WP1 Meeting #25 (5 October @ 09:00 UTC)

Attendees:

Sub-group Members: Alan Greenberg, Asha Hemrajani, Avri Doria, Cherine Chalaby, Chris Disspain, Finn Petersen, Fiona Asonga, Gary Hunt, Greg Shatan, Izumi Okutani, Jordan Carter, Jorge Cancio, Julia Wolman, Kavouss Arasteh, Konstantinos Komaitis, Malcolm Hutty, Mark Carvell, Mary Uduma, Matthew Shears, Par Brumark, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Steve DelBianco, Tijani, Ben Jemaa

Staff: Bernie Turcotte, Brenda Brewer, Grace Abuhamad, Laena Rahim

Apologies:

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

Transcript

- [Transcript WP1 Meeting #23_5 October.doc](#)
- [Transcript WP1 Meeting #23_5 October.pdf](#)

Recording

- The Adobe Connect recording is available here: https://icann.adobeconnect.com/p4wxpm9pjv6/
- The audio recording is available here: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-wp1-05oct15-en.mp3

Agenda

1. Review of Agenda

2. Review of conclusions from previous meeting

3. AoC into the Bylaws - Steve DelBianco reporting

4. Board Removal - Greg Shatan reporting

5. Review of other comment areas and agendas for next meetings

   Current draft follows:

   - WP1 — Tues 6 Oct - 19h-21h UTC
   - Fundamental Bylaws and Regular Bylaws (Keith)

   Individual Director Removal (Mike and Robin)

   WP1 — Thur 8 Oct - 05h-07h UTC

   - Community Forum (Matthew)
   - CMSM (Avri and Robin)

6. Any Other Business

Notes

1. Review of Agenda

Any additional items? No

2. Review conclusions from previous meeting

Steve chaired the last meeting. Jonathan will circulate an updated document in a few days. The last call discussed agenda and timeline for group work. On the Budget, group focused on areas needing clarfication. Goal is to have these updated documents done by Oct. 12.

3. AoC into the Bylaws (Steve)

(review of document)

Actions for next iteration of CCWG Proposal:

- Add AoC commitment 7 to the Core Values
- Clarify selection/composition of Review Teams to indicate that community can appoint members
- Clarify that AoC reviews can move forward regardless of the status of the AOC or the CCWG's proposed changes to those Reviews
- Clarify in the text that the Board is required to take action upon recommendations
- Decision not to expand on current statement p.75: " The draft report of the Review will be published for public comment. The Review Team will consider such public comment and amend the Review as it deems appropriate before issuing its final report and forwarding the recommendations to the Board." However, the CCWG report will clarify on what is intended in this statement (public comment review tool)

- Retain that ATRT may recommend changes to any AoC reviews, and clarify that RTs have the ability to recommend changes to their own review (including ending the review)
- No conclusion on review team composition -- do we maintain 21 person composition or expand?
- No conclusion on WHOIS review.
- Recommend that initial ATRT review not be more than 5 years after the termination of the AoC.
- Should Article 18 should be a Fundamental Bylaw? There was a split in the comments.

Action: Staff to provide list of reviews that have occurred with composition of the reviews teams (by community group).

Action: On WHOIS review text, Greg to review text (CCWG/Board) before nxet call

Action: All to send Steve comments within the next 24h so that these can be incorporated for next discussion (in 36h).

4. Board Removal (Greg)

(review of document)

Actions for next iteration of CCWG Proposal:

- Clarify that there will be standards for selection of interim board. Use standards suggested in ICANN Board comment and/or other standards?
- Use of pre-service letters needed or not?
- Threshold for multiple removals is an issue related to individual Board Directors
- Clarify the consequences for failure to meet community process requirement
- George Sadowsky suggests keeping process on Board removal, but tightening standards. Suggests finding a solution that it model independent for Board removal.
- Alan Greenberg reminded that there needs to be clarification "eliminate potential for failure to agree on Interim Directors": SO/AC could not remove a Board member without suggesting an Interim Director. The two processes are linked and must be linked in order to proceed.
- There is support for rationale to be provided along with removal of Board

Action: Greg to correct #2 in Areas of Concern/Divergence to say "Time Period for Selection of Replacement Board"

Action: question for the CCWG counsel: is there any question that the pre-service letters are enforceable, if a Board member refused to resign?

Action: all to review the section "Options for Consideration by full CCWG" p.6 and make suggestions.

5. Review of other comment areas and agendas for next meetings &AOB

- WP1 — Tues 6 Oct - 19h-21h UT Fundamental Bylaws and Regular Bylaws (Keith) Individual Director Removal (Mike and Robin) + 2nd reading of AoC (Steve) and Board removal (Greg)
- WP1 — Thur 8 Oct - 05h-07h UTC Community Forum (Matthew) and CMSM (Avri and Robin) and Budget, Strat/Op Plans (Jonathan)
- Maybe need another call around 18h00 on Friday 9 October to get through everything.
- Thank you to all for good work.

Action Items

Actions for next iteration of CCWG Proposal:

- Add AoC commitment 7 to the Core Values
- Clarify selection/composition of Review Teams to indicate that community can appoint members
- Clarify that AoC reviews can move forward regardless of the status of the AOC or the CCWG's proposed changes to those Reviews
- Clarify in the text that the Board is required to take action upon recommendations
- Decision not to expand on current statement p.75: " The draft report of the Review will be published for public comment. The Review Team will consider such public comment and amend the Review as it deems appropriate before issuing its final report and forwarding the recommendations to the Board." However, the CCWG report will clarify on what is intended in this statement (public comment review tool)
- Retain that ATRT may recommend changes to any AoC reviews, and clarify that RTs have the ability to recommend changes to their own review (including ending the review)
- No conclusion on review team composition -- do we maintain 21 person composition or expand?
- No conclusion on WHOIS review.
- Recommend that initial ATRT review not be more than 5 years after the termination of the AoC.
- Should Article 18 should be a Fundamental Bylaw? There was a split in the comments.

Action: Staff to provide list of reviews that have occurred with composition of the reviews teams (by community group).

Action: On WHOIS review text, Greg to review text (CCWG/Board) before nxet call

Action: All to send Steve comments within the next 24h so that these can be incorporated for next discussion (in 36h).

Action: Greg to correct #2 in Areas of Concern/Divergence to say "Time Period for Selection of Replacement Board"

Action: question for the CCWG counsel: is there any question that the pre-service letters are enforceable, if a Board member refused to resign?

Action: all to review the section "Options for Consideration by full CCWG" p.6 and make suggestions.

Documents Presented

- AoC - analysis of PC2_.pdf

- [Power - Recall Entire Board - analysis of PC2_.pdf](#)

Chat Transcript

Kavouss Arasteh: (10/5/2015 03:38) Hi Brenda ,out firthful stasff to CCWG

Kavouss Arasteh: (03:38) SORRY OUR AND NOT OUT

Brenda Brewer: (03:39) Good Day Kavouss!

Brenda Brewer: (03:43) Good day all and welcome to WP1 Meeting #25 on 5 October @ 109:00 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

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:00) hi everyone

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:00) we'll kick off the call in about 1 minute

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:00) the agenda is now copied into the notes pad to the right of your screen

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (04:02) That

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (04:03) That's right, Jordan.   Jonathan needs to circulate an updated doc on budget. He had his wedding this weekend so don't expect anything from him for a few days

Konstantinos Komaitis: (04:04) hello all

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (04:04) hi all

Matthew Shears: (04:04) hello

Pär Brumark (GAC Niue): (04:04) Hi all!

Gary Hunt - UK Government: (04:06) Good morning from London!

Greg Shatan: (04:07) Good pre-morning from New York....

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:07) it's a civil 10pm on a warm spring evening in Wellington (Wellington warm is ~10c)

Rinalia Abdul Rahim 2: (04:08) That is not warm, Jordan.

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:08) sTEVE,

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:08) gm,

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:09) All, I am going to propose that we have the second "substantive" discussion on the Budget when we have the revised document later in the week

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:09) this is simply an update from Steve from the last call.

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:09) We did not agree on the notion of voting but having concluded perhaps in other forms such as consenszus

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:10) The consensus approach is in line with the wishes of some advisory group that may not intend to votew

Malcolm Hutty: (04:11) Kavouss, I think that some ACs may not wish to participate in the decision, but only to advise on it: this is not quite the same as not voting

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:11) Malcolm

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:12) Why we push for Voting rather than acheiving cionsensus in whatever, way it is done to day.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:12) Tijani - I think this is a good idea. May I suggest you write a short note about this on the WP1 list, so that (among others) Jonathan and Cherine see it?

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:13) The issue is not that some AC s do not wish to vote .It that we do not change the ststus of ACs they remain advisory and they are encourage to advice

Malcolm Hutty: (04:14) Kavouss, I haven't heard anyone wants to push for voting instead of consensus, only to ensure that there is a vote available to resolve a deadlock in the case of lack of unanimity

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (04:14) Agree, Malcolm

Malcolm Hutty: (04:14) @Kavouss, (re: change of status), exactly, well put.

Mary Uduma: (04:14) Audio breaking, I did not hear Tjani at all

Asha Hemrajani: (04:14) +1 Tijani on the suggestion to formalize the current community input process into budget.

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:15) Many Gac Mmember wish to have maintzained their right to participate at all dedcision making but within an advisory capacity

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:16) Many GAC Mmember wish to have maintzained their right to participate at all dedcision making but within an advisory capacity

Alan Greenberg: (04:17) Detailed budget process improvement IS WS2, but we need to talk about it a bit more in WS1 to make it clear that it is the real place where the changes need to happen or become permanent.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:17) Alan, agree.

FIONA ASONGA (ASO): (04:18) +1 ALAN

Matthew Shears: (04:18) + 1 Alan

Rinalia Abdul Rahim 2: (04:18) The consensus is strong on AOC inclusion, which is great.

Matthew Shears: (04:19) we need both - better engagement process and budget "veto"

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:19) sTEVE

Tijani BEN JEMAA: (04:19) nothing is on Adobe connect

Avri Doria: (04:20) i see it.

Tijani BEN JEMAA: (04:20) is it only my screen?

Matthew Shears: (04:20) I see it also

Grace Abuhamad: (04:20) @Tijani.--- restart?

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:20) Tijani, it is the same paper that Steve emailed around on the list a few hours ago

Tijani BEN JEMAA: (04:20) ok

Tijani BEN JEMAA: (04:20) thx

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:21) tHE TITLE SHOULD READ, bRINGING aOc into Standard Bylaws not to leave the impression that they are brough into Fundamental Bylaws, I merely mean the seat of ICANN:

Matthew Shears: (04:22) I think 7 is important and we should support inclusion

Greg Shatan: (04:22) Most of the AoC is being brought into Fundamental Bylaws. Bringing the AoC into the Standard Bylaws would be a very short document.

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:22) pLS CALIRY AND CONFIRM THAT THE SEAT OF icann WILL ONLY BE INCLUDED IN THE sTANDARD bYLAWS

Greg Shatan: (04:22) I support inclusion of 7 as well.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:22) Kavouss, nobody has proposed changing that so far

Malcolm Hutty: (04:23) That's a WP2 issue; I see no reason to objection, but I suggest referring to WP2

Avri Doria: (04:23) ok, i'll stop ticking

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:23) BUT WE SHOULD INDICATE sTANDARD bYLAWS

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:23) Jordan,

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:24) Pls make sure that it is in Standrad BYLAWS BY DEFUINITION

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:24) Kavouss: that's what our proposal says, and I think it's dealtwih further in this paper later.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:24) If it was going to be moved, that would be a discussion face to face in Dublin at the end of next week

Rinalia Abdul Rahim 2: (04:25) An area for clarification could be on whether the people SO/AC suggests must be formal members or SO/AC or if they can source externally as well.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim 2: (04:25) members of SO/AC

Malcolm Hutty: (04:27) @Steve: makes sense to me, leave it as "in process"

Matthew Shears: (04:27) agree with "in process"

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:29) (I haven't had my last coffee yet)

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:29) 5 yrs, Alan

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:30) This discussion might be simpler once we have a clearer idea about when the CCWG proposal will be finalised, and if we have some kind of cut0over date.

Avri Doria: (04:31) i hate the example that includes postponing ATRT3

Malcolm Hutty: (04:32) +1 Steve

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:35) tHIS IS A TRANSITIONAL ASPECT AND COULD CLEARLY DESCRIBED HOW THOSE IN PROGRESS SHOULD BEDEALTH WITH

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:36) I think we need to move on, team

Avri Doria: (04:36) the rules for the current AOC are goverement by NTIA and the ICANN Board i expect.

Avri Doria: (04:36) ...governed by ...

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:37) sTVE,

Avri Doria: (04:37) so would think that any decsion to postpone have to be done by the agreement of both ICANN Board and NTIA

Avri Doria: (04:37) but that aint really our problem

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:37) What is the rational for fixing six months

Avri Doria: (04:37) we do not yet have a voice in such things.

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:38) May be we shorten that six months

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:38) the intent was clear right

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:38) that things don't stay on the table forever and ever

Matthew Shears: (04:39) agre Jordan - it was to try and speed up staff/board engagement and responsicveness

Matthew Shears: (04:39) "begin implementaiton" was key

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (04:40) Board has to respond to AoC review recommendations - and provide updates and timelines for implementation. This has worked well I believe.

Kavouss Arasteh: (04:40) May we consider to shorten the peiod of six months

Rinalia Abdul Rahim 2: (04:40) Actually, Board has to instruct Staff to produce a plan with timeline for implementation.

Julia Wolman GAC Denmark: (04:41) Exactly the "begin implementation part" is important

Greg Shatan: (04:41) "consider approval" is also ambiguous.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:41) please team, let's not turn this into a drafting committee?

Rinalia Abdul Rahim 2: (04:41) Correct, Steve.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:41) Chris is on mute

Avri Doria: (04:42) that is the role of the next ATRT

Greg Shatan: (04:43) This is not a particularly important point as long as we are clear on the substance.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:43) I think our text did add a requirement to have review teams assign priority to their recommendations

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:43) clear recommendations including what completion means is important

Chris Disspain: (04:44) happy to be invalid in context...Alan...:-)

Avri Doria: (04:44) but it is a good argument to use when people argue that it hasn't been implemented yet, you can see but that is why we recommended that you be clearer in the next atrt report.

Chris Disspain: (04:45) ;-)

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:45) It's like saying "I agree with you in principle, but...."

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:46) a ref to our transparency recs seems reasonable for 5. On 6, we've done it, so all good.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:47) it should be at least a PC analysis?

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:47) do the ATRTs do that?

Rinalia Abdul Rahim 2: (04:47) I think this is a good addition.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim 2: (04:49) Yes.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:49) this will stand and get read by the whole CCWG in any case

Rinalia Abdul Rahim 2: (04:49) This is one way of showing we are accountable for consideraton of review input

Rinalia Abdul Rahim 2: (04:49) Sorry, my spelling is really bad today.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (04:50) The draft report of the Review will be published for public comment. The Review Team will consider such public comment and amend the Review as it deems appropriate before issuing its final report and forwarding the recommendations to the Board.

Avri Doria: (04:51) the standard of review that we following her has developed in the PDP in the last years. it seems naturla that these standards move to the reviews

Avri Doria: (04:52) the record ixists of the industrial effort in showing our work, whatever ends up in the final doc.

Avri Doria: (04:53) final docs have to find the balance between reporting all and being readable

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:53) the public comments also will be on the public record

Rinalia Abdul Rahim 2: (04:53) RAR: Consider having individual Review Teams make recommendations for ICANN to amend/sunset relevant reviews.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim 2: (04:54) The authority to decide may belong elsewhere.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (04:55) para 549: The Review Team may recommend termination or amendment of other periodic Reviews required by this section, and may recommend additional periodic Reviews.

Avri Doria: (04:55) i see no reason the review itself can't also recommend it.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:56) I don't have a strong feeling about it, tbh

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:57) the argument for having the individual reviews being able to make a reocmmendation is that they should know most about the subject

Rinalia Abdul Rahim 2: (04:57) Recommendations can come from any RT. Who decides is the key clarification.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:57) the ATRT can take a helicopter view of all the reviews and their contribution to Accountability and Transparency, which is probably useful.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim 2: (04:57) Yes

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (04:58) agree with Avri,

Rinalia Abdul Rahim 2: (05:00) I don't see a problem with that.

Avri Doria: (05:00) i n that case it would go in the chapeau

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:00) it could go in the chapeau indeed

Avri Doria: (05:02) yes, anytime we say something goes in each of them, that should mean it goes into the chapeau

Rinalia Abdul Rahim 2: (05:03) Review Team size does need to be manageable – otherwise effectiveness within specified time could be compromised. There is also the impact on budget to consider. Questions to consider: Do all reviews require a full and balanced representation of GNSO constituent parts or could there be exceptions?

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:07) we can just identify this as an issue to take up with CCWG

Avri Doria: (05:09) and we know that out of 21, it is never the case that they all do enough work.

Greg Shatan: (05:09) I would support Steve's point.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:10) (we have to move on with this call because we have to get through both topics.)

Greg Shatan: (05:10) Although I would be concerned about getting multiple members of the same subgroup.

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:10) Stev

Greg Shatan: (05:10) and "stacking" the ATRT.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:11) good staff action there

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:11) No change

Alan Greenberg: (05:11) It is also unclear from our text if the Board member is counted in the 21,

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:11) on 3, happy personally with Board text while bemused this has to be WS1, and our own timing formulation.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:12) Alan: how is "In addition, the Board may designate one director as amember of the Review Team" ambiguous??

Avri Doria: (05:12) Greg, isn't that the task of the ACSO and the chairs that do the picking of the final crew that need to make sure that does not happen?

Matthew Shears: (05:13) what was the board's rationale for objecting to waiting in poiint 4?

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (05:14) Steve, I'd like to take No. v back to the Board to check if there is movement.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (05:14) No 4

Avri Doria: (05:14) CI find it hard to understand how we can do another round before we have have completed the review. on the other hand we are starting that CCT now and wont be ready for another round for at least a year, so it seems a moot point.

Greg Shatan: (05:14) @Avri, yes it is (or at least, I hope it should be), but I'm not sure where that is documented. I'm just responding (positively) to the suggestion that an SO/AC could go above 3 members if another SO/AC leaves seats empty.

Julia Wolman GAC Denmark: (05:14) Thanks for that explanation Steve

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:16) We need to retain the members of each SO and AC to 3 only

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:16) I don't support any change to either of those - but relaxed for either of them to go to CCWG

Matthew Shears: (05:18) great job steve and those who contributed

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:18) Thank you Steve, well done

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:21) If it is at all possible, I would urge those providing docs for the next call to circulate them ASAP (with no criticism of the fact that might not be possible!), so that the call can focus on discussion more than presentation

Matthew Shears: (05:24) putting in place reasons for director removal and interim board selection could go into WS2?

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:24) agree not in by laws

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:25) Jordan

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:26) What should not be inBylaws pls?

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:26) Kavouss: implementation details, generally speaking...

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:26) Agreed

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (05:28) Is there a template for a pre-service letter?

Matthew Shears: (05:28) yes would be good to see - would include standards for discmissal, etc.?

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:28) Implementation detail - we've not written one, but we have advice that they can be workable if I recall

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (05:30) for the lawyers, is there any question that the pre-service letters are enforceable, if a board member refused to resign?

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:30) I don't think our lawyers are on here

Alan Greenberg: (05:30) Presumably removal BY DECISION OF AC/SO.Community body.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:30) Staff, can you note that as a question for lawyers for CCWG to consider for certification?

Grace Abuhamad: (05:30) ok

Alan Greenberg: (05:31) I said nothing about "removal for cause"

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:31) We have one more bite at this cherry.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:31) (in terms of meetings to discuss this.)

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:31) Malcolm, could you write a question of this sort to the WP1 list?

Grace Abuhamad: (05:33) Yes, Greg. pre-service letters was in the individual Board removal section. The reason for that is that the Board comments focused more on individual removal with the understanding that removing 1 or 15 or more board members would meet full board removal

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:33) [I think we have to look at the board comments in the context of their whole submission.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (05:34) CSG believes Board removal mechanism should not be constrained by a list of possible offenses

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (05:34) Is the question of community approval for removing individual members now agreed (aapologies if I missed relevant e-mail).

Grace Abuhamad: (05:34) Ideally comments on Board removal (individual or full) could be discussed together

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:34) we have half an hour everyone

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:35) "with justification" is more where we got to in LA, I thought

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (05:35) +1 George. We can provide justification

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (05:36) @Mark -- there is another WP1 group handling indiv board member removal. This discussion is just about full board removal

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:36) hi team, may I urge maximum brevity?

Malcolm Hutty: (05:36) There's a distinction between "stating your reasons" and "satisfying the defined criteria".

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:37) we have to get comments on eight areas of divergence, and some proposals for CCWG discussion, in 24 mins

Alan Greenberg: (05:38) 22 minutes now...

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (05:38) #3 is an issue on Indiv Board member removal. Not for this discussion, I think

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:39) #3, Steve?

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:39) I WAS DISCONNECTED

Brenda Brewer: (05:39) We are calling you back Kavouss.

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:40) TKS

Brenda Brewer: (05:40) you are connected again Kavouss

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:40) gREG

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:40) i was disconnected

Greg Shatan: (05:40) I see you.

Alan Greenberg: (05:41) Threshold of multiple removals will be discussed in removal of single directors

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (05:41) +1 Alan

George Sadowsky: (05:42) Greg: arewe goig to get to areas of convergence/divergence? Ihave a couple of macro comments to make

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:43) suggest briefly running through these, Greg, and then general comments

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:44) fifteen minutes left

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:44) I apologise in advance if we draw the call to a close without finishing the agenda, but we can do the last item on the list

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:45) The reason this is worded very complexly in the proposal is very simple

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:45) it is that our lawyers "lawyered" it.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:48) [that is why it is far more detailed, and feels like a more engineered process, tahn for the other powers; I didn't have time to de-lawyer the text properly.]

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:48) I;d note on point 8 that the proposal DID have a higher threshold for all of board removal

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (05:48) re-tight deadlines 15 days for the GAC to respond to a valid petition is impracticable becausee reps have to consult in capitals: not a decison to be rushed.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:49) Mark: that presumes that this would come out of the blue, doesn't it?

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:49) Surely if there was any chance of this being exercised it would have been being debated for months

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:49) Alan, you are right

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:51) [[[[ten mins left]]]]

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:52) Steve+1

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:52) Greg

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:53) Did I understood from your explanation that before WS2 we will not be able to proceed with the recall of the entire Board.pls confirm

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (05:53) It won't be out of the blue but nonetheless after petition, I ennvisage need for formal national level consultation - sounds bureaucratic but this kind of step I see requiring maximum care.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (05:54) +1 to justification.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:54) Mark: that is an ongoing discussion we have to have. If we have a 90 day window for each stage of the powers, things are clearly getting silly. Even though that would suit governments just fine, it wouldn't suit accountability just fine.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:54) (it would add up to 270 days.)

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (05:54) explanation

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:54) Mark, what do you mean by NATIONAL cONSULTATION

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:54) Kavouss: no, not no proceeding.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:54) List discussion good idea, Greg.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (05:55) Good work, Greg

Mark Carvell GAC - UK Govt: (05:55) @ Kavouss: in UK's case, across our adminsttraitosn and with national stakeholders in ICANN.

Matthew Shears: (05:55) yes thanks Greg

Greg Shatan: (05:56) Good idea, Jordan. These are interrelated powers.

Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]: (05:56) Aye to that, Jordan

Greg Shatan: (05:57) I support the suggestion of a WP1 meeting at the Guinness Brewery.

Matthew Shears: (05:57) + 1

Avri Doria: (05:57) i will miss the next meeting

Matthew Shears: (05:58) i will also apologies

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:59) jORDAN

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:59) cERTAINLY WE NEED THAT ADDITIONAL WINDOW

Bernard Turcotte Staff Support: (05:59) bye all

Kavouss Arasteh: (05:59) We have other commitment

jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland): (05:59) thanks and bye!

Pär Brumark (GAC Niue): (05:59) Thx all, bye!

Matthew Shears: (05:59) thanks all

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: (05:59) Thank you.

Jordan Carter (.nz, rapporteur): (05:59) bye everyone

Julia Wolman GAC Denmark: (05:59) bye

Mary Uduma: (05:59) Bye All