

# CCWG ACCT Meeting #51 (1 September @ 12:00 UTC)

## Attendees:

**Members:** Alan Greenberg, Becky Burr, Bruce Tonkin, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Eberhard Lisse, James Bladel, Jordan Carter, Jorge Villa, Julia Wolman, Julie Hammer, Lyman Chapin, Mathieu Weill, Olga Cavalli, Pär Brumark, Robin Gross, Samantha Eisner, Steve DelBianco, Sebastien Bachollet, Thomas Rickert, Tijani Ben Jemaa (20)

**Participants:** Allan MacGillivray, Andrew Harris, Barrack Otieno, Carlos Raul, Chris Disspain, Christopher Wilkinson, Farzaneh Badii, Finn Petersen, George Sadowsky, James Gannon, Kavouss Arasteh, Keith Drazek, Malcolm Hutt, Martin Boyle, Matthew Shears, Nigel Roberts, Olivier Muron, Phil Buckingham, Philip Corwin, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Sabine Meyer, Tom Dale, Tracy Hackshaw, Yasuichi Kitamura (24)

**Legal Counsel:** Holly Gregory, Ingrid Mittermaier, Michael Clark, Rosemary Fei

**Staff:** Alain Durand, Bernie Turcotte, Berry Cobb, Brenda Brewer, Grace Abuhamad, Hillary Jett, Marika Konings, Theresa Swinehart

**Apologies:** Alice Munyua, David McAuley

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

---

## Transcript

- [Transcript CCWG ACCT #51\\_1 Sept 2015.doc](#)
- [Transcript CCWG ACCT #51\\_1 Sept 2015.pdf](#)

## Recording

- The Adobe Connect recording is available here: <https://icann.adobeconnect.com/p9rou3wyyb7/>
- The audio recording is available here: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ccwg-acct-01sep15-en.mp3>

## Proposed Agenda

1. Welcome, Roll Call, Sol
2. Review input received
  - Jones Day Impact Analysis - <http://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-ccwg-accountability-03aug15/msg00007.html>
  - Call with CCWG-Accountability Advisors
1. Prepare for discussion with ICANN Board
2. Discuss SCWG item - <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2015-August/005106.html>
3. Elaborate a work plan for analysis of PC2 comments and finalization of report (September meeting suggested by ICANN Board)
4. Documentation of work
5. Political communication
6. Bylaws amendment discussion
7. A.O.B

## 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.*

### Review input received

To date we have received 10 submissions. The comment period will close on 12 September. The CCWG has also received Jones Day's impact analysis. We have relayed it to lawyers and expect to receive initial feedback on Jones Day's document by the end of today. It is also anticipated that legal counsel will speak with JD lawyers. A briefing with the ICANN Board and a call with Advisors took place on 31 Aug. The ccNSO organized two ccTLD webinars. Outreach is extremely active. 4 Advisors offered comments on the Advisors call. Most comments were supportive of our proposal. We received valuable feedback from Nell (proposal should dive deeper into outreach) and Jan (voting methodology). On the leadership call with NTIA, NTIA reminded us of the blog post and BA intervention. Larry asked us to document its process. It was also reported that there is too little rationale: pro and cons of models need to be highlighted etc. NTIA mentioned that there might be questions on IRP. We conveyed to NTIA that our group has worked strictly on a requirements basis.

### Feedback:

- The BC is concerned about: 1) Board is suggesting that they would give us new wording for AoC WHOIS review - we have not received that text and need it; 2) the Human Rights draft is currently limited.

- Synopsis of Bylaws changes implies a deletion of article 2 section 3. Is that the case?

**ACTION ITEM:** Clarify whether article 2 section 3 is deleted or not

- How do we intend to proceed with Jones Day advice? Are we envisioning a systematic answer? It is a complex and hard-to-read document. Jones Day is still arguing that the Board must remain final arbitrator, IRP should be advice and that ICANN should not be subject to coercive reviews.

---> Board is calling for us to signal any misunderstandings there may be in the memo. Our core focus will be to read the memo and provide comments. We have asked legal counsel to provide overview of relevant points and points that may be based on wrong assumptions of proposal. Jones Day's memo does not mention key legal issues, technical problems, but only focuses on pointing Board to appropriate risk level they want to take. We will discuss with Board once we have the memo at hand.

---> Legal counsel: we have focused on sole member and IRP issues. We will provide in-depth comments by Friday. We suggest our memo be sent to Board and/or posted.

[ACTION ITEM: Bruce to ensure proposed language on AoC WHOIS review is sent to CCWG](#)

## **Prepare for discussion with ICANN Board**

Meeting on 2 September - 22:00-01:00 UTC

Briefing (31 Aug) was organized to ensure Board had a good understanding of our proposal and that spirit of proposal is appropriately conveyed. No major concerns were raised on 31 Aug. The Board is continuing analysis of report. There were no questions on mission, commitments, core values, fundamental bylaws, building blocks. There were a lot of questions on CMSM and IRP. We can anticipate comment that there are gaps in the report on voting procedures, IRP etc - we have not spelled out details.

### Feedback:

- Is the Board aware of all changes that need to be made?

[ACTION ITEM - Ensure synopsis of changes is posted](#)

## **• . SCWG**

Suggest closing this issue as it is not CCWG related. This is a CWG-ICG issue.

### Feedback:

- This conversation is based on a misreading. There is nothing for the CCWG to do other than to form a community mechanism. There is no indication that CCWG input would be needed on SCWG.

- We need to be aware of glaring hole in process. The IETF is not part of community mechanism. Separation could include one or all IANA functions.

- Section on ICG is a summary of CWG report. It is not intended to replace the CWG report. The CWG has a process with a special IFR.

- The community mechanism does not participate in the SCWG.

- Close coordination is needed.

CONCLUSION: This issue is closed.

## **Elaborate a work plan for analysis of PC2 comments and finalization of report (September meeting suggested by ICANN Board)**

Staff is getting organized to populate the PC tool by Sept 15. We have limited time to deliver an analysis of comments and the final report incorporating any additional amendments as appropriate for COs to endorse in Dublin. We need to set time aside for lawyers' reviews. We were invited by ICANN Board for a face-to-face on 23-24 Sept. Should we organize intensive call periods or double amount of calls per week.

### Feedback:

- Do we expect to refine proposal or rebuild the proposal into a third draft?

- interaction with Board is useful. We have to have as much interaction with the Board as possible.

- We need to take the Board's offer.

[ACTION ITEM: Cochairs to debrief on September meeting and discuss polling \(whether dates get tracking\)](#)

## **Political communication**

We received feedback from NTIA, Board, community that implies our proposal is not adequately transparent and easy-to-read. Report describes differences between first and second report. We need to have a stand-alone version of the report or similar document that explains the proposal as it is now. We have received requests to provide realistic/theoretical examples of how powers are interlinked. We need to further work on explaining our proposal and spelling out the genesis of our proposal. We should be coming up with recommendations that are suitable to meet requirements but we need to be professional about how we populate and formulate recommendations. We must ensure our high quality outcomes are understood. We have started a dialogue with Tarek Kamel. Idea is to ensure that our proposal does not lose strength because we failed to use the language of the target group.

#### Feedback:

Each recommendation has to be well explained.

#### **Bylaws amendment discussion**

We have to take holistic of proposal to Bylaws. Both ICANN legal and legal counsel are working on amendments. No objections to process.

Benefit of experimenting is that we will learn about what is effective and what is not effective. We wrote to John Jeffrey to kick off process. Sam has indicated that we would have more clarity towards the end of the week.

**ACTION ITEM: Staff to get back to CCWG with a clearer deadline.**

#### Feedback:

- Timeline and role unclear.

- We need to be clear on what process is going to be and division of roles. How will this be conducted from a transparency point of view? Clarity needed.

A.O.B

#### **Action Items**

**ACTION ITEM: Clarify whether article 2 section 3 is deleted or not**

**ACTION ITEM: Bruce to ensure proposed language on AoC WHOIS review is sent to CCWG**

**ACTION ITEM - Ensure synopsis of changes is posted**

**ACTION ITEM: Cochairs to debrief on September meeting and discuss polling (whether dates get tracking)**

**ACTION ITEM: Staff to get back to CCWG with a clearer deadline.**

#### **Documents Presented**

- Jones Day Impact Analysis.pdf
- On behalf of Cochairs - SCWG - Ref.pdf

#### **Chat Transcript**

Brenda Brewer: (9/1/2015 06:39) Welcome to the CCWG ACCT Meeting #51 on 01 September 2015! 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: (06:40) Hi Brenda

Brenda Brewer: (06:40) Good day!

Olga Cavalli - GAC Argentina: (06:41) good morning from buenos aires!

kavouss arasteh 2: (06:45) brenda

kavouss arasteh 2: (06:45) I can not open the referenced hyperlink

Grace Abuhamad: (06:50) Jones Day Impact Analysis - <http://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-ccwg-accountability-03aug15/msg00007.html>

Grace Abuhamad: (06:51) Discuss SCWG item - <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/2015-August/005106.html>

Grace Abuhamad: (06:51) Hi Kavouss -- I copied the links into the chat for you. On screen, there is an image of a PDF, so that's why you couldn't click on them

Brenda Brewer: (06:53) I believe it works now on the agenda. Thanks Kavouss.

Brenda Brewer: (06:53) Thanks Grace.

Sabine Meyer: (06:54) both links work. Thanks Grace & Brenda!

Sabine Meyer: (06:54) and hello everyone.

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (06:55) Hello everyone !

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (06:55) Good morning and happy first day of September.

Rosemary Fei (Adler Colvin): (06:56) Good morning/afternoon/evening/night, everyone.

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (06:57) hi all

Pär Brumark (GAC Niue): (06:59) Hi all!!

kavouss arasteh: (06:59) Dear Co-Chair

kavouss arasteh: (07:00) Last night call did not have any agenda

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (07:00) Hi all

kavouss arasteh: (07:00) There were five active people and others have not had any opportunity to talk

Brenda Brewer: (07:00) Barrack Otieno on audio only

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (07:02) hello all!

Bruce Tonkin: (07:02) Good evening all

matthew shears: (07:03) Hello

Farzaneh Badii: (07:03) Hi

Asha Hemrajani: (07:03) Good evening

Eberhard Lisse [NA ccTLD Manager]: (07:04) We had a power failure in the building, but it has come back on, let's hope it'll stay on.

Rosemary Fei (Adler Colvin): (07:06) Valerie was also on the call, but didn't speak, I believe.

Grace Abuhamad: (07:06) Correct @Rosemary

kavouss arasteh: (07:07) Pls for the next time 1. PRODUCE AN AGENDA

matthew shears: (07:07) as referenced on the call with the Board last night is there any feedback from co-chair discussions with NTIA ?

kavouss arasteh: (07:08) 2. ALLOW EVERY BODY who wish to talk ask for the floor

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (07:08) I'd like to hear that NTIA feedback also, Matt.

Bruce Tonkin: (07:09) Hello Steve, I am happy to talk to that if that is helpful. The changes are minor - mostly just incorporate the new gTLD directory as well.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (07:10) @Bruce -- great. Could you send some times we could speak about it?

Bruce Tonkin: (07:12) I will see if the staf can get a draft our quickly - I have seen a draft about a week ago and there haven't been any changes since.

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (07:12) @Bruce: would you agree if we set an AI for you to update the group on the list ?

Chris Disspain: (07:16) Malcom, would you like the document in a different format...we can sk them if you wish

kavouss arasteh: (07:16) I heard that IICANN wished to provide a new text or draft for AOC why ICANN?

Alan Greenberg: (07:17) The changes to the core values, commitments and principles of e the Bylaws is proposing some very substantive changes, and I am afraid that many people who are reviewing this draft will be oblivious to many of the changes because of how the information was presented.

Bruce Tonkin: (07:18) Yes - happy to @Mathieu regarding WHOIS. I have sent a note to staff to release the proposed text that has been drafted.

Eberhard Lisse [NA ccTLD Manager]: (07:18) Not unexpected that Jones Day would try to turn our work onto its head

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (07:19) @bruce -- I think it would be helpful to circulate the new WHOIS text soon as you can. Far better than holding it back until the board files its broader comments on the proposal.

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (07:20) Kavouss: ICANN was going to propose some changes to the AOC review into Whois, relating to Steve Crocker's comment on the first webinar.

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (07:20) Agree with Steve.

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (07:20) We have a short 4 page memo that will circulate after the call focusing on the JD comments on Sole Member and IRP. We will follow-up by Friday with our comments on the 40+ page chart

Sabine Meyer: (07:21) Looking forwardto it, Holly!

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (07:21) Chris D - it would be much easier to read the doc if it was just by section for each area, rather than in those columns

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (07:21) \*columns

James Bladel: (07:22) Thanks, Holly. Looking forward to it. But to Malcolm's point, I don't think we have opposing legal perspective, but just a general note that that JD memo is opposed to binding accountability (IRP, CMSM) generally. Thanks.

James Bladel: (07:22) (disclaimer - I didn't read the entire JD thing yet)

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (07:22) +1, James. Same disclaimer.

Malcolm Hutty: (07:23) @Chris: Yes, a more conventional format (chapters for areas, sub-sections for topics and Proposal/Analysis/Alternative) would be greatly appreciated

Sabine Meyer: (07:23) oh, the second half is rather interesting.

Malcolm Hutty: (07:23) Very difficult to read when a single sentence spans multiple pages

Chris Disspain: (07:23) Jordan - happy to ask if they can change it

Bruce Tonkin: (07:24) Yes @Malcolm - I also found it hard to read in its current format.

matthew shears: (07:25) agree

Rosemary Fei (Adler Colvin): (07:26) Has any further thought been given to the Board's offer for a meeting in LA around September 23-24?

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (07:27) @Rosemary : we will discuss under agenda item 5

Rosemary Fei (Adler Colvin): (07:27) Sorry, should have seen that.

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (07:28) No pb

Beck: (07:30) sorry to join late all

Beck: (07:31) and that's Becky Burr

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (07:31) Welcome Becky

Eberhard Lisse [NA ccTLD Manager]: (07:32) As with the Board positions, the Jones Day approach is not unexpected. But, we should not shoot from the hip, but consider their positions properly and thoroughly. It's not as if we need to self-impose a deadline

Eberhard Lisse [NA ccTLD Manager]: (07:34) sorry, got kicked off for a moment by the Adome Connect Plugin which decided it needed 30 minutes to load :-)-O

Grace Abuhamad: (07:39) +1 Greg

Grace Abuhamad: (07:42) @Steve -- the Names CWG only had the Names in scope

Eberhard Lisse [NA ccTLD Manager]: (07:42) this is not a misunderstanding, this is a mess!

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (07:42) the separation WG has nothing to do with numbers or protocols

Greg Shatan: (07:43) The Separation CWG only deals with separation relating to Names.

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (07:43) Yes.

matthew shears: (07:43) agree with Steve - there is no OC level mechanism for separation coordination

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (07:43) The separation that is dealt with \*at all\* by the CWG proposal is \*only\* to do with Names.

Greg Shatan: (07:43) The CWG could not deal with anything other than Names; it was outside our remit.

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (07:44) including by this special separation review thing, which is part of the extremely multi-layered separation process for Names functions only.

Greg Shatan: (07:45) I would not say it is "extremely multi-layered", though I know at least one participant who would.

matthew shears: (07:45) yes, for names only, but it would be bizarre if separation of the IFO were to be determined solely by the names OC

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (07:45) I was a vague participant and it certainly is multi-layered to an extreme.

Greg Shatan: (07:45) It is only separation as to names.

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (07:45) Matthew: the three sets of functions have three separate separation paths

Greg Shatan: (07:45) Numbers and PP can stay with ICANN after a Names separation.

Greg Shatan: (07:47) I suppose the CWG could have referred to the INaFO ("IANA Naming Functions Operator") instead of the IFO, for clarity's sake. But hindsight is 20/20.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (07:47) Right, Greg.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (07:48) Many of us on this call are preparing our comments on the ICG proposal right now, so this discussion is immensely relevant

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (07:48) it's very relevant, but it isn't very relevant for the CCWG's work

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (07:48) @Matthew: no. PTI is only the IFO for names. It is ICANN for the other communities. It is just expected that ICANN would subcontract to PTI for numbers and protocol parameters

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (07:50) @Alan: why chaos?

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (07:53) the work plan depends on the work that needs to be done.

kavouss arasteh: (07:54) There should not be any CCWG in parallel with ICH meeting

Grace Abuhamad: (07:56) 17-18 Sept

kavouss arasteh: (07:56) ICG PLANNED TO HAVE MEETING ON 16 AND 23 OCTOBER

Malcolm Hutty: (07:58) @Jordan, or (for a third alternative) whether the final draft should include more implementation detail, such as more draft bylaws text (perhaps in an appendix, for ease of reading)

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (07:58) yes, bylaws text is another point

Beck: (07:58) I can't fly before Dublin, so will not be able to make LA in person

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (07:58) the package of things we want to put up for approval / review in Dublin.

Alan Greenberg: (07:59) @Martin, perhaps chaos is too strong, but the action of splitting the IFO, IE cleaving off whatever part leaves will not be easy.

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (07:59) I don't prefer to have a F2F, but for once it will be one flight away from my country.

Alan Greenberg: (07:59) And will leave opportunity for thing going awry.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (07:59) ouch

Thomas Rickert, CCWG Co-Chair: (07:59) Tijani, are you in your helicopter?

Sabine Meyer: (08:00) but it could be no flight if we do it by phone, Jordan :D

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (08:00) @Alan: not convinced it will be any more difficult to split the functions than to re-tender

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:00) it would only be necessary to have a F2F if we are locked up, like we were before Paris.

Eberhard Lisse [NA ccTLD Manager]: (08:00) It'll be a whole week loss of work for people who have to work for a living

Alan Greenberg: (08:01) A f2f would be FAR more effective. I find intensive days at bad hours far more disruptive and less useful. That being said, the proposed dates are impossible for me. I would prefer later in the month.

Eberhard Lisse [NA ccTLD Manager]: (08:01) Later and not in LA

Eberhard Lisse [NA ccTLD Manager]: (08:02) perhaps

Sabine Meyer: (08:02) exactly. those are three questions, not one. i.e. F2F?/Date?/Place?

Eberhard Lisse [NA ccTLD Manager]: (08:02) and so that half travel can occur over a weekend

Eberhard Lisse [NA ccTLD Manager]: (08:02) We can have it in Windhoek :-)-O

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (08:03) I am not a fan of planning a F2F with the board. Better that the board file specific comments and we answer with specifics. F2F could go in any direction.

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:03) I don't think we should have a f2f with the Board. I think we should have an F2F if we need one for our work.

kavouss arasteh: (08:04) Once again pls do not plan any meeting with ICG on 16 and 23 of October

Eberhard Lisse [NA ccTLD Manager]: (08:04) We can meet the Board on the Friday F2F before DUBLIN

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:04) the problem is, by the time we know whether we will need one or not, it will be too late to organise one.

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:04) (if we want one in that late September window.)

Alan Greenberg: (08:04) @Martin, two different processes. If Names decides to "separate", not clear how that will work if numbers/protocols still happy with IANA.

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:05) I worry that if we have a special F2F meeting with the Board, we would be seen to be unduly privileging their perspective in finalising the proposal. Not sure what others feel on that point.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (08:05) That is part of BC question/concern, Alan

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:05) we should know in ~36h where things stand with the Board anyhow.

Sabine Meyer: (08:06) I tend to agree. Maybe we might need to re-assess at that point.

Lyman Chapin (SSAC): (08:06) +1 Jordan re undue privilege

Eberhard Lisse [.NA ccTLD Manager]: (08:06) The audio is breaking up

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair, ALAC): (08:06) audio fine here Eberhard

Eberhard Lisse [.NA ccTLD Manager]: (08:06) probably on my side :-)-O

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (08:06) We'll poll availability any way, will be useful to assess our work plan

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (08:08) Adobe Connect Mtg is far less disruptive and costly than F2F mtgs.

kavouss arasteh: (08:10) Mathieu

kavouss arasteh: (08:10) What do you mean by " Political comm."/

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:11) I suspect he means communications with governmental and political audiences, Kavouss

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (08:11) +1 Jordann

kavouss arasteh: (08:11) Through or for media

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:11) also, it is Thomas speaking not Mathieu

kavouss arasteh: (08:11) For congress

kavouss arasteh: (08:11) for what and why we need that?

Eberhard Lisse [.NA ccTLD Manager]: (08:12) What is the accountability concern here, to communicate with politicians differently?

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (08:13) Reaching out to "political" stakeholders enables to gather appropriate feedback upfront

kavouss arasteh: (08:13) I am not clear about this topic y

kavouss arasteh: (08:13) Pls describe the need to even discuss that?

Julia Wolman, GAC Denmark: (08:13) + 1 Thomas

Beck: (08:13) we could, for example, have a webinar focused on the NTIA requirements

Beck: (08:13) and how we meet them

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (08:13) that sounds like a good suggestion, Becky.

James Gannon: (08:14) Yes agreed, we can tailor a webinar

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:14) and maybe a tailored slide pack

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:14) it's about using the terms and structuring information in ways that various target groups are used to, I'd say

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:14) seems sensible and... accountable

kavouss arasteh: (08:14) Do you intend to have a special webinar for NTIA?

Phil Buckingham: (08:14) Becky +1

Beck: (08:15) Kavouss - not NTIA as the audience, but the NTIA requirements and how we meet them as the topic

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:16) the more draft bylaws work we have done, the better

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (08:17) We are not clear on when that process starts, what the time frame is etc

Beck: (08:18) i agree with Holly - a bit confused

Greg Shatan: (08:18) We also need to coordinate the Bylaws drafting process with the CWG.

Rosemary Fei (Adler Colvin): (08:19) The only authorization I have seen for work by legal counsel concerns incorporating AoC into bylaws.

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (08:19) Correct Rosemary, it was starting point

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:19) yes, that was all I thought had been agreed formally so far.

Malcolm Huty: (08:20) Are we permitted to take part in the Bylaws drafting process to which Holly just alluded? How/what is the process?

Samantha Eisner: (08:20) I'm not on audio, but we have the request and it is in process from our side

Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair: (08:21) @Sam: an estimated timeline ?

Leon Sanchez (Co-Chair, ALAC): (08:21) how long will it take the process to begin Sam?

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (08:21) the process of bylaw drafting will be most efficient and cost effective if the lawyers draft and then CCWG/CWG reviews and comments. ACommunity involvement in drafting will take a long time.

Samantha Eisner: (08:21) We'll have more clarity on that towards the end of the week

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:22) I support legal-legal as the first start.

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:22) we don't need transparency of it, because we will get the text to do with what we will.

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (08:22) @Holly: drafting by committee - never a pretty sight!

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:22) (in my current opinion)

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (08:23) agreed @Martin and @Jordan

Greg Shatan: (08:23) Sounds like a plan.

James Gannon: (08:23) If thats the case thats fine but as I said we need to set that out much more clearly.

kavouss arasteh: (08:24) What is the relation with meeting NTIA criteria and the " Political communications "

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:24) I thought that this was kicking off ages ago

Malcolm Hutty: (08:24) I just lost audio - anybody else?

James Gannon: (08:24) Fine for me Malcom

kavouss arasteh: (08:24) You were not right

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (08:24) So did we Jordan. We stand ready to draft whenever given the go-ahead

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:26) If ICANN legal can't get agreement to participate, we'll need to change the proces and have our Counsel draft things consistent with CCWG requirements. ICANN could then comment.

Rosemary Fei (Adler Colvin): (08:26) Suggest notes reflect the limited initial authorization on bylaws work to counsel

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:26) It can't be a hold up.

James Gannon: (08:26) +1 Jordan

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:26) no AOB from me

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (08:26) I think we should have our own counsel make the initial drafts anyway.

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (08:26) bye all

James Gannon: (08:26) Agreed Robin, thats been my cotention from the start

Cheryl LangdonOrr: (08:26) good call indeed thanks everyone

matthew shears: (08:26) + 1 Robin as well

kavouss arasteh: (08:27) Co Chair

Cheryl LangdonOrr: (08:27) bye

Holly J. Gregory (Sidley): (08:27) Robin, we agree that that may be most efficient but we are happy to participate in any way that CCWG and ICANN agree make sense

Pär Brumark (GAC Niue): (08:27) Thx All! Bye!

kavouss arasteh: (08:27) Pls kindly clarify what do you mean by Political Communiocationbs :

matthew shears: (08:27) thanks all

Allan MacGillivray: (08:27) Bye all.

Michael Clark (Sidley): (08:27) Thanks and bye

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member): (08:27) byeeee

James Gannon: (08:27) thanks all

Theresa Swinehart: (08:27) Thank you all

Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]: (08:27) Thanks all, bye!



Martin Boyle, Nominet: (08:27) thanks & bye