

WP4 Meeting #9 (2 November @ 13:00 UTC)

Attendees:

Sub-group Members: Aarti Bhavana, Avri Doria, Brett Schaefer, David McAuley, Gary Hunt, Greg Shatan, Kavouss Arasteh, Leon Sanchez, Markus Kummer, Martin Boyle, Matthew Shears, Nick Shorey, Niels ten Oever, Ram Mohan, Ron da Silva, Sabine Meyer, Samantha Eisner, Seun Ojedeji, Tatiana Tropina (19)

Staff: Alice Jansen, Bernie Turcotte, Brenda Brewer, Theresa Swinehart

Apologies:

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

Transcript

- [Transcript WP4_2 November.doc](#)
- [Transcript WP4_2 November.pdf](#)

Recordings

- The Adobe Connect recording is available here: <https://icann.adobeconnect.com/p6qv98pfp36/>
- The audio recording is available here: <http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-wp4-02nov15-en.mp3>

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.

See <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1bm0Nnlq35j3-FwmBwKEjSOJia-c10wv0mhHytngTDiM/edit>

On public comments paragraph. Should we be recommending changes to our approach?

Feedback:

- Build on WP4 fruitful discussions. Add this text to the document to show that we are transparent and document our conclusions as well as thinking.

Conclusion:

- Remove two highlighted paragraphs (consider level of support & Need for More Detail) and replace with statement that we have addressed public comment concerns.

- Remove paragraph on drafting alternative formulations

We need to consider what our actual Bylaw suggestion would look like.

"Within its mission and in its operations, ICANN will respect internationally recognized human rights" was winner but minority of comments approved it. More comments rejected this version of Bylaw.

Feedback:

- Number of people who opposed the text was not that large but some called for more details. In Dublin - James Bladel asked for refinement. His concerns were addressed in text of analysis. Analysis added to transitional Bylaw should address concerns.

- Only one party raised these concerns which refer to "operations". This is largely addressed through rationale and explanatory note as well as transitional Bylaw.

How do we refine "Within its mission and in its operations, ICANN will respect internationally recognized human rights"? (per Dublin action item)

Feedback:

- Transitional Bylaw should give comfort that there won't be unintended consequences.

- In Dublin there was no closure on references to add. Transitional Bylaw would put text on hold until document on human rights is enforced. Refinement could be seen as transitional Bylaw.

- Board concern is that it should not extend ICANN's mission and responsibilities i.e. not involve content. We need language that limits the mission and operations. There is need to build firewall around it. Board is committed to including language but some concerns remain. Concerns that there may not be enough time to address issues. We need careful analysis of implications. Any provision in Bylaw should include a reference to international human rights (UDHR) while clarifying that mission limited to protocol parameters etc.

- Agree that need for firewall. It is placed in two places: 1) Bylaw text within its mission and operations; 2) Transitional Bylaw: in Work Stream 2 or any charter CCWG - commitment to work on development. First bylaw will not become active until second step is done. It will be a firm commitment that this will happen and will give us time to study and elaborate on framework.

--

> We should come back to group with refinement with note that we refine mission to narrow technical. Clarification of meaning would be made through work of WS2.

- Respect for human rights, not protection. It's a difference in level of commitment/enforcement.
- Suggestion to have a hard stop for Bylaw to become effective with or without framework of interpretation.
- Caution against deadline. Human Rights is a complex. In addition we should not minimize Work Stream 2.
- We should think of enforcement of process. Explanatory note or transitional bylaw should include Bylaw language assessed as part of WS1.
- Consider solution where come back to group with addition to Bylaw text: "this is simply a statement of respect and not protection - i.e. no enforcement". This would be instead of transitional Bylaw.
- Concerns that above suggestion may not survive public comment period. We need to assure community.
- Consider keeping transitional Bylaw that would ensure WS2 work.
- Concern that it would be opening to freedom of interpretation. Continuing need for transitional Bylaw and framework of interpretation.
- We need transitional Bylaw - it should be explicitly stated group will be established for implementation.
- Commitment would be given shape in WS2. If we commit to human rights we need to understand what that means.
- Develop a framework of interpretation for the Bylaw. It would need to take place in PDP /non PDP working groups. Idea was to create a relatively succinct guide or framework for what is meant as fundamental. Is it about internal operations or policy or does it dictate what third parties do?

WRAP-UP/ CONCLUSION -

Call for objections on David's suggested text: 1 objection (contingent about what we do with transitional Bylaw)

Do we support having transitional Bylaw that supports that WS2 work will be carried out?

It would not delay enactment of Bylaw on human rights.

--> Concerns that it will be interpreted as see fit.

- On transitional Bylaw - agreement with part 1

[ACTION ITEM - Greg Shatan to add sentence that would address interpretation sentence.](#)

[ACTION ITEM - Niels and Greg to finalize and freeze document by 21:00 UTC so that it may be sent out to the CCWG.](#)

[ACTION ITEM - David to provide Niels, Tatiana and Greg with suggested text.](#)

David McAuley's proposal is supported subject to refinements Greg and Niels will make.

Action Item

[ACTION ITEM - Greg Shatan to add sentence that would address interpretation sentence.](#)

[ACTION ITEM - Niels and Greg to finalize and freeze document by 21:00 UTC so that it may be sent out to the CCWG.](#)

[ACTION ITEM - David to provide Niels, Tatiana and Greg with suggested text.](#)

Documents Presented

- [HumanRights_PC2_PD_v2Clean_.pdf](#)
- <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1bm0Nnlq35j3-EwmBwKEjSOJia-c10wv0mhHytngTDiM/edit>

Chat Transcript

Brenda Brewer: (11/2/2015 06:45) Welcome to the WP4 Meeting #9 on 2 November 2015 @ 13:00 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>

Matthew Shears: (06:59) heelo

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (06:59) swimming? pouring drinks?

Gary Hunt - UK Government: (06:59) Good afternoon from london!

Niels ten Oever: (06:59) Hi all!

Niels ten Oever: (07:00) Is someone calling from an underwater call centre?

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (07:00) Hi all: I'll only be on Adobe for this call

Brett Schaefer: (07:00) Is this the first time everyone is seeing the latest draft?

Tatiana Tropina: (07:00) Hi all!

Leon Sanchez: (07:00) hello everyone

Aarti Bhavana: (07:00) Hi all!

Niels ten Oever: (07:00) The link has been shared before last call

Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany): (07:00) Hi everyone!

Leon Sanchez: (07:00) I am waiting for my dial out but we'll begin shortly

Niels ten Oever: (07:00) <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1bm0Nnlq35j3-EwmBwKEjSOJia-c10wv0mhHytngTDiM/edit#>

Brett Schaefer: (07:01) Oh, so this is the previous draft then.

Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany): (07:01) Alas I'm not the person at the pool bar..

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (07:01) @Sabine +1:-D

Niels ten Oever: (07:01) yes

Matthew Shears: (07:01) what is the doc on the screen?

David McAuley: (07:01) Hello Leon, hello all

Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany): (07:01) Martin, why does that make you so happy? ;)

Tatiana Tropina: (07:02) I also wonder where the doc on the screen comes from

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (07:03) @Sabine: it brightened me up that I was not the only one not at the pool party

Niels ten Oever: (07:03) And me

Tatiana Tropina: (07:03) Niels too

Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany): (07:03) that problem will increase in severity next week, I suppose.

Greg Shatan: (07:04) hello, all

Tatiana Tropina: (07:04) where the UDHR come from?

Niels ten Oever: (07:04) I'm surprised

Tatiana Tropina: (07:05) David, we took your proposal for the amendment of the doc

Tatiana Tropina: (07:05) Google doc

Matthew Shears: (07:06) I thought we were working on the google doc as well

David McAuley: (07:06) Thank you Tatiana, I have to admit with some newness to google docs and wondered if I even got it in there

Brett Schaefer: (07:07) Opposed to a specific reference to any HR treaty or principles, like the UDHR or Ruggie.

Brett Schaefer: (07:08) This is substantially different from where we were on Friday.

Matthew Shears: (07:08) I think that the agreement was that we3 would not call out specific rights or documents

Brett Schaefer: (07:08) Right Matthew.

David McAuley: (07:08) we seem to have lost Niels

David McAuley: (07:08) yes, back

Tatiana Tropina: (07:08) I think we agreed to work on the google doc till 3rd of November

Greg Shatan: (07:09) <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1bm0Nnlq35j3-EwmBwKEjSOJia-c10wv0mhHytngTDiM/edit>

Tatiana Tropina: (07:09) and then discuss it on the call

Tatiana Tropina: (07:09) the new doc shared on the screen is an old version - the google doc was amended significantly

Niels ten Oever: (07:10) Yes, it's the old PDF

Alice Jansen: (07:11) <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1bm0Nnlq35j3-EwmBwKEjSOJia-c10wv0mhHytngTDiM/edit>

Matthew Shears: (07:11) the text has been considerably revised over the weekend

Niels ten Oever: (07:12) No, it was merged

Aarti Bhavana: (07:12) Is the PDF that Greg just sent the latest version?

Niels ten Oever: (07:12) we agreed on a methodology for that

Niels ten Oever: (07:12) I proposed an index in last call

Tatiana Tropina: (07:13) Hm, I went through the doc Greg sent just now and it doesn't contain the revisions....

Aarti Bhavana: (07:13) Okay, thanks. Will rely on the google doc then

Brett Schaefer: (07:14) I have been confused as to what we are doing here. The entire premise of this exercise seems to be to put in a "draft" by law along with a specific instruction to pay it no mind because we don't fully understand what the implications of that bylaw might be. That fundamentally casts doubt on the inclusion of ANY HR bylaw at this time. Based on our recent discussion, I am convinced that we should punt to WS2.

Matthew Shears: (07:18) well, my understanding is that there has been and continues to be general support for such a bylaw addition and this is why we are going through this process

David McAuley: (07:18) While I think we should ask our lawyers for language about making it clear that the HR bylaw did not open the door to HR enforcement claims, I thought I added a stab at such language last night in google docs but don't see it – will paste it here.

Matthew Shears: (07:19) David - I think it was incorporated

David McAuley: (07:19) I saw a comment, Matthew, but not suggested language - did you see suggested text?

Tatiana Tropina: (07:20) David I added your suggestion... I think

Tatiana Tropina: (07:20) I even commented that I added it

David McAuley: (07:21) I saw that, thanks Tatiana - but it was, I think, my comment rather than suggested text I thought I added - I will paste here anyway

Brett Schaefer: (07:21) Matthew, but we are admitting that we don't know what we are doing in terms of the potential impact on ICANN. I mean read this:

David McAuley: (07:21) Nothing herein shall be construed, directly or indirectly, as an obligation on ICANN's part, or on the part of any other person or entity having a relationship with ICANN, either contractual or in any other manner, to protect human rights to any degree by receiving, considering, adjudicating or acting in any other manner on any complaint or other request or action to the extent such complaint or other request or action concerns any human right.

Brett Schaefer: (07:21) Bylaw xx will be implemented in accordance to the framework of interpretation developed by the CCWG-Accountability or another a cross-community working group chartered by one or more Supporting Organizations or Advisory Committees and tasked with that matter. Said group must be established in order to and develop an appropriate framework of interpretation no later than one year after Bylaw xx is adopted. Bylaw XX will not become effective until such framework is developed and implemented.

David McAuley: (07:21) good point Greg

David McAuley: (07:22) I agree with that idea that Greg just mentioned

Niels ten Oever: (07:22) +1

Tatiana Tropina: (07:22) + 1 from me

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (07:25) Don't first three lines on page 3 also need to be deleted?

David McAuley: (07:29) There has been enough paper rattling around in our WP that I can understand the impetus that Leon felt to offer a distilled "clean" text but I also had to say Greg is doing an awfully good job stepping in to lead us through the longer doc cold

Alice Jansen: (07:31) 16 OCT Meeting Transcript - https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56140470/ICANN54-DUB_Fri16Oct2015-CCWG-Accountability%20F2F_FULL%20DAY-en.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1445231873000&api=v2

Tatiana Tropina: (07:32) my hand is up :)

Niels ten Oever: (07:34) "But perhaps where we need a littlebit more expansion in item number 1, which is my preference is now, is expand what we mean by within the mission and scope of operations. And we also need to know what it means to respect."

Niels ten Oever: (07:34) ^from the transcript

Tatiana Tropina: (07:35) Thanks Greg. But that's what we are doing now :)

Matthew Shears: (07:37) I think that refinement is largely related to the intent of the bylaw and less the language of the bylaw itself - the refinement has occurred in the explanatory note/ rationale

Avri Doria: (07:38) i do not understand a bylaw that is valid until some follow up work happens. i am baffled.

Brett Schaefer: (07:38) +1 Avri

Avri Doria: (07:39) seems too tricky for words, we can have a bylaw but not really?

Niels ten Oever: (07:39) We had the poll, right?

Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany): (07:40) but wouldn't that be the same logic as is behind the WS2 bylaw?

Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany): (07:40) (sorry if I'm way off the mark)

Niels ten Oever: (07:40) The poll had a clear outcome

Greg Shatan: (07:40) the poll was before Dublin

Brett Schaefer: (07:40) I think referencing any specific HR document is inviting complications later, especially since we are clearly in the exploration stage basing on the provisional status of this bylaw.

Tatiana Tropina: (07:41) :) what has changed after Dublin concerning UDHR - we got any significant support for this option?

Leon Sanchez: (07:41) not that I recall

Avri Doria: (07:41) so in other words we don't really have a bylaw in ws1?

David McAuley: (07:41) An alternative is to say yes respect to HR but no to HR enforcement as an active bylaw while saying there may be refinement to come in WS2

Leon Sanchez: (07:42) @Avri we would have one but pending activation till a FoI was developed

Matthew Shears: (07:42) @ David - I think that is in the rationale part of the text

David McAuley: (07:42) I like Markus's reference to building a firewall around this

Niels ten Oever: (07:42) But the text says: "Within its mission and in its operations, "

Niels ten Oever: (07:42) which is the firewall

David McAuley: (07:42) I hope so Matthew, as this language will be picked at very finely

Niels ten Oever: (07:43) And transitional bylaw says: Bylaw XX will not become effective until such framework is developed and implemented.

Brett Schaefer: (07:43) Avri, the current proposal is to adopt a bylaw, but not make it operational until some time in the future when we more fully understand the implications of it. It seems to be an effort to address popular support in the community to include human rights in the bylaws, but acknowledge that we don't fully understand what the potential implications might be.

Niels ten Oever: (07:43) +1

David McAuley: (07:43) I think Brett explained the dilemma well

Avri Doria: (07:43) Brett, to my simple mind, that is the absence of a bylaw.

Niels ten Oever: (07:43) Yes

Brett Schaefer: (07:44) Avri, that is why I suggested punting to WS2.

Avri Doria: (07:44) not that it will matter, but I will object to this.

Matthew Shears: (07:44) The mission is being clarified and constrained in WP2 no?

Avri Doria: (07:46) and if the framework is never done?

Brett Schaefer: (07:46) I like David's proposed language above: Nothing herein shall be construed, directly or indirectly, as an obligation on ICANN's part, or on the part of any other person or entity having a relationship with ICANN, either contractual or in any other manner, to protect human rights to any degree by receiving, considering, adjudicating or acting in any other manner on any complaint or other request or action to the extent such complaint or other request or action concerns any human right.

Leon Sanchez: (07:46) @Avri the framework must be done. If it doesn't we enforce a community power like spilling the board?

Niels ten Oever: (07:48) I don't think there was majority support for UDHR in public comments, nor in our poll.

Leon Sanchez: (07:48) Indeed Niels

Matthew Shears: (07:48) there wasn't support for mentioning specific rights or dox

Niels ten Oever: (07:48) Agree with Greg

Leon Sanchez: (07:48) that is what makes it virtually impossible to reach closure on this topic in WS1 I think

Avri Doria: (07:48) Leon, not likely. I see this as a way of appearing to agree but blocking the reality.

Niels ten Oever: (07:50) Respect already slams the door on enforcement already imho, but wouldn't disagree to that.

Brett Schaefer: (07:50) +1 David

Leon Sanchez: (07:50) That is another good alternative Greg

Leon Sanchez: (07:51) if the FoI is not developed, the bylaw will in any case become operational in 18 months

Matthew Shears: (07:51) Agree with David and Greg's approach

Brett Schaefer: (07:52) We are all acknowledging that we don't understand the implications of this, so we are suggesting a deadline to implement it if we can't agree? That sounds foolish.

David McAuley: (07:54) my approach meets that need Greg

Avri Doria: (07:54) if we can't accept this simple bylaw now, we are not accepting to respect human rights. i can't see it any other way.

Avri Doria: (07:55) we are just being too fancy with words.

Matthew Shears: (07:55) David to understand better you are suggesting putting the bylaw in to be effective now but to parameter it with appropriate language about enforcement, etc., - is that correct

David McAuley: (07:56) Yes - I will speak to it

Avri Doria: (07:57) i can accept David's construction, respect but not enforce.

Tatiana Tropina: (07:58) I think there shall be transitional bylaw.... which at least will establish the group for WS2. However, I agree to drop the language on inactivity

Leon Sanchez: (07:58) I like David's proposal

Matthew Shears: (07:59) I think we would have a very carefully craft that second sentence

Niels ten Oever: (07:59) connection issues

Niels ten Oever: (07:59) go ahead

David McAuley: (08:00) I do that all the time Niel;s

David McAuley: (08:01) Matthew I would ask our lawyers to draft ot or use my suggestion earlier

Avri Doria: (08:01) make the framework a third sentence, but do not make the first sentence contingent.

Matthew Shears: (08:01) if we craft it so that we focus on enforcement but not on precluding internal changes to accommodate human rights impact assessment, etc. so its a fine line

Matthew Shears: (08:03) need to be sure we don't inhibit WS2 work and further elaboration

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (08:06) sorry, had to drop audio

Matthew Shears: (08:07) I don't think we need a transitional bylaw if the the report explicitly calls for and anticipates WS2 work

Niels ten Oever: (08:09) Agree with Matt and David

David McAuley: (08:09) Well that a serious concern about off to the enforcement races - I hope to stem that reflex and so if my approach did not do it then back to drawing board

Niels ten Oever: (08:10) Also OECD

Avri Doria: (08:11) Greg how can argue that respect turns into enforce, when there is a statement that is explicit against enforcement.

David McAuley: (08:11) Sentence for lawyers to improve (shorten) could be: Nothing herein shall be construed, directly or indirectly, as an obligation on ICANN's part, or on the part of any other person or entity having a relationship with ICANN, either contractual or in any other manner, to protect human rights to any degree by receiving, considering, adjudicating or acting in any other manner on any complaint or other request or action to the extent such complaint or other request or action concerns any human right.

Niels ten Oever: (08:12) Can we divide the package? First agree on David's proposal and then tackle analysis/transitional bylaw?

Leon Sanchez: (08:13) That's what I propose Niels!

Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany): (08:13) I think that's what Leon proposed...

Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany): (08:13) :)

Tatiana Tropina: (08:13) oh then lets make vote with green ticks?

Leon Sanchez: (08:13) I feel like I am really not able to communicate sometime

Tatiana Tropina: (08:14) Leon, you stated this clear. It's just because everyone started talking about both I also talked about both :)

Tatiana Tropina: (08:14) but the message was conveyed, no worries :)

Leon Sanchez: (08:14) :D

Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany): (08:14) you need to come out of that well, Leon ;)

Leon Sanchez: (08:14) LOL!!

David McAuley: (08:14) either that or we all need to join Leon in well

Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany): (08:15) only if that's where the pool party is being held.

Tatiana Tropina: (08:15) I feel like I am in a kind of a well already

Tatiana Tropina: (08:15) without the pool party though

Tatiana Tropina: (08:15) only human rights concerns

Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany): (08:16) sorry, but I think the confusion stemmed from David's proposal excluding a transitional bylaw. am I right?

Avri Doria: (08:16) isn't this about implementation?

Leon Sanchez: (08:16) Yes Sabine

Leon Sanchez: (08:17) my proposal is that we support David's approach and that we also support adding a transitional bylaw that ensures WS2 work to be carried out

Tatiana Tropina: (08:17) I agree with Leon on both

Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany): (08:17) ah. so espousing that would already indicate a decision on that question. so one could only talk about these things together, not subsequently.

Leon Sanchez: (08:18) And not subject operationalization of the proposed bylaw to the development of WS2

Niels ten Oever: (08:18) agree Greg, I can live with that

Matthew Shears: (08:18) agree also

Tatiana Tropina: (08:19) Can live with that too. I lived with many things already, this one sounds ok

Niels ten Oever: (08:19) Also more confined

Niels ten Oever: (08:19) So let's go ahead with Leons decision model

Niels ten Oever: (08:19) That is in the text

Tatiana Tropina: (08:19) That's in the doc

Matthew Shears: (08:19) we have not got to the end of the doc

Tatiana Tropina: (08:19) How did we get there?

Niels ten Oever: (08:20) @ brett you can switch to non-mark down by clicking on "suggest" and then 'view"

Tatiana Tropina: (08:20) No it will show an old version of the doc, Niels

Niels ten Oever: (08:20) ah sry

Tatiana Tropina: (08:20) at least that what is happening to me in this case

Tatiana Tropina: (08:21) First part only!

Matthew Shears: (08:21) we have to see the three parts - bylaw + extra sentnece that parameters the bylaw and then the commitment to WS2

Tatiana Tropina: (08:21) Yes. And we suggested the language for this bylaw.

Brett Schaefer: (08:21) So we are asking to vote on truncated draft with Option 1 plus David's enforcement language and WS2 suspension?

Avri Doria: (08:22) delayed effectiveness nullifies the bylaw as far as i am concerend.

Matthew Shears: (08:22) Can we work on the langauge first before voting on it?

Gary Hunt - UK Government: (08:23) Mattew: +1

Brett Schaefer: (08:23) +1 Matthew

Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany): (08:23) Thirthing this.

Brett Schaefer: (08:23) Let's get a draft and circulate it to the WP4 list for support/objection, maybe?

David McAuley: (08:24) That comes in the third half of this call Sabine

Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany): (08:24) Yay! That's my favourite part.

Niels ten Oever: (08:24) I have text proposal

Niels ten Oever: (08:25) I think we're almost there

Matthew Shears: (08:25) Drafting in the google doc please David

David McAuley: (08:26) yes please Niels

Matthew Shears: (08:26) So we can all see how the text evolves

David McAuley: (08:26) Ok Matthew - althou as Brett said after a lot of whacks the google doc looks very strange

Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany): (08:26) and to keep one "authoritative" document

David McAuley: (08:26) I agree

David McAuley: (08:27) I think that raises the Avri objection

Avri Doria: (08:27) i can't live with part 2

Tatiana Tropina: (08:27) I can live with part A

David McAuley: (08:27) Niels can yo type in part A

Matthew Shears: (08:28) agree with Avri

Tatiana Tropina: (08:28) YES

Brett Schaefer: (08:28) How adding the proposed text to the very end of the current google doc so we can read it cleanly?

Tatiana Tropina: (08:28) strike it.

Niels ten Oever: (08:28) Yes

Niels ten Oever: (08:28) it would be:

Niels ten Oever: (08:28) Bylaw xx will be implemented in accordance to the framework of interpretation developed by the CCWG-Accountability or another a cross-community working group chartered by one or more Supporting Organizations or Advisory Committees and tasked with that matter. Said group must be established in order to and develop an appropriate framework of interpretation no later than one year after Bylaw xx is adopted.

Tatiana Tropina: (08:28) Yes.

David McAuley: (08:28) thanks

David McAuley: (08:29) I made a suggestion Greg

Tatiana Tropina: (08:29) Greg, the compromise position is what david proposed + transitional bylaw part 1

Avri Doria: (08:31) in your concer, you used the word enforce 3 times

Avri Doria: (08:32) but enforcement was barred

Tatiana Tropina: (08:32) what exactly will be forwarded?

Tatiana Tropina: (08:32) the doc? there was three here during the call....

David McAuley: (08:32) What is going to full group?

Matthew Shears: (08:32) we should not forward anything until we have seen the text?

Tatiana Tropina: (08:32) I just want to have it on record to avoid the misunderstanding we had in the beginning of today's call

Seun Ojedeji: (08:33) +1 Matthew

Brett Schaefer: (08:33) +1 Matthew, we need a final draft before sending it forward

Gary Hunt - UK Government: (08:33) +1 Matthew

David McAuley: (08:33) I will add my text after Greg cleans it - is that right?

Niels ten Oever: (08:33) David, you can add it now

Niels ten Oever: (08:34) So we all work at the same time

David McAuley: (08:34) ok - will add shortly after call ends

Matthew Shears: (08:34) can we have the new text added to the top of the existing google doc - thanks

David McAuley: (08:34) I will add my suggestion at top of google doc if that is ok

Matthew Shears: (08:34) thanks!

David McAuley: (08:35) thanks Greg

Brett Schaefer: (08:35) David maybe add a specific reference to enforcement? Nothing herein shall be construed, directly or indirectly, as an obligation on ICANN's part, or on the part of any other person or entity having a relationship with ICANN, either contractual or in any other manner, to protect OR ENFORCE human rights to any degree by receiving, considering, adjudicating or acting in any other manner on any complaint or other request or action to the extend such complaint or other request or action concerns any human right.

Brett Schaefer: (08:36) ENFORCE, sorry

Tatiana Tropina: (08:36) Give me rights too :)

Tatiana Tropina: (08:36) just in case :)

Brett Schaefer: (08:36) maybe would help address Greg's concern?

David McAuley: (08:37) Greg - I should add my text now, right?

David McAuley: (08:37) and add it at top

Tatiana Tropina: (08:37) me

Tatiana Tropina: (08:37) of course

Tatiana Tropina: (08:38) Greg, I am happy to have editing right but I am happy to work withut them too

Avri Doria: (08:38) just to say, i still think this effort to stall the bylaw is an effort to block human rights at ICANN.

Matthew Shears: (08:38) hopefully not Avri - we'll see

David McAuley: (08:38) ok thanks Brett

Greg Shatan 2: (08:39) That is neither my intent nor the effect of my concerns

Tatiana Tropina: (08:39) Thanks :)

David McAuley: (08:39) Thanks to Leon, Greg, staff and all

Avri Doria: (08:39) Greg, i cannot judge the intent, but i can judge the effect.

Matthew Shears: (08:40) thanks!

Martin Boyle, Nominet: (08:40) bye

Tatiana Tropina: (08:40) bye

Gary Hunt - UK Government: (08:40) Bye!