

CCWG ACCT Meeting #9 (27 January 2015)

Attendees:

Members: Alan Greenberg, Alice Munya, Becky Burr, Bruce Tonkin, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Fiona Asonga, Izumi Okutani, Jordan Carter, Julia Wolman, Leon Sanchez, Mathieu Weill, Par Brumark, Robin Gross, Samantha Elsner, Sebastien Bachollet, Steve DelBianco, Thomas Rickert, Tijani Ben Jemaa

Participants: Avri Doria, Andrea Beccalli, Alain Bidron, Barrack Otieno, David Maher, David Johnson, Edward Morris, Eric Brunner-Williams, Finn Petersen, Greg Shatan, Guru Acharya, John Poole, Jonathan Zuck, Kavouss Arasteh, Keith Drazek, Mark Carvell, Matthew Shears, Olivier Muron, Pedro Ivo Ilva, Phil Buckingham, Rudi Daniel, Stephanie Duchesneau

Staff: Adam Peake, Berry Cobb, Brenda Brewer, Grace Abuhamad, Marika Konings

Apologies: Philip Corwin, Martin Boyle, Olivier Crepin Leblond; Vrikson Ivan Acosta-Velasquez; David McAuley; Eberhard Lisse

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

Transcript

[Transcript CCWG ACCT #9 27 Jan.doc](#)

[Transcript CCWG ACCT #9 27 Jan.pdf](#)

Recording

The Adobe Connect recording is available here: <https://icann.adobeconnect.com/p56uwwk1ntf/>

The audio recording is available here: <https://icann.box.com/shared/static/js721860s8c6yrsvbb2mmflhnqtgjin9.mp3>

Proposed Agenda:

1. Welcome & Roll Call - update SOI
2. CWG update & joint statement
3. WS1 requirements : organising further work
4. Contingencies : organising further work (inc. feedback from Board committee)
5. Timeline update
6. Outreach plan for Singapore
7. AOB
8. Closing remarks

Notes 1/27:

Audio-only -- Jonthan Zuck

Please contact Grace if you need help with your SOI

CWG update & joint statement

- Chairs' Statement out of F2F (published on 23 January): <https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2015-01-23-en>
- Joint Statement published on 26 January: <https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2015-01-26-en>
- CWG reponse to "Accountability Issues" Document has been sent to Avri for final check before sending
- Response is public and can be passed on

WS1 requirements : organising further work

Two groups (mailing lists are set up):

- WP1: Review & Redress (coordinated by Becky Burr).
- WP2: Community Empowerment (coordinated by Jordan Carter)

Two key deliverables for WP1 and WP2:

- Scoping document based on WS1 requirements coming out of Frankfurt
- Identification of key underlying issues to discuss such as composition, decision making methodologies (threshold, consensus, ...), standing ground, standards of review, cost, delays, ...
- When those are defined, then the group can move to developing list of questions for legal advice detailing expected requirements, and asking for proposed mechanisms, in the form "how can we... ?"

Action: send out Call for Volunteers. Please send a note to Grace if you would like to volunteer.

Legal Advice

- Legal Advice subteam also has a mailing list and has started to work based on CWG document.
- The timeline that we are working with is very aggressive. In Frankfurt, we discussed that we would get initial response from ICANN legal as we develop our questions document.
- No deviance from the path discussed in Frankfurt.,
- CCWG will attempt as an ideal to use the same firm as used by the CWG, although scoping documents will be different.
- So as not wait for the firm to be selected, or wait for the scoping document to be finalized, the first step is to ask for advice from ICANN legal team on a board set of initial questions to help the CCWG understand if it is on a useful track. This will be checked by the external firm..

Contingencies : organising further work (inc. feedback from Board committee)

- Agreed on a list of 21 contingencies. Agreed to provide additional analysis to these by responding to a list of questions, after discussion of an appropriate lists if questions.
- Request to the Board Risk Committee of the contingencies they use as part of their risk management, a communication has been received from the committee. Comparison shows a couple of items to be updates.

Next steps to answer the various questions:

- Are there existing remedies in place ? How robust are these remedies ?
- Could addressing the contingency be achieved through amending existing accountability mechanisms or is creating new ones necessary ?
- How relevant is the threat to the transition of the IANA stewardship ? ie how does the transition affect the likelihood of the threat, or the severeness of the consequences ?

Reframe the questions and ask whether contingencies from Board Risk are either in WS1 or WS2 based on our Charter.

Action: Add a specific contingency part to the communication materials that we'll edit in Singapore.

Timeline update

Berry Cobb explains timeline

40 days of Public Comment

Outreach plan for Singapore

Adam Peake presents

- Slide deck or briefing document?
- Sent a summary of mailing list discussions sent to the CCWG list
- Please let Adam know if you would like a briefing document and we'll see how we can assist.

Action: prepare a short summary and slide deck that CCWG can share during next week's meeting and use for Singapore.

Action: Adam to talk to GAC Chair and Staff Support to address timing.

AOB

- Timing of F2F in March (Kavouss)

Closing remarks

- Outstanding progress in Frankfurt, but still a lot to do in short time.
- Press on with various work groups
- Elaborate documents and build on substance
- Next Call: 12:00 UTC on Tuesday 3 Feb

Action Items

Action: Add a specific contingency part to the communication materials that we'll edit in Singapore.

Action: prepare a short summary and slide deck that CCWG can share during next week's meeting and use for Singapore.

Action: Adam to talk to GAC Chair and Staff Support to address timing.

Documents Presented

[ccwg-legal-advice-note-ajp.pdf](#)

Chat Transcript

Brenda Brewer: (1/27/2015 12:43) Good Day All! Welcome to the CCWG ACCT Meeting #9 on 27 January 19:00 UTC.

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair, ALAC): (12:58) Hello everyone

Tijani BEN JEMAA (ALAC): (12:58) Hi there

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair, ALAC): (12:59) we will begin shortly

FIONA ASONGA (ASO): (12:59) Hallo everyone

Pär Brumark (GAC, Niue): (12:59) Hi!

Pedro Ivo Silva [GAC Brasil]: (13:00) Hello everybody.

Keith Drazek: (13:00) Hi all!

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (13:00) Hi eevryone !

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:00) Hello

Alan Greenberg (ALAC): (13:01) A bit of delay getting on bridge.

Rudi Daniel: (13:01) Hi All

Jordan Carter (.nz): (13:01) Hi everyone

arasteh: (13:01) Hi every body

Becky Burr: (13:02) hellow

arasteh: (13:02) Good time (morninfg, noon, evening or mid night

Izumi Okutani (ASO): (13:03) hello everyone

Matthew Shears: (13:03) hello!

Phil Buckingham: (13:04) hello everyone

Grace Abuhamad: (13:05) Please contact me if you need help with your SOI

Bruce Tonkin: (13:08) Hello All

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair, ALAC): (13:08) Hello Bruce. Welcom!

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair, ALAC): (13:08) Welcome

Greg Shatan: (13:11) Well stated, Thomas.

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (13:12) Much appreciated !

Ebehard Lisse [NA ccTLD Manager]: (13:12) Please note my apology for not being on the call, we have a power failure, and my iPad battery is going flat.

Grace Abuhamad: (13:13) Noted. Thanks Eberhard

Matthew Shears: (13:16) could you reduce the size of the image just a little?

Grace Abuhamad: (13:17) better

Grace Abuhamad: (13:17) ?

Grace Abuhamad: (13:17) I also unsynced it

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:19) how to join the group? via this chat or send a note to Grace?

Matthew Shears: (13:19) thanks

Grace Abuhamad: (13:19) send a note to me please

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair, ALAC): (13:19) @Robin please send a note to Grace

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:20) thanks!

Jordan Carter (ccTLD member, .nz): (13:23) Will the notes reflect what Mathieu just stated? I got interrupted

Grace Abuhamad: (13:23) working on it :)

Jordan Carter (ccTLD member, .nz): (13:23) cool, thanks Grace

Steve DelBianco: (13:31) Just joined. Sorry to be late.

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (13:32) @Steve : Welcome !

Jordan Carter (ccTLD member, .nz): (13:33) Why is ICANN providing initial advice? I thought we were getting external advice

Jonathan Zuck (IPC): (13:34) +1 jordan

Edward Morris: (13:34) +1 to Jordan. ICANN legal is certainly not a disinterested party.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (13:35) Just getting on, but I hope I am not hearing that we are asking ICANN Management to comment on our draft requirements/mechanisms!

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (13:36) NTIA Secretary Strickling gave remarks at my panel today in Washington. See <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/speechtestimony/2015/remarks-assistant-secretary-strickling-state-net-conference-1272015>

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:36) The group consensus was to obtain external advice.

Avri Doria: (13:36) i thought we were piggybacking on the CWG legal requests. - not ICANN legal

Keith Drazek: (13:36) +1 Avri

Jordan Carter (ccTLD member, .nz): (13:36) Getting access to ICANN advice or ICANN's perspectives is going to be useful, but I have to say that great caution will be required to make sure that nothing that comes from that influences or shapes the requests for advice

Avri Doria: (13:36) obviously ICANN legal is going to be doing this as well, i assume.

Matthew Shears: (13:37) + 1 Jordan, Jonathan

Eric Brunner-Williams (ebw): (13:37) @robin, did _you_ conduct a consensus call on the issue?

Rudi Daniel: (13:37) +1 Jordon

Keith Drazek: (13:38) I have no problem with ICANN legal giving its views. In fact, I welcome it. But ICANN legal should not be the gating resource. We should rely on independent expertise to validate anything we're hearing.

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:38) There was no agreement to utilize ICANN legal team - indeed the majority of views expressed said to NOT do that.

Matthew Shears: (13:38) Robin is correct

Keith Drazek: (13:38) Also, if done sequentially, it raises concerns about timing.

Phil Buckingham: (13:38) Jordan +1 Keith +1 what s the budget , what is the process to appoint external legal advice

Samantha Eisner: (13:39) There seems to be a presumption that ICANN will return with inputs that are opposed to the needs of the group, but there is a possibility that the information that we provide can actually take some issues off the table (in a positive way) so that we can identify those issues that further inputs are needed on

Bruce Tonkin: (13:39) I am assuming here that the CWG on naming for IANA transition has yet to identify external legal advice?

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (13:40) @Bruce : correct

Matthew Shears: (13:40) correct

Thomas Rickert (co-chair, m, GNSO Council, eco Association): (13:40) There is no exclusivity

Jonathan Zuck (IPC): (13:40) +1 Avri

Bruce Tonkin: (13:40) I believe the chairs of CWG and CCWG are working with ICANN staff to identify an appropriate external legal resource.

Keith Drazek: (13:40) @Samantha...that would certainly be welcome.

Matthew Shears: (13:40) @ Bruce - that would make a lot of sense

Eric Brunner-Williams (ebw): (13:40) @sam, "fixation" more than "assumption"

Bruce Tonkin: (13:41) There are two steps - finding firms with a partner with the right balance of skills in non-profit governance in ZCalifornia law, and also doing a conflicts check to ensure that the partner is not already advising significant companies in the industry - ICANN as well as major registrars and registries etc.

Keith Drazek: (13:41) +1 Bruce

Jordan Carter (ccTLD member, .nz): (13:42) @ebw - it is about avoiding opportunities for the subject of the discussion to improperly frame the discussion, from my point of view

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:42) It is rather frustrating that we are moving forward with a plan that the group did not support (non-independent advice)

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (13:43) @Robin; we are still seeking this independent advice

Edward Morris: (13:43) @Samantha. As I'm sure you are aware in politics as in life perception is often more important than reality. ICANN legal could be professional, impartial and perfectly correct in your advice history suggests some will not recognize it as such. Best to get independent external advice from the start.

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (13:43) but it will come very late

Phil Buckingham: (13:43) Bruce -thanks for clarification .

Becky Burr: (13:44) Does the CWG have independent legal advice with California law expertise?

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (13:45) not yet

Avri Doria: (13:45) not waiting makes sense. but i think there is no doubt that we also need external and that this needs to be done as soon as possible. the idea of 'if we need it' was confusing to me.

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair, ALAC): (13:45) not yet @Becky

Thomas Rickert (co-chair, m, GNSO Council, eco Association): (13:45) Agreed, Avri!

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (13:45) agree Avri

Edward Morris: (13:45) +1 Avri

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair, ALAC): (13:45) Sorry for the confusion

Thomas Rickert (co-chair, m, GNSO Council, eco Association): (13:45) If we need just refers to the initial exercise, not for the other track with the full legal advice...

Thomas Rickert (co-chair, m, GNSO Council, eco Association): (13:45) full that is

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair, ALAC): (13:46) Exactly @Thomas

Phil Buckingham: (13:46) absolutely Avri

Matthew Shears: (13:46) + 1 avri

Eric Brunner-Williams (ebw): (13:47) i've made my comments on the main mailing list.

Jordan Carter (ccTLD member, .nz): (13:47) As long as we can definitely cross-check any ICANN advice with independent advisors and as long as we are vigilant, I can live with this.

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (13:47) yes, it was the "if we need it" reference that concerned me. I would hate to think we have to make a case that specific advice should be challenged before seeking external advice on the issue.

Bruce Tonkin: (13:47) I would assume that to the extent that the group does get advice from the ICANN legal team - that the advice has appropriate references in law - ie the advice should be able to be independently verified by checking the same sources.

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair, ALAC): (13:48) @Robin sorry for the confusion I didn't transmit the message accurately :(

Avri Doria: (13:48) Bruce there may be various competing sources and interpretations.

Eric Brunner-Williams (ebw): (13:48) @bruce, that would be the norm.

Becky Burr: (13:48) Sam - is ICANN comfortable opining on this stuff knowing that we are seeking separate legal advice?

Becky Burr: (13:49) I think this is potentially problematic

Avri Doria: (13:49) Becky, i would hope so. why wouldn't they?

Edward Morris: (13:49) I hope folks realise that on some of the questions we raise there may be no definitive agreed upon black letter law s

Bruce Tonkin: (13:49) Hopefully Avri there are only one set of laws in California :-). I guess there could be legal case law that has some different interpretations by different judges - but hopefully any solution is not r

Becky Burr: (13:49) because they could be forced to deal with conflicting legal advice

Edward Morris: (13:50) agreement

Becky Burr: (13:50) which in turn could create some liability exposure

Avri Doria: (13:51) Yes, Bruce, that is my point, legal advice is laws of California plus legal case precedence. and interpretations may vary as well as which precedents are indeed precedents.

Becky Burr: (13:51) there is one set of laws but I guarantee that the precedent will require careful interpretation and may support many different interpretations

Avri Doria: (13:51) Becky, does this mean that start out as being in adversarial position with the CCWG?

Greg Shatan: (13:52) +1 to Becky.

Becky Burr: (13:52) not sure I understand Avri.

Avri Doria: (13:52) sorry can't type 'as' when typing quickly

Edward Morris: (13:53) I've already spent a little time on Westlaw looking into some of this, Avri - we will find some conflicting opinions on some of our major questions concerning organisational structure. Big reason we need competent, specialised external legal advice.

Jonathan Zuck (IPC): (13:53) exactly

Becky Burr: (13:53) If I was ICANN's General Counsel I would want the ability to maintain the confidentiality of attorney client communications and attorney work product

Jonathan Zuck (IPC): (13:54) +1 Steve

Avri Doria: (13:54) and this committee is part of the client. unless we are in an adversarial relationship.

Bruce Tonkin: (13:56) Steve - I think you are misinterpreting the meaning of that statement in the list of risks.

Greg Shatan: (13:56) There's not enough room in this chat to explain all of the reasons why legal advice on a particular question of legal interpretation under the law of a single state (e.g., California) can vary radically..

Becky Burr: (13:56) the "adversarial" positioning is confusing me. I am pretty sure that ICANN will not consider legal assistance provided to this committee to be legal advice to the corporation

Phil Buckingham: (13:56) Steve +1 alarming

Jordan Carter (ccTLD member, .nz): (13:57) That is an astonishing thing to say. Well done picking it up, @Steve.

Keith Drazek: (13:57) +1 Steve, that's significant scope creep for ICANN. It's not responsible for implementing the NetMundial principles or a global IG framework.

Eric Brunner-Williams (ebw): (13:57) icann sent us a list of enterprise-wide risks, drafted at some prior time, and not in response to the ccsg-accountability.

Keith Drazek: (13:57) Did we lose the Adobe Chat?

Greg Shatan: (13:57) Becky, I expect that this will need to be clarified when engaging counsel.

Eric Brunner-Williams (ebw): (13:57) so some of the items are not useful.

Jordan Carter (ccTLD member, .nz): (13:57) @KeithD - it does explain a number of things - the coalition, 1net, NetMundial, NMI, etc.

Eric Brunner-Williams (ebw): (13:58) excited rhetoric and outrage aren't useful.

Bruce Tonkin: (13:58) My understanding of the Board at least is that we are focussed on ensuring that ICANN itself has true broad participation from the multi-stakeholder activity. This is why we have established offices in multiple locations etc. In any case I will take your feedback back to the Board in Singapore to get that statement clarified.

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (13:58) Share Steve's concern - we need to see that letter reference to IG eco-system failure. ICANN is but one component in the system - an important one but there are other entities and processes. ICANN does not lead.

Matthew Shears: (13:59) As a player in the Internet governance ecosystem ICANN does have a role along with many other entities in the distributed Internet governance ecosystem

Matthew Shears: (13:59) but not the core of it

Samantha Eisner: (13:59) For analyzing the stress tests, isn't it important to state why this stress test would be settled differently if the IANA functions contract was still in place?

Eric Brunner-Williams (ebw): (13:59) @sam: yes.

Avri Doria: (14:00) Samantha, makes sense.

Avri Doria: (14:00) but the 'deus ex machina' backstop accountability mechanism will often be the answer.

Jonathan Zuck (IPC): (14:00) don't think that's relevant. ianac

Jonathan Zuck (IPC): (14:01) iana is impetus, not model

Edward Morris: (14:01) +1 Samantha

Avri Doria: (14:01) i.e. the belief that at the end of the day, NTIA will reign ICANN is if need be.

Becky Burr: (14:01) yes, although outside of the IANA functions context we are talking about a far more amorphous "traditional stewardship" role that applies to accountability generally

Avri Doria: (14:02) wrong reign, perhaps Freudian slip.

Becky Burr: (14:02) which is why the community insisted on an accountability work stream that went beyond accountability for competent provision of IANA functions

Becky Burr: (14:03) good one Avri

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (14:04) ICANN rules OK (but not UK).

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (14:04) sorry 'rules' !

Alice Munyua: (14:04) Share concerns regarding the reference to net mundial multi stakeholder principles as widely accepted.

Bruce Tonkin: (14:06) Agreed @Mark.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (14:07) @Kavous -- if all we do is to answer the question, I agree with you

Izumi Okutani (ASO): (14:08) I'm good with Kavous's suggestion. Keep the question and separate from how we handle that.

Pedro Ivo Silva [GAC Brasil]: (14:08) @Alice - "broad consensus" was reached at NETmundial. Not every stakeholder agreed to the final Statement, but my understanding is that we have using parts of it as reference for some concepts, e.g. "check and balances". I think it is helpful to refer to that document.

Jonathan Zuck (IPC): (14:09) +1 Steve. why do we keep redeligitating this?

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (14:09) Agree with Pedro.

Jonathan Zuck (IPC): (14:09) relitigating

Matthew Shears: (14:10) Isn't it actually how our proposals for WS1 and WS2 approaches would be able to account for the contingencies if they are deemed appropriate or relevant?

Phil Buckingham: (14:10) Quote does not extend to business continuity measures .what about LOC COI re TLD Registry failure huge financial risk

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (14:13) When will materials be available? We need to get all GAC members comfortably up to speed.. No pressure but....

Pedro Ivo Silva [GAC Brasil]: (14:13) +1 Mark

Avri Doria: (14:15) and we can make it full screen to see better.

Julia Wolman, Denmark, GAC: (14:17) +1 Mark. Also important that the material is easy to understand with key issues and questions for the community to consider

Pär Brumark (GAC, Niue): (14:18) +1 Mark

Keith Drazek: (14:18) 15 days prior

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (14:24) is there an expectation of a face-to-face meeting April or May?

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:24) Yes and yes

Jordan Carter (ccTLD member, .nz): (14:24) Mathieu - is that April *AND* May?@

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:25) tentatively yes : one to finalize proposal for public comment, one to take comments into account before submitting final proposal

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (14:25) up for discussion of course

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (14:26) what are the green dots again?

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (14:26) CO approval times (10 days for this?) are potential real risk.

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair, ALAC): (14:26) @Robin tentative f2f meetings

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (14:26) I see the legend now, thanks.

Jordan Carter (ccTLD member, .nz): (14:27) Can this be circulated in a useful format for us to look at more closely, and can we also get a table of dates too?

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (14:27) yes it would be great to get this timeline on the wiki

Matthew Shears: (14:28) yes very useful

Berry Cobb: (14:28) @Mark, yes that is Risk Factor #4 "Not enough time to Approve"

Izumi Okutani (ASO): (14:28) good suggestion Robin - useful to have this timeline on wiki

Berry Cobb: (14:28) @Mark, in the project plan this is 3 Business weeks for SO/ACs to approve.

Jordan Carter (ccTLD member, .nz): (14:29) if we have face to face meetings can one be in west coast North America (LA, or SFO, or Vancouver?) or in Asia (SG or BKK or HKG or something)? Or even Dubai? :)

Avri Doria: (14:29) there are 3 face to face meeting, or can my eye not distinguish the two types of green dot.?

Jordan Carter (ccTLD member, .nz): (14:29) Avri - we already had one

Phil Buckingham: (14:29) Berry Thanks - Jordan +1 this is a very tight critical path !

Avri Doria: (14:29) true, i sometime forget where i stand in relation to time.

Keith Drazek: (14:29) That's correct Kavouss, the CCWG will deliver nothing to the ICG. However, the CCWG WS1 efforts are directly relevant to some of the work of the CWG, so the goal is to sync up those two efforts as needed, both in terms of substance and timing.

Matthew Shears: (14:30) + 1 Keith

Izumi Okutani (ASO): (14:30) + 1 Keith

Berry Cobb: (14:30) @Avri, we already had 1.....2 more are tentatively schedule for end of March and Mid-May

Avri Doria: (14:30) CWG does not have a complete answer without CCWG phase 1 results.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (ALAC AP Region): (14:30) exactly @Keith

Matthew Shears: (14:30) It is important that WS1 mechanisms (in place and committed to) are accepted prior to transition

Matthew Shears: (14:31) meant "agreed"

Jonathan Zuck (IPC): (14:31) +1 Matthew, perhaps even implemented

Izumi Okutani (ASO): (14:31) I agree Matthew

Matthew Shears: (14:31) implemented would be even better

Avri Doria: (14:31) Barry, ok, thanks. so we have no high intensity online meetings planned.

Keith Drazek: (14:31) It's also critical that the CWG doesn't design something that is contradictory or inconsistent or unnecessary in light of the CCWG work. And vice versa.

Jordan Carter (ccTLD member, .nz): (14:32) This is all going to take longer than people want it to.

Berry Cobb: (14:32) 40 days

Bruce Tonkin: (14:32) I am afraid so @Jordan.

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (14:32) Larry Strickling reminded us today that 30 Sept. isn't really a "deadline".

Jordan Carter (ccTLD member, .nz): (14:32) I would say the chances of the community "signing off" something in BA is 5%

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair, ALAC): (14:32) True @Robin

Avri Doria: (14:33) Jordan, interesting number.

Berry Cobb: (14:33) @Avri, none yet for High Intensity, but Chairs discretion if needed.

Jordan Carter (ccTLD member, .nz): (14:33) But that does not mean we should let our work lag, of course.

Alice Munyua: (14:33) very challenging timelines especially for the GAC

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (14:33) @ Berry: thanks for clarification - GAC will need to be agile and work fast on turn-around.

Jordan Carter (ccTLD member, .nz): (14:34) Thanks for this presentation tho - it's great to see a chart of this graphical usefulness

Keith Drazek: (14:34) +1 Thanks Berry

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (14:34) yes, it is a great format for the info. thanks, Berry.

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (14:34) EXTREMELY useful graph and management tool. look forward to synched version with CWG - mant thnks, Berry.

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (14:36) is there any news on our request for a room on Saturday afternoon for an informal mtg of participants in this group?

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (14:38) The Sat before that is (GNSO weekend sessions)

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (14:38) I think we've been informing our sending organizations regularly, with links to CCWG docs. I think Singapore constituency day gives our sending orgs a chance to tell us what they think about our path/progress

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (ALAC AP Region): (14:38) agree @steve

Eric Brunner-Williams (ebw): (14:39) please provide the meetig times in utc

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (14:40) @Adam - are you in touch with Thomas Schneider and ACIG about GAC requirements for materials BEFORE GAC reps travel mid-week to start meeting on Saturday and Sunday morning session on stewardship and accountability?.

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (14:41) Sorry, I meant Sunday 8 February for an informal mtg - can we get a room?

Adam Peake: (14:42) Mark, yes, but need to update Thomas and GAC staff support

Adam Peake: (14:42) i.e preliminary in Frankfurt

Julia Wolman, Denmark, GAC: (14:44) Briefing documents would be much appreciated

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (14:44) @Adam - thanks: imperative to get GAC reps briefed effectively.

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair, ALAC): (14:45) Thanks everyone!

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (14:45) ICANN staff tells me they will post the Frankfurt video interview early next week.

Jordan Carter (ccTLD member, .nz): (14:45) Thanks for a great meeting, well done the co-chairs

Pär Brumark (GAC, Niue): (14:45) Thank you all!

Thomas Rickert (co-chair, m, GNSO Council, eco Association): (14:45) Thank you all!

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (14:45) Thanks

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair, ALAC): (14:45) Thanks @Jordan!

Izumi Okutani (ASO): (14:45) Thanks all!