greg, wow!

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (14:40) @Greg -- so you say the current bylaws core value 6 effectively Un-ties ICANN's hands if the market alone isn't feasible and appropriate?

Brenda Brewer: (14:40) Break...call will resume in 10 minutes

Becky Burr: (14:40) I am not a libertarian - but i do not believe ICANN is competent in this area.

Grace Abuhamad: (14:40) Please not the recording is paused at this time

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (14:40) at 10 to the hour

Grace Abuhamad: (14:40) Please note *

Alan Greenberg: (14:40) Current 5 and 6 are compatible. Proposed 4 and 5 are at odds with each other.

Matthew Shears: (14:41) whjat is a market mechanism lin the context of this CV)?

Chris Disspain: (14:43) whoever is playing with their dog(s) is not on mute...

Becky Burr: (14:44) that would be cheryl

Becky Burr: (14:44) Matthew - more to the point, what non-market mechanism could ICANN appropriately use?

Matthew Shears: (14:46) indeed

Chris Disspain: (14:46) with Cheryl it may, of course, not be dogs...could be snakes

Greg Shatan: (14:46) @Steve, yes.

Becky Burr: (14:46) @Alan, no. there is a difference between promoting competition and using non-market mechanisms to preserve it. ICANN is fully equipped to do the first and absolutely unequipped to do the second. I repeat my question - what non-market mechanism could ICANN appropriately use to "sustain" competition

Brett Schaefer: (14:47) @ Becky, ICANN could just pick winners and losers, I'm sure everyone would be satisfied with the results, right?

Becky Burr: (14:47) @chris. ick

Becky Burr: (14:47) well, that would be a non-market mechanism

Matthew Shears: (14:48) what market mechanisms does ICANN have at its disposal?

Becky Burr: (14:48) it can expand the market

Becky Burr: (14:48) that's a market mechanism

Matthew Shears: (14:48) yes, what else?

Becky Burr: (14:49) isn't that the definition of a market mechanism? Let folks get out there and innovate and compete?

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (14:50) One minute warning

Greg Shatan: (14:50) Even controlling the number of TLDs available or when they can be applied for is a non-market mechanism.

Matthew Shears: (14:50) that assumes market demand

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (14:50) yes

Kavouss Araste: (14:50) Thomas

Kavouss Araste: (14:51) We can not continue this discussion.

Brenda Brewer: (14:51) Recordings are restarted.

Greg Shatan: (14:51) Here's a definition of "Market Mechanisms": "The process by which a market solves a problem of allocating resources, especially that of deciding how much of a good or service should be produced, but other such problems as well."

Kavouss Araste: (14:51) Pls ask whether everybody else has any concern with the original text before being amended by the qualifier

Rosemary Fei (Adler & Colvin): (14:52) Is there audio? I got nothing.

Becky Burr: (14:52) which original text Kavouss? The 3rd draft language was in 1st and 2nd draft as well

Kavouss Araste: (14:52) We need to be efficient .We try to make everybody happy ,if we can

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (14:53) 5. Where feasible and appropriate, depending on market mechanisms to promote and sustain a competitive environment.

Greg Shatan: (14:54) Artificial scarcity, black-box bidding, etc. are not market mechanisms. Market mechanisms refers to standing back and letting the market do its thing, good or bad.

Becky Burr: (14:54) you are conflating two different provisions Steve - ICANN "promotes" competition affirmatively but relies on market mechanisms to "sustain" a competitive environment

Becky Burr: (14:55) what action Greg?

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (14:55) promote and sustain are in the same sentence, Becky

Matthew Shears: (14:55) + 1 Greg

Becky Burr: (14:56) right Steve but I think they appear in slightly different context

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:56) 10 points for Greg at the bingo for planting digital archery

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:56) Next in line : glitch !

Sabine Meyer: (14:56) @Mathieu: what's the prize?

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:56) Extra calls

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:57) ;-)

Sabine Meyer: (14:57) everybody drop their sheets!

Sabine Meyer: (14:57) :D

Izumi Okutani (ASO): (14:57) "Coordinates the allocation and assignment of the top-most level of Internet Protocol ("IP") and Autonomous System ("AS") numbers. In this role, ICANN's Mission is:1) to provide registration services and open access for these global number registries as requested by the Internet Engineering Task Force and the Regional Internet Registries, and2) to facilitate the development of related global number registry policies by the affected community as agreed with the RIRs."

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (14:57) i'm reminded of a quote from Spaceballs. "Fooled you!"

Izumi Okutani (ASO): (14:57) This is the latest suggested language

Greg Shatan: (15:00) @Becky (from earlier) - rounds, favoring communities, black box, application periods are all "non-market mechanisms." Indeed, "market mechanisms" standing alone requires ICANN to do nothings.

Greg Shatan: (15:00) Bad static for me.

Sabine Meyer: (15:01) same here

Greg Shatan: (15:01) Izumi is in the ASO submarine...

Sabine Meyer: (15:01) Seems preferable to the co-chair well.

Alan Greenberg: (15:02) Vacuum cleaner in background....

Sabine Meyer: (15:03) Mega-Maid?

Bruce Tonkin: (15:03) Changes make sense Izumi. I have sent to the Board list.

Andrew Sullivan: (15:03) I think the new language solves the problem (of the mou being referred to)

Athina Fragkouli (ASO): (15:03) just to clarify that Izumi's suggestion is the official ASO suggestion

Chris Disspain: (15:03) Board needs to look at this wording and comment asap

Andrew Sullivan: (15:04) and it says what ICANN does, so it's good from my POV

FIONA ASONGA (ASO): (15:04) Yes it is the official ASO position

Becky Burr: (15:04) @greg - not sure what the "black box" refers to. I think communities, application periods are squarely within ICANN's mission and part of expanding the space - which is fundamentally allowing market mechanisms to function

Keith Drazek: (15:04) +1 Izumi

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (15:04) Izumi's blue text looks good

jorge villa (ASO): (15:04) +1 Izumi

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (15:05) it avoids citing sepcifically dated MoUs, so it is more durable as a bylaw

Malcolm Hutty: (15:05) why?

Greg Shatan: (15:06) @Becky -- black box = nobody knew who was applying for gTLDs until after the window closed.

Andrew Sullivan: (15:08) @Greg: are you saying that blind silent auctions are not market mechanisms?

Keith Drazek: (15:08) No objection to permitting the renewal of agreements with existing PICs.

Keith Drazek: (15:09) The question was "does anyone object to permitting the renewal of contracts with PICs"

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (15:09) +1 Allan

Becky Burr: (15:10) I am likewise fine with renewal of agreements with existing PICs, including new gTLD applicants that have not yet signed

Philip Corwin: (15:10) Are we prohibiting future PICs? Isn't the new PDP on subsequent gTLD rounds to address such questions.

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (15:10) +1 Becky

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (15:11) I would be against a blanket renewal

Becky Burr: (15:11) We are not prohibiting anything Phil. that would be subject to policy development

Greg Shatan: (15:11) It depends on who is setting up the auctions. If it is a market participant, it probably is a market mechanism. Otherwise, it's not

Keith Drazek: (15:11) Not prohibiting future PICs. Agree with Becky.

Greg Shatan: (15:11) What am I, chopped liver?

Becky Burr: (15:11) Robin - not sure what "blanket" means - applies only to the most recent round of new gTLDs

Bruce Tonkin: (15:11) @Philip - fundamentealy I think we really should let the AoC review on the new gTLD launch and the GNSO PDP to define how ICNAN manages PICs in future. Not sure why the CCWG is itself hgetting into theswe details at this time.

Becky Burr: (15:12) I don't think we should make that assumption. grandfathering is "for the removal of doubt" Greg

Alan Greenberg: (15:12) Most of PICs have nothing to do with content.

Becky Burr: (15:12) and I agree that all but the final PIC are safely within.

Jonathan Zuck: (15:12) +1 Bruce

Andrew Sullivan: (15:12) @Bruce: I think the original reason there was a problem is because of a worry about whether a given PIC is troublesome under the mission

Bruce Tonkin: (15:12) I thin the general principle was that ICANN should continue to enforce its agreements with registries and registrars.

Andrew Sullivan: (15:13) and making that clear was how people wanted the PICs to be explicitly coped with

Keith Drazek: (15:13) +1 Bruce

Becky Burr: (15:13) we can say that grandfathering makes no assumption. I'd be happy to get rid of grandfathering, but that is not what folks were asking for

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (15:13) it may be the case that some PICs have exceeded the scope of ICANN's mission. We need to recognize that and provide for the means of fixing it.

Finn Petersen, GAC - DK: (15:14) +1 Greg

Andrew Sullivan: (15:14) @Robin: that seems to be an effort to make changes to what ICANN is doing rather than to create the necessary foundation for the IANA transition

Becky Burr: (15:14) Chris that is already in the language

Andrew Sullivan: (15:14) and therefore I think it's going too far. If there is some fact of the world that's already in effect, but we don't like it, I don't think this effort is the place to try to fix it

Keith Drazek: (15:14) mute lines please

Philip Corwin: (15:15) Thanks to all who responded to my question.

Greg Shatan: (15:15) If they are not out of scope, they are not being "Grandfathered." They are just okay.

Greg Shatan: (15:16) If there is no debate on most of the standard PICs, we should clarify that these may be used in all agreements without the need for grandfathering.

Kavouss Araste: (15:16) that assumption is not correct. We grandfather something which currently exist they are not out of scopep

Greg Shatan: (15:17) Grandfathering is a black mark. It means that something isn't really allowed, but we're giving you a special pass.

Keith Drazek: (15:17) Agree fully with Becky here. We need to conclude this.

Alan Greenberg: (15:17) Where is the list of the "standard PICs" that is being referenced?

Chris Wilson: (15:17) @Bruce: Stress Tests 29 and 30 opened up the can of worms we are dealing with now

Kavouss Araste: (15:17) NOT AT ALL

Andrew Sullivan: (15:17) Surely the problem was that people thought there _might_ be a problem, and so this is a belt to go with the suspenders "they're ok under the mission"

Greg Shatan: (15:17) I'm happy to conclude this too. But correctly.

Becky Burr: (15:17) Alan, it is Specification 11 to the new gTLD agreement and I circulated it via email yesterday.

Alan Greenberg: (15:18) thank you

Kavouss Araste: (15:18) How you could say that. who decided that grandfathering is balk market

Andrew Sullivan: (15:18) If you conclude it for that reason, and others for some mistaken reason, what difference does it make?

Becky Burr: (15:18) @ Greg - fine, how? I agree with you that the standard pics and the current registry language is within ICANN's mission, subject to my concern about closed generics

Becky Burr: (15:19) correct Andrew, belt and suspenders

Kavouss Araste: (15:19) Grandfather existed since decades and were included in the charter, convention, constitution, agreement of many entities

Greg Shatan: (15:19) How about this; "To the extent that PICs may be out of scope, those PICs are grandfathered in.

Becky Burr: (15:19) ok by me Greg

Greg Shatan: (15:19) Board cannot unilaterally cancel contracts!

Chris Disspain: (15:20) News to me if we can

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (15:20) We don't have to wordsmith now, as long as we provide clear answers to lawyers questions

Alan Greenberg: (15:20) Becky, those are the "standard" PICs for normal TLDs. There are additional mandatory PICs for the TLDs classed as Category 1, Safeguard 1-8 under the Beijing GAC Communiqué.

Greg Shatan: (15:20) @Chris, for rhetorical purposes, you can.

Becky Burr: (15:20) Board can, for example, offer registry operators the option of signing new agreements developed in the future

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (15:20) If PICs are out of scope, they need to be corrected - done through a proper process. I do not agree to grandfather in PICs that exceed ICANN's scope

Greg Shatan: (15:21) I had wanted to offer a solution. But okay if you want to move on.

Chris Disspain: (15:21) Robin...who will decide if the OICs exceed scope?

Greg Shatan: (15:21) It's in the chat, and seemed to get some traction with Becky at least....

Chris Disspain: (15:21) PICs

Becky Burr: (15:21) I thought it was fine Greg

Jonathan Zuck: (15:22) agree Greg

Keith Drazek: (15:22) Yes, thanks Greg.

Becky Burr: (15:22) ok, will do

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (15:23) Chris, it is no different than other issues where it must be decided if ICANN did something out of scope. Bring an IRP.

Chris Disspain: (15:23) who would bring an irp Robin?

Becky Burr: (15:23) @ Robin - isn't the process to use the new contract development for next round?

Greg Shatan: (15:23) I believe my understanding of grandfathering is correct. And I also believe that I offered a solution to the concern I identified.

Becky Burr: (15:23) typically registry operators would be offered the opportunity to "upgrade" to a new model RA

Keith Drazek: (15:24) No objection and support Greg's suggestion.

Greg Shatan: (15:24) At least under US law, you grandfather in things that would not be allowed otherwise.

Kavouss Araste: (15:24) Your understanding of grandfather need to be accepted by others which is not the case

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (15:24) I do not support the broad grandfathering of PICs, Thomas. If they are out of scope, they are fair game for a fix.

Sabine Meyer: (15:25) @Greg, to my European understanding, grandfathering would rather imply that you do not test if something is within/without scope, you just take on the existing obligations (at least for a while)

Kavouss Araste: (15:25) We are dealing with a general issue and should find a general solution without referring to specific law

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (15:25) BUT Malcolm, we have new gTLDs that are in the process of negotiating contracts that include the PIC. that other TLDs have signed for this round

Kavouss Araste: (15:26) Sabine, you are right

Becky Burr: (15:26) i think that Robin objects but otherwise we have broad agreement regarding grandfathering

Samantha Eisner: (15:26) @Malcolm, I understand that to make two different classes of New gTLD contracts by virtue of the transition discussion. How does that interplay with ICANN's obligation for equal treatment?

Greg Shatan: (15:26) I disagree with Malcolm's suggestion. Until we change the rules, the rules are the same. Outlawing new PICs is premature at best.

Greg Shatan: (15:27) We should not be picking and choosing, so to speak....

Philip Corwin: (15:27) Agree with Greg, "Grandfathering" only needed when a past practice would be prohibited under a new law, regulation, or other document setting forward rules for the future.

Kavouss Araste: (15:27) Malcolm described the situation quite clearly

Philip Corwin: (15:28) Does anyone have an example of a new gTLD PIC that would be outside the scope of the revised Mission, Commitment and Core Value?

Becky Burr: (15:28) Phil, I think some of us are concerned that the prohibition on closed generics is problematic in the absence of a bottom up policy

Becky Burr: (15:29) but it was also outside of ICANN's mission as currently stated

Kavouss Araste: (15:29) Are we going to satisfy a small minority?

Philip Corwin: (15:29) Thx Becky.

Greg Shatan: (15:29) ICANN is still bound by its mission in considering PICs offered during the current round. The judgment made is the same.

Kavouss Araste: (15:30) There are people that they oppose to every language proposed by others unless their own language is imposed to the overwhelming majority

Kavouss Araste: (15:31) People need to show some degree of flexibility and latitude

Kavouss Araste: (15:32) s

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (15:33) page 12, right?

Greg Shatan: (15:33) Nice use of old hand...

Philip Corwin: (15:33) Given the Core Value language to "enable competition", I would think a prohibition on closed generics would pass muster so long as the process establishing it is "open and transparent". Of course, everything done in round 1 will be reviewed by Subsequent procedures PDP.

Philip Corwin: (15:33) Everything

Becky Burr: (15:34) perhaps the Board members on the call could weigh in here?

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (15:34) This critical principle obviously needs to be in the bylaws.

Bruce Tonkin: (15:35) @Becky - which page on the mission statement document are you referring to.

Becky Burr: (15:36) 12 Bruce

Becky Burr: (15:36) ICANN shall not impose regulations on services that use the Internet's unique identifiers or the content that such services carry or provide.

Chris Disspain: (15:37) @ Greg....that was my understanding...

Becky Burr: (15:37) i think board said this concept could appear in a separate part of the bylaws on contracting

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (15:38) your lawyers will need some poetic license to draft the bylaws. We will do our very best to capture CCWG intent, and the bylaws subgroup will provide oversight all subject to CCWG approval.

Chris Disspain: (15:38) we have been consistently told that these are NOT draft by-laws

Kavouss Araste: (15:38) Thomas, there should a limit on intervention of the people on a given point

Bruce Tonkin: (15:38) Ah - OK now I recall. We were thinking that some of the text that relates to gTLD agreement should really be in the section related to the GNSO and GNSO policies. The picket fence language etc can be incorporated.

Becky Burr: (15:38) the picket fence language is just a note to drafters Bruce

Bruce Tonkin: (15:39) The aim was to keep the mission itself narrow and simple.

Becky Burr: (15:39) never intended as anything close to bylaws language.

Greg Shatan: (15:39) You may have thought it was clear.... But I am telling you what readers are taking away from this method of expressing ourselves.

Bruce Tonkin: (15:40) SO I think it is all a set of instructions - that define the key elements that need to be taken into account.

Becky Burr: (15:40) but the language on regulation has a slightly different character. It could be redrafted by the lawyers but intended as a stand-alone concept

Bruce Tonkin: (15:41) ON the term regulate - I think the ICANN lawyers understand the concept - they just wanted to use different language to avoid the term "regulate".

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (15:41) We recommend that consideration be given to further clarifying the Review Team provision in Paragraph 54 (1) to specify the type of "diversity" desired (geographic or otherwise) for Review Team members

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (15:42) on Rec 5: has the proposal of an impact assessment been discussed? thanks!

Jonathan Zuck: (15:44) +1 Steve

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (15:44) yup

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (15:44) i agree Steve

Jonathan Zuck: (15:45) We've had so much discussion on this. The kind of diversity we need for review teams has got to be substantive, not arbitrary

Finn Petersen, GAC - DK: (15:45) Jorge - it has not been discussed

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (15:45) @Jorge: I don't think we have come that far I'm afraid

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (15:46) Thanks Mathieu. Any plan to get there some time?

Kavouss Araste: (15:46) Thomas, you had a great expectation?!

Bruce Tonkin: (15:46) @Jonathan - I think part of the challenge of diversity is that the selection of teams is often biased in different ways. e.g. Geographic diversity as the main requirement as used by the nominating committee.

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (15:47) I share Jonathan and Greg's concerns regarding arbitrary diversity requirements

Kavouss Araste: (15:47) Some people speak on every and all points

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (15:47) our lawyers: (2) to state whether, in determining the composition of the members of the Review Teams they select, the group of chairs can solicit additional nominees or appoint less than 21 members to avoid potential overrepresentation of particular ACs or SOs if some nominate less than 3 members.

Bruce Tonkin: (15:47) The current review team for the new gTLD process had a heavy focus on geographic diversity.

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (15:47) @Jorge; yes.

Bruce Tonkin: (15:48) Sometimes geographic diversity has been at the expense of gender diversity or at the expense of diversity in skills sets - engineering, legal, Government policy for example.

Greg Shatan: (15:48) I apologize if I have ever been excessive. Hmph.

Kavouss Araste: (15:48) I hope we could agree on this Rec. to at least have some output

Thomas Rickert, CCWG Co-Chair: (15:48) Greg, I should just have said it was long

Jonathan Zuck: (15:48) @GReg, some of us are geographically diverse all on our own

Chris Disspain: (15:49) @ Greg...I think Thomas was joking...

Chris Disspain: (15:49) or seemingly not:-)

Greg Shatan: (15:49) I will try to be brief.

Kavouss Araste: (15:50) Multiculturalism guiding us to understand each other rather than sticking on our individual position

Jonathan Zuck: (15:50) Agree Bruce

Thomas Rickert, CCWG Co-Chair: (15:50) Chris, humor just does not translate, right

Kavouss Araste: (15:51) Thomas, please ask whether there is a major opposition to this Rec otherwise take it as a consensus agreement on that and go ahead

Chris Disspain: (15:51) not from German Thomas...:-)

Kavouss Araste: (15:52) German Thomas is also flexible

Matthew Shears: (15:52) if there are new Board comments on the issues to be discussed in an upcoming call could they please be provided beforehand

Sabine Meyer: (15:52) Just wanted to say: Way to spend all German humor reserves this early in the year, Thomas.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (15:52) I don't know if it is awesome use of call time to read the email sent to the list?

Jonathan Zuck: (15:52) +1 Jordan. IT's also very quiet

Brett Schaefer: (15:53) +1 Jordan, but it would help to get the comments earlier so we have more time to absorb them

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (15:53) the Board's email was sent after this call began. I see several items in there that are worthy of discussion. But we don't have time today

Greg Shatan: (15:53) Rinalia, at least you were not called "excessive" :-)

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland): (15:53) please may we have the comments in writing?

Bruce Tonkin: (15:53) I have sent the Note that Rinalia is reading to the CCWG mailing list.

Greg Shatan: (15:54) Four hour calls anyone? :-)

Sabine Meyer: (15:54) You got bingo, Greg?

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (15:55) Greg: please don't suggest it

Kavouss Araste: (15:55) why not a FIVE HOURS MEETINGS

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (15:55) Kavouss: not you too!

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (15:55) :-)

Jorge Cancio (GAC Switzerland): (15:56) only five?

Keith Drazek: (15:56) I would do a 5-hour meeting if we accomplished 5 hours of progress.

Kavouss Araste: (15:56) NOT AT ALL. I AM NOT COMFORTABLE EVEN WITH THREE HOURS SINCE THE MORE THE TIME THE MORE THE NUMBER OF REPEATED OBJECTIONS

Kavouss Araste: (15:57) Our progress at this meeting was the most minimum during the 80 calls that we have. there are no demonstration of flexibility, tolerance

Keith Drazek: (15:57) We must publish the Supplemental Report in mid-February if we want the transition to proceed.

Finn Petersen, GAC - DK: (15:57) 5 hours of progress - you must be dreaming

Keith Drazek: (15:57) ...or before

Matthew Shears: (15:57) + 1 Keith

Greg Shatan: (15:57) @Sabine, nobody sent me the Accountability Bingo sheets.... :-(

Kavouss Araste: (15:58) You think so ? but a supplement full of contradictions or full of agreement

Andrew Sullivan: (15:58) The more work we do on the list, the less we have to do in calls, I note

Greg Shatan: (15:58) Je ne comprends pas votre dröllerie....

Sabine Meyer: (15:58) @Greg pretty sure they just got lost in the mail

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (15:58) let's aim to resolve everything on the next call

Greg Shatan: (15:58) I'll reassemble the packets myself.

Avri Doria: (15:58) bingo sheets, i love bingo sheets. we need bingo sheets.

Kavouss Araste: (15:59) But we did a lot on the e-mail exchanged but none of them were observed

nigel hickson: (15:59) bingo.....

FIONA ASONGA (ASO): (15:59) +1 Jordan

Sabine Meyer: (15:59) as Mathieu introduced the idea I nominate him for that particular task.

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (15:59) that might focus the mind :-)

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair ALAC): (15:59) half hour calls with deep focus ;-)

Greg Shatan: (15:59) excessive has to go on the next bingo sheet. Along with "mute if you are typing"

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (15:59) Keith+1

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (15:59) good call, we are still progressing, talk again soon... bye for now then..

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (15:59) thanks all

Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur): (15:59) ciao!

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair ALAC): (15:59) thanks everyone

Matthew Shears: (15:59) yes thanks to all

Brett Schaefer: (16:00) Bye all

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (16:00) Bye all, thanks!

David McAuley (RySG): (16:00) Thanks and good bye all

Kavouss Araste: (16:00) Yes proccessing but milimeter by milimeter.

Avri Doria: (16:00) Kavouss +1

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (16:00) Bye all

Keith Drazek: (16:00) Thanks all.

Kavouss Araste: (16:00) ARIVEDERCI

Pär Brumark (GAC Niue): (16:00) Thx all! Bye!

FIONA ASONGA (ASO): (16:00) Thanks all bye!

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair ALAC): (16:00) bye all

Andrew Sullivan: (16:00) bye

Greg Shatan: (16:00) I thank you excessively. Bye all!

Avri Doria: (16:00) bye

nigel hickson: (16:00) good bye

Izumi Okutani (ASO): (16:00) Thanks all good call!

Sabine Meyer: (16:00) bye!

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (16:00) thanks & bye

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (16:00) arrivederci