

20140804_SOACSG_Fadi_ID90

Robert Hoggarth: Greetings everyone. This is Rob Hogarth, filling in for David Olive on your typical SO/AC/SG CEO Senior Team Leadership Call.

Welcome. Good day, good afternoon, good evening, to everybody who has been able to join. What I've done is I've either tracked voices on the phone, or looked at those of you joining in the AC room.

So let me run through, of our 15 potential attendees who I've got so far. In no particular order, I've got, Jonathan Robinson from the GNSO; Olivier Crepin-Leblond from the At-Large, the ALAC; Patrik Fältström from the SSAC; Elisa Cooper from the BC; Kristina Rosette from the IPC; Michele Neylon from the Registrars; and Keith Drazek from the Registries.

I'm sure there are folks who may have joined via the phone, but not the Adobe Connect room. If so could you please let us know you are here?

Lars-Johan Liman: Hello. This is Lars Liman who is one of the two Co-Chairs of RSSAC.

Robert Hoggarth: Welcome, Lars-Johan. Thanks for joining.

Rafik Dammak: Hi. This is Rafik.

Robert Hoggarth: Rafik, welcome, sir. Thank you very much.

Tarek Kamel: Hi. This is Tarek Kamel from ICANN Staff.

Robert Hoggarth: Welcome, Tarek.

John Jeffrey: John Jeffrey is on.

Robert Hoggarth: John, welcome. So, to fill out the complement of staff, I also note in the Adobe Connect room, Bart Boswinkel, Duncan Burns, Marika Konings, and of course Olof is joining us from a train or a car somewhere.

I think that will give us our complement for now. I'll record if anyone else joins, or if anybody else speaks during the call. But with all that together, Theresa, I'll turn it over to you and Fadi, and let you conduct the call. Thanks very much.

Theresa Swinehart: Fantastic. Thank you. Fadi, did you want to make any opening remarks? Or should I just leap right into our graphic.

Fadi Chehadé: Hello, everyone. Just to put the context again; first to thank, also, everyone, for taking the time to join today. When we spoke last time we agreed that it would make sense for us to review, this is a

most important accountability track together, before we share this with the whole community, which I believe Theresa will walk us through now, and we intend to do this relatively quickly after we get your comments. We have shared this with the Board late last week and gotten their comments, and I think it's time that we hear from you as well. All of you should have received it, and some of you I know already sent your comments in.

But more importantly, just on the context, let's make sure we are all aligned why we are doing this altogether. It's been extremely important for the community, that as we think about the transition from the U.S. Government, that we equally think about how to ensure that ICANN, without U.S. contract, and beyond the U.S. contract -- and this is important, this is not an exercise purely because of the U.S. contracts, but this is (inaudible) and beyond this. We need to be attentive to the accountability and governance needs of ICANN.

The world is asking us to do this, not just the ICANN team, and the ICANN Community at large, everyone is asking for ICANN to actually pay attention to these areas in order for it to continue to evolve as a global organization. So this, in my opinion, is one of the most strategic and important community efforts that we will undertake in the next couple of years. So it is in this context that I ask Theresa, to at least explain to us, the approach that is in front of you, which is based on the input we got, starting in Singapore, and through that period from the public comments, and the one we plan to propose as a result to the community. Theresa?

Theresa Swinehart:

Sure. Thanks, Fadi. We received quite a few comments during the public comment period, but also in addition to that there was a lot of dialogue, of course at the ICANN Meeting in London. Then subsequent, as well, during the IANA Coordination Group Meeting, of the process looking at NTIA's Stewardship transition, the meeting that was held on the 17th and 18th of July, and we received, through the range of comments, really focused from the community standpoint on ensuring that there's a type of Community Working Group.

I think on the last call we had also had this conversation around the cross-community style working group, and so trying to identify a mechanism whereby one has that approach which is very important with representation across the community stakeholder groups, that we had also identified in the proposed process originally.

And then identifying ways that one can consolidate the input and issues that had been identified, many of which came in through the comment period as well. And I think will be a fantastic resource for the community to be looking at, and look at how to provide that into what is being looked as a coordination group that's really then solidifies and categorizes and prioritizes issues that have been identified by the community. Looks at approaches to solutions, and looks at how to work with also substitute experts that may be very versed in specific governance or accountability areas, to identify best practices around that.

So in the graphic that you have there's -- the suggested approach is a -- what would be referred to as a community assembly, which is comprised of representation from the respective SOs and ACs, proposing that there's an appointment of up to seven participants, except for the GNSO which would have four from each SG, we appreciate that within the GNSO context. It's a bit of a unique situation. And again, it's up to, it doesn't mean one has to go to that full number. And the assembly compiled of the community representation would really be responsible for identifying the issues for discussion and improvement around the changing relationship with ICANN and the U.S. Administration.

It would also be responsible though, for appointing participants to what's referred to as a Community Coordination Group, on accountability and governance, and this group is the one that would then look at categorizing and prioritizing issues that have been identified by the community. The assembly would then also have responsibility though for providing ongoing community input to the coordination groups, so also serving as a mechanism for community consultation, community dialogue, and continuous community input. The suggestion is that the

group meets virtually first, given the timeline, but then also ensures that there's a face-to-face meeting at the ICANN 51 Meeting in Los Angeles.

Then moving over to the right-hand part of the graphic, the Coordination Group itself, as I mentioned, to really look at being comprised of a more limited group in order to focus in on, really categorizing and prioritizing issues, putting some pen to paper, obviously with full staff support for both of these groups. And then looking at what sort of solutions are needed for the issues that have been identified and provided as input from the assembly overall. And then be responsible for issuing the final report and recommendations.

The compilation of this group, again, would be a representation, identified from the community itself, complemented by a liaison from the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group. This is an issue that came up at this meeting in London on how to ensure the link between the two processes, and I think many on this call have also highlighted that as an important issue; also the liaison roles that are identified there.

An ICANN staff member; and then up to seven (ph) advisors with specific expertise in different areas around ICANN accountability and governance, but on the broader space, so taking best practices from other forums that may have been dealing with similar issues on a global level. It was also felt though, that you don't want to miss the opportunity of the expertise that had arisen through the Affirmation of Commitment from (inaudible) and the ATRT; and so identifying an expert there. In order to ensure, first of all, that we are not going backwards in looking at accountability issues, really moving forward on the different topic areas that may already have been identified in the ATRT process, and then clearly aboard, liaisons.

So with this structure, the sense is that we can look at ensuring that we've reached the -- meeting the needs of the community and the issues that have been identified there, and then also ensuring that we have the process moving forward. And of course, in this area many of the accountability issues that have been raised; cover a very wide range of issues. Some are specifically related to the changing relationship with the U.S. Administration. Others may be areas of identified enhancement. So, again, the opportunity to categorize and prioritize issues, it gives the ability to look at what has to occur first in light of the transition, but what other issues have been identified that could be looked at, and in what kind of timeline is moved forward. So with that, this partnership is really being looked at.

So this is the proposed process based on the community input, and we realize that we've gotten some comments already which we are happy to address, either before, or if we want to have a dialogue here, before we move into this.

Rob, do you want to -- Does anybody have any questions, or? No? Did I drop off the call?

Unidentified Participant: Excuse me, Theresa.

Theresa Swinehart: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: Rafik has a question.

Theresa Swinehart: Okay. Fantastic. Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Theresa, for this presentation. I just have a question about, what kind of process will be set for the selection of those advisors; because I see that it will be done by the Board Governance Committee? And I'm just wondering if the Board is involved with the selection. So what would be the criteria for this, and what kind of process should be set up, and so on? So I'm just a little bit confused here.

Theresa Swinehart: So on that, in looking at some of the input that we've received during the comment period. For example, areas specifically around, you know, topics for accountability or governance or, you know, additional judiciary kinds of mechanisms, third-party judiciary kinds of mechanisms. So many of these topics come up, really identifying experts who have been dealing with this across a wide range of institutions; for example, there is the gentleman who was speaking and participating, Yan (ph), at the event at the ICANN Meeting in London.

People who've been dealing with issues across a wide range of other organizations, who could bring some best practices, some additional suggestions to issues that have been identified. And in looking at a listing of that, providing that to the Board Governance Committee and asking them to help identify where there may be some additional needs.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks. This is Rob. We've got a queue of Olivier, then Keith, then Kristina, then Jonathan. So Olivier, you have the floor.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Rob. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. So thanks very much for this intro, Theresa. I just wanted to ask one thing, with regards ATRT1 and the ATRT2 recommendations, has the Board set up a timetable for implementation of these recommendations?

Theresa Swinehart: Yes, absolutely. In fact, the ATRT2 recommendations are moving towards implementation, and we have that timetable mapped out and ready to go, and then we'll be reporting back to the community on how we are implementing that. And one of the key areas here is of course that, we have a lot of accountability-related work occurring, and so we want to ensure that we are moving forward and building off of that. Not a revisiting to, for example, any of the ATRT1 or 2 recommendations, so this process is not intended to re-look at anything of the past, but rather build on anything that's been identified in moving forward. But yes, the Board has, as you know, in London, adopted the recommendations and the plan to move forward.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks, Theresa. Keith you are next in line.

Keith Drazek: Thank you, Rob. (Inaudible), and thanks Theresa and Fadi for making the time for this call. And thanks also, to Theresa, for circulating a draft of the -- I guess, the proposal here for our review, before this call, I think that was very helpful.

On that note the Registry Stakeholder Group and our internal Accountability Working Group haven't had a chance to really consider this in full. But I've received some initial response from our working group members, or at least handful of them. And I think there are some questions as to the structure, and why it appears, a sort of brand new structure is necessary? Why we couldn't rely on the sort of tried and tested cross-community working group approach?

Another concern that's been raised, is that it seems to be pretty fully baked. It's clear that you all have put some -- you know, a lot of time and effort; and when I say, you all, I mean Staff and maybe the Board as well. They've put a lot of time and effort into this, and it raises the question as to why we weren't engaged, we the community, we weren't engaged earlier in the discussion so we could provide input, support at this point. I think there's a sense that, with your announcements that you want to be posting the public comment summary, and sort of all of this by the end of this week.

But it really is sort of unfair to put us in a position of now commenting on something; and it appears sort of a de-facto decision, that you are now trying to get our alignments, or synchronization, or whatever the words are, in very short order. In other words, that any possible changes might be, sort of, around the edges at best; you know so -- and I think that, generally speaking, it's a very initial reaction, and maybe this is a perception, but it is a perception in our group. Is that this appears to be an attempt by ICANN to control the outcome of this process.

Specifically I can point to the selection of the seven experts by the Board Governance Committee. I mean, if you look at this, let's even take it out of the ICANN context, that if you are trying -- if you are discussing accountability for an organization where the Board is the ultimate decider today of the policy decisions, of decisions for the organization, and you have a very small group of -- the Coordination Group, whatever it is, and that there are seven experts who will be picked by the Board, to really influence the discussion and the outcome, that raises some questions. And whether it's perception or not, I think, you know, my folks have had a pretty strong reaction to the construct of this approach. So I'll stop there, and I may have some more input later on, but I wanted to at least get that on the table, thank you.

Fadi Chehadé: Keith, good morning. This is Fadi. I must tell you, I'm deeply disappointed by your comments. This is not the tone with which we left our call last time. You always bring us back to this tone of mistrust. I'm very disappointed.

We work together over the last few months to get everyone's comments into the process. We analyze these comments. For example, the comment said, we do not want these advisors to be on their own, separated, kind of giving their own opinion. We want these groups to be working with us. So we listened, and we did our best to give you something, then we agreed together, in good spirit; that will come together before this is out, so that we can do our best and ensure that we are aligned. Now you are upset because we are only giving you a week. How many weeks do you need, Keith. I mean let's--

Keith Drazek: Yes, Fadi, I can respond to that, I'll be happy to respond to that.

Fadi Chehadé: --let's stop this -- let's stop this mistrust track (ph) that every time we get back into, let's work together, you bring this back to, we don't trust. Seven advisors--

Keith Drazek: Fadi, I can respond to that.

Fadi Chehadé: No. Let me finish, please. Let me finish, please, because if we continue with this, we will never, ever be accountable enough in a mistrusted environment. So the first step to work towards accountability, of this organization, not of the staff, including you and your group, is for us to start, even a little bit, trusting each other, because that's not going to get us far.

Secondly, there are seven advisors that number one, are not allowed to be selecting on issues. The issues are selected by a cross community group, that's what's on the left there. They decide what's on the table, and what's not on the table. That's very important, once all of this done in a cross-community fashion, and we address, for your request, and many requests, that the GNSO, if it has one representative... or even equal representatives to all the SOs/ACs, it is not working anymore because the GNSO has many constituencies within. We addressed that.

So now we have a cross community group that we are trying, we are giving you an input point here, to tell us if this could work for you. That is what the left-hand side is of this graph. Then that group will then select a smaller group so that we have a grouping that actually can get things done, as opposed to having 70 people coming up with the issues which is necessary. Once the issues have been identified and catalogued, then the group on the right attempts to then come up with solutions, and solution requirements, and that group will obviously also have enough people so that these advisors are not dominating, they are just providing insight and input from the outside best practices perspectives, something we could always use.

Now in this case, it is particularly important, not because the Board is selecting them, everybody is focused on that. Let's focus on the fact that if all we did is pick, from amongst us, people to ensure that we are accountable, the world will view this as an exercise of self-examination, and they will not consider it as an exercise that was at least informed by people who would be globally recognized as people from all over the world who have expertise in various areas of governance and accountability.

So this actually, for us, we hoped would be viewed as a guarantee against people accusing ICANN of just looking at its own navel, right. That this is a way for us to bring outsiders, and you saw that the expert that Staff had brought to the London Meeting, Yan (ph) what's very well received, people received him very well. And he had some good input and good ideas and was willing to listen and learn about what we do.

So that was the intent of this, and if all of us agree that this is so important that we need more time to look at this, fine, I'm happy to discuss this with you. I'll publish a blog very clearly saying, we shared this with the SO/AC leaders, and the leaders decided that they need more time, and we will give more time. But we also need to guard against the accusations that some of the community members are lobbying against us, that we are delaying the accountability track, that we are not in a rush on this track, we just want to get the transition done from the NTIA, but we don't quite understand, that this track and the NTIA Transition has interrelations, and therefore this needs to move forward as well.

So while I'm happy to give time so that all of us participate fully and without any complaint that we are trying to, as you said, top-down decide anything. I mean I don't know how else to do this. Any attempt to do anything is top-down. There has to be at some point a stoppage of this.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks, Fadi. Keith, I think you wanted to do a follow up, and then just for the record, I've got Kristina, Jonathan, Patrick, Heather and Lisa. And Olivier, I've noticed you, in the chat, have a follow up that I can read; or you can go to. Keith?

Keith Drazek: Yes. Thanks, Rob. And thanks, Fadi. Just a couple of things; one -- first, I wasn't on the last SO/AC call with you due to the ICT Meeting in London. I had a conference, but I did listen to the MP3, and I read the transcripts and, you know, I think that -- I welcome your sharing this with us today. I simply regretted it wasn't shared with us earlier in the process of your developing the proposal. I wish that you wouldn't personalize this. I'm simply relaying the views of my group, as they've been relayed to me.

You know, frankly, I think there's a lot of good work here, and I think that there's a great opportunity for the community moving forward, but please don't take the pushback that you are hearing as anything to do with Keith Drazek, or even with VeriSign. I'm here today representing the Registry Stakeholder Group in a bottom-up consensus way. And frankly I'm not opposed to experts getting into the substance of your proposal. I think experts would be very valuable. I think the expert that was in attendance in London, was very informative.

My point is I think it's wrong for the Board of Governance Committee to be the ones selecting the experts. So let's not get bogged down into whether experts are good or bad, it's a really a question of who selects them. I'll stop there. Thanks.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks. Fadi, did you want to respond, or can I move to the next question?

Fadi Chehadé: Let's move to the next question, please.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay. Thanks. Kristina, you are next in line, and Jonathan.

Kristina Rosette: Thank you. I guess I will note at the outset that I'm still getting feedback from the ITC members on the graphics. So I'm not in a position to provide any (inaudible) definitive view. I did have a couple of clarifying questions though, and one is that is it -- just try to try and make sure that I'm clear on the proposed structure, so that when members come to me with questions, I can answer. Question number one will be, is it the expectation that the members or participants, however you want to call it, of the Community Assembly, on the one hand, are going to be different from the members of the Community Coordination Group on the other hand; particularly with regard to the SO/AC representation? That's the first question.

The second question I had is in terms of the Community Coordination Group, is the identified ICANN staff member, is that somebody who is going to be an active participant? Or are they intended to be there as a facilitator, or to provide support? Information that you could probably provide that could kind of clarify that role, and to the extent that there had been some preliminary views internally as to who that person may be, I think would be very helpful. Thank you.

Fadi Chehadé: Kristina, just -- the answer to your first question is in point number B on the graphic on the left-hand hand side. So it's, appoint participants to the Community Coordination Group which may be members of the Assembly or of the broader community. So they could be the same.

As to your second question about the staff member, I think -- it became clear that having a person, a liaison, a person who understands the governance structures that are in place today at ICANN would be important to have. There is a lot of history, and there is a lot of, also, experience with various activities that I think would be important to be represented on that team in an authoritative way in the sense -- by authoritative I mean in a knowledgeable way -- that someone could say, this is how it is how it is structured today legally.

There are some, clearly legal and structural aspects that will be discussed here, that it's important to have the facts at the fingertip of this group. So that's was the purpose of the staff member. My guess, frankly, is that this would be someone from the Legal Department so that, would have the experience and the background to share this data (ph).

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks, Fadi. Theresa, anything to add?

Theresa Swinehart: No. I think Fadi, you had explained. I mean, just to reinforce on the -- you know, we have -- there's a lot of reviews to the earlier question about the ATRT implementation and various other factors. Having somebody who is present, who has the information at their fingertips, is valuable and it's time-saving, so that's the intention, from the staff aspect. And on the selection aspect, it's already been touched on and incorporated in point B, that was the thinking there.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks, Theresa. And Kristina expressed her thanks in the chat. Jonathan, you're next. And Patrick you are on deck.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Rob. Hello, Fadi, Theresa, and colleagues. A couple of things, I think to just -- really, I guess, it's probably more personal reflections, since this hasn't really been shared and discussed very broadly at this stage, but the first thing is that this is clearly a unique and new format and structure. So regardless, and that's why you are hearing clarifying questions, I think on the structure. It may take us a little bit of digesting the views to what's being proposed here, and to understand in and of itself, and perhaps why it needs to be different to structures we used in the past; and so that's one of the challenges, I think, we will need to deal with.

I think the second is, as you look at it, you naturally see a hierarchy, and maybe this is something which needs to be clarified to me, or more generally, but you naturally see a hierarchy between a group on the left which provides some inputs, have some discussions, and a group on the right which has a form of decision-making power or, you know, controlled outcomes.

And to that extent, I think that's where the seven advisors, potentially, start to be something to think about, because they have a powerful balance of force in that if that is the hierarchy in the structure. So that's certainly something we need to understand, and be clear on and make sure is understood. Depending on how the feedback looks (inaudible) to work, and how much ultimate control or power sits on the right-hand side.

And then the third (inaudible) and big issue which we need to be very clear on, (inaudible) list this whole issue of the interrelationship and interdependence or not, and where the dependencies exist on the parallel track, or work together with the parallel track of the transition, because that's going

to be an ongoing issue. And we just need to be very clear how those -- how these two pieces of work do or don't interrelate, and if there's a specific subset of accountability issues that do directly have a pattern, to some extent, I guess, that's what comes out of the work of the ITG and the associated community working groups in that.

So three things, I think, that are challenges with the structure, and things we need to be thinking about, at the very least concentrating and making clear in communications an understanding of it. Thanks.

Theresa Swinehart:

Jonathan, thank you. To your point about the, sort of, perceived hierarchy, or however one may want to define that, I think the intention is really two-fold. One is to ensure that one has a community type of working group, so the Community Assembly, an area where the issues are being percolated, and the issues are being raised. And there's been a wide range of issues already.

You'll notice that there are two very bold arrows going back and forth, right. Really, the intention of the Coordination Group, is as it looks at categorizing and prioritizing issues that have been identified, and as it looks at, and building proposed solutions for those kinds of issues, as it looks at, you know, preparing a draft report, preparing recommendations, and categorizing issues, it's really essential that there is a dialogue with the community, and the Assembly really also has to play a role in ensuring that there's input into this.

So it's really seen as an opportunity for raising issues, solidifying issues, continuous feedback loop, and continuous dialogue. And to your point, I mean, that obviously can be reflected in the text that surrounds this.

Also to your point, about the relationship with the IANA Stewardship process, I think identifying a liaison to the respective group, ensuring that there's a dialogue continuing and, you know, as I mentioned at the start, there's been a wide range of topics that have been raised in the context of the accountability process. And a wide range of topics that some goes specifically to the changing historical contractual relationship with the U.S. Administration, so the perceived backstop that the U.S. holds; the perceived oversight roles that they hold.

But there's a range of other topics that have also been raised that may not go directly to that, and so part of the workflows of the Community Assembly and of the Coordination Group is going to be, okay which topics are specifically related to the changing historical relationship? What are some of the other topics, and how do we prioritize and categorize each of those, in order to ensure that we are looking at what needs to occur for the changing relationship with the U.S. Administration? And what other issues should be looked at subsequent to that?

So this is really intended to allow for the opportunity, both for raising of the issues, the continuous feedback with the community obviously, and consultation and dialogue, and transparency, is going to be an ultimate aspect, of course, any of these processes. And then identifying which ones are specifically related to the other process, which ones aren't, and in the category of which ones aren't how would we want to proceed with those.

Robert Hoggarth:

Great. Thanks, Theresa. Patrick you're next in the queue, and then Heather and Lisa after you.

Patrik Fältström:

Thank you very much. I have a couple of things where some of them have already, to some degree, been mentioned already. The first one, regarding the experts, I just have a more explicit question. Have you been thinking about having other ways of appointing those, for example, using NomCom? Because even though we -- there is no problem with it, we need to think about the optics (ph), just like someone said, the right-hand circle seems to be more like a decision-making body, even though it's sort reporting to the left circle.

Secondly, I think people -- these people have been -- at least in effect have already start to ask questions like, how much did this construction reassemble the constructions that we already use

with cross constituency working groups? Is one or both of these, CCWG, or is there something new that we are inventing regarding the overall structure?

Third issue, how does this map to existing CCWGs and other processed within ICANN, I think to be able to decide quickly whether this is good or bad, and as you said, Fadi, recognize that we need to move forward quickly, I think we need to have a greater map so that, as Keith points out, so that we can do the prioritization of where we spend our time and effort, because in parallel with all of these, accountability and improvement processes, we still have to continue to do our work, we have -- we cannot forget that, and we cannot spend all our time on processes. So an overall map would work -- would be good to have.

Then the detail, regarding the circle to the right, I think one thing that is important before this ship is set to sail, is to know more, precisely what the role of each one of these different individuals or seats mean. For example, what is a liaison, and what is an advisor? This is something that, as a member of this Coordination Group regarding IANA, that has been taking like a serious amount of time to know what actually, what is a member, what is a liaison, what is the role of these various groups -- various individuals? And that's immediately a question that comes up. So having that spelled out is something that will help when moving forward with this.

And then I come back and repeat the issue with overload, which was actually what we talked on the dinner in London, where we, unfortunately, have not been able to talk about. We haven't -- we were not even -- we were not able to meet and talk about the general overload issue that we have between the SOs and ACs, so that is something that also refers back to what I said, a mapping of this against the other process going on. Thank you.

Theresa Swinehart:

Thanks, Patrick. I think in the context of the assembly, the concept is really to be building off of the concept of the Cross Community Working Group that has been discussed in the context of the accountability, so building really something that is a cross-community style working group with representation from the different SOs/ACs, and from the SGs obviously within the GNSO context. So that is building off of that model, not trying to reinvent a new kind of model.

And then to the point on the right, that's really just to solidify some of the work. I take your point on identifying the roles of the advisors versus the liaisons, and providing some clarity on what those different responsibilities are, and that's certainly something that can be fleshed out a little bit further.

Fadi Chehadé:

Yeah. I'd add to that, Patrick, that the -- how would you feel if the left-hand circle was simple renamed a Cross Community Working Group that you all put together? The question is not so much the labels, it's the roles as you said, very well. I think the left-hand circle is designed so that we have a broad enough group of people that are truly representative of the community, that will essentially come up with the catalogue of things that need to be looked at.

And we believe that this is community-centric and should be community-centric, because we are the people who, again, over the years, and with the experience we have, and with the commitments we have to ICANN, the community should be deciding what gets looked at, not some outside expert. Not some outside entity. Not the U.N., no one, we should be, as a community saying; these are the things that we believe will make our ICANN a better ICANN.

So I think the left-hand side, we could -- I mean we could essentially replace that by a Cross Community Working Group that you will help us put together. And then the right-hand side becomes the smaller group, not 50, 70 people, but a much smaller group of people who take these issues and essentially start solutioning them, and coming up with very specific ways to address them, and that requires a smaller group, it requires a lot of governance and accountability expertise and knowledge of the law. And we can -- I think that that may help a little bit, clarify the difference between the circles.

It's not that one is consultative and one is a decision-making. No. It's one that identifies issues and that's very critical, and then the other one is that takes these very issues identified by the other, and attempts to solution them, goes back to those who identify the issues saying, here is proposed solutions, what do you think? So that was our, I guess, design, and again, as you suggested maybe it's best to drop the assembly and simply replace it with the label Cross Community Working Group and asking you all to help us form that. It's really no difference.

Patrik Fältström: Yeah. Let me just respond to that. Other people on this call like, Olivier, and Jonathan have more experience than myself on the Cross Community Working Groups. I think my overall, general comment to you, and feedback, is that I think the more existing processes and names and words you use, and use them exactly the same way as we have been doing historically, I think the less people will get hung up on the processes you provide, and will concentrate on the content which I -- what I hear from you is what you actually would like.

Fadi Chehadé: Yes, very much. We are in synch, Patrick.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you, all. Heather and Elisa, you were next in line with your hands up, and then notice, I did in the chat that Olivier and Keith have been making some comments and asking some questions, so I'll ask them to verbally ask them. And then we'll turn to Jonathan and Kristina, who've since raised their hands. Heather, you're next.

Heather Dryden: Thank you. Good morning, everyone. So just to start, I do appreciate this call. I think it's really helping us get to what are some of the questions or issues that the community might have in relation to this, and so it's are really useful step in getting us to where we want to be. To the point of really beginning to do the work associated with enhancing accountability. So I'm really grateful for this opportunity, and for the time that's being taken in order to look at these issues. And it think it's a really a feature of the importance that this community places on this track of work.

So, but just to give you a sense of where the GAC is, the GAC hasn't seen this proposal as far as I know, and will take a bit of time to look at what's being proposed and digest it. Our energy, our attention was (inaudible/audio skip) on the ICG effort, and making sure we have the clarity we needed about what that process is, and how the GAC nominees will be participating. And some issues there about how the GAC organizes itself internally, not really about the ICG as such, but really about the GAC coming to grips with that whole thing.

So we actually had to hold off really getting into the accountability side of things, until now. So I think the timing is really good for the GAC to now look at how efforts have moved along, and to find a way to contribute or comment, or whatever is really needed to get this work moving ahead more quickly. We do have interest in the GAC already in those that would want to be nominated even though, as I say, they haven't really seen the structure, or have an opportunity to come to grips with it.

And I agree with others that have had questions or wanted to highlight the importance of understanding linkages, roles and really what the relationship is to the ICG, or even other work. Olivier had some points about the Accountability and Transparency Review Team, and this is something governments placed a lot of priority to. And so I think that it's quite a natural drive to want to understand where those efforts fit in.

As far as the notion of the Cross Community Working Group, I think -- so the GAC, those efforts are underway for the ICG is something the GAC now wants to look at more closely. It can be challenging for the GAC to participate in cross community working groups, that doesn't mean that they shouldn't continue, or that the GAC won't be able to identify a way to make that kind of effort work for it.

And so I just want to cite that -- to point out that I think really fair for the GAC to contribute to a community effort, and I think that's right where it belongs. That I keep seeing and hearing the word community, and whatever we call the (inaudible), on this graphic--

Unidentified Participant: On the slide (inaudible)?

Heather Dryden: --I think there are some things that the GAC would need to really think about, more closely, about how to really make that work with the other SOs/ACs, and it's really an issue about moving across community, and a lot of good work has been happening with the GNSO, on those sorts of issues. Anyway, I'm hoping we can tap into that particular effort, underway with the GNSO, to help us identify a way forward on that.

So that's where we are, I think, on the GAC side of things and, again, I think this is really going to get us to better clarity so that we can get this work for us really moving now, and I the GAC is in a good position to start, really engaging and looking at what we need to do internally within the GAC, and as well as with the other SOs and ACs. Thank you.

Theresa Swinehart: Thanks, Heather.

Heather Dryden: Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you, Heather. This is Rob. I've got Elisa next, and then as I noted before, we go to Olivier, then Keith, and then back to Jonathan whose hand is up in the chat. So, Elisa, please?

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Rob. So first of all let me say that this has not been shared yet with the Business Constituency, I wanted to get a better understanding before anything was shared with them. But I'm going to give you what I think some of their concerns might be, or one of the issues might be, and that is, when we were traveling down the path, when we thought there was going to be a cross community working group, I had tremendous outpouring of members who wanted to participate. And I understand the desire to keep it now, you know, down to a relatively few number of participants from each SO/AC, and then for each for the SGs.

That's that, I'm wondering if it might be possible to have some sort of observer status in the left-hand circle, and these would just be, you know, members of the community that may listen to calls, or be included on the list, but not allowed to perhaps, maybe, necessarily to engage directly, they would have to do it through their appointed member, so that's what I'm asking for, to see if whether there might be the possibility of adding that, because I think that might address some of the desire to participate. Because I think, honestly, many people, they want to participate, their companies want them to participate, and I just think it might be a way to move forward. So that's my ask. Thank you.

Fadi Chehadé: This is Fadi. Thank you, Elisa. I actually think -- I mean, I want to defer to my colleague as well, Theresa, but the idea of observers is fantastic. Everyone is welcome to observe, the more I think the better, because I think it will legitimize the process. So I think that would be great. I mean, obviously, we should not forget that both the coordination group being proposed here, and the larger group, will operate completely transparently and completely, everything they will do will be public, scripted, available, streamed, whatever we need to do, so everyone is participating.

And this is needed, not just clearly and mostly for our community, it's also needed so we can show the world how ICANN is an open transparent organization to start with. And this in my opinion will be the most watched process at ICANN in the next two years, by far. There are -- the number of organizations writing us, that they are gearing up -- some organizations are hiring people to start watching this process and analyzing it. So where -- this is going to be a highly visible process, and observers, I think, should be welcome.

Elisa Cooper: Thanks, Fadi.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you, Fadi. Theresa anything to add?

Theresa Swinehart: No. I think that covers it.

Robert Hoggarth: Great. Thanks. We are going to look back around a little here. Olivier, earlier in the chat you had some follow-ups with respect to the ATRT2, so one to give you a chance to express them verbally rather than me channel you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Robert. It's Olivier speaking. So the question was actually more of a statement. The question was whether the timetable of ATRT1 and ATRT2 recommendation implementation were going to be published for transparency purposes? But really, my statement in that is that because we are dealing specifically with transparency, the process itself for implementation should be as transparent as possible. And in my view, and the view of many of my colleagues in At-Large, this process should be clearly tracked and clearly shown on whatever Web page or Wiki page, and with each recommendation showing the factual implementation status set in time.

The concern is that we would end up, if we don't have something like this, with the case of ATRT1 recommendations, where some recommendations either fell through the cracks, and were far from being implemented, and others were still going on and being implemented, but no one was really sure where they were, and some of them had been delayed or slowed down because of ICANN not having the resources to be able to implement those.

Now transparency and accountability appears to be one of the key subjects, key topics that ICANN has to go through at the moment, and not having the resources to implement recommendations is not going to have a very good -- well it's not going to look very good from the outside world, and so we are just very concerned that this has to be as transparent as possible, and people, and I'm saying here, anyone should be able to see how far we are and where we are on this, specifically, when we know that this process of accountability and transparency is very much linked to the transition of stewardship and the IANA contract. And we have a one-year deadline for the transition of stewardship in the IANA contract. So the ATRT2 also, in my view, has a very short deadline for things to be implemented. Thank you.

Fadi Chehadé: Thank you, Olivier. First of all, let me assure you that you shouldn't be concerned; you should enjoy the rest of your summer in Europe. We are going to be working very hard to publish these (inaudible) tables, one. We are a step ahead in that we have concluded that for the visibility on the ATRT1 and 2 to be better, we are going to move it to our Project Management Office, the PMO office has now been moved under Operations, the Operations Team at ICANN, so there was some transitioning taking place under the leadership of Carol (ph). But now all ATRT1 and ATRT2 is being transferred from an implementation standpoint, so it doesn't stay in Theresa's Strategy Team, or Legal, it now will be managed the people who, as you know, are very, very focused on timelines, deliverables, and a typical PMO approach to ATRT1 and ATRT2.

So I don't want you to be concerned. There is no effort here to -- the effort is precisely in the opposite direction that you are concerned about, which is to structure this under the PMO office so that we can all have the visibility we need and the precision we need in how these things are getting done. So stay tuned, in the weeks ahead you will see the output of that starting to come out publicly into the community.

And frankly, the second reason you shouldn't be concerned is that we've noted the importance of having on the Coordination Group for accountability and governance an actual ATRT expert. Someone who has lived through the ATRT1 and 2, who understands it, who can ensure that there is further -- no further duplication, that more importantly that the efforts of ATRT1 and ATRT2 do not secondly -- do not suddenly get second-class citizen status against this particular effort. But in

fact, that they meshed and prioritized so that people understand that these things have been agreed, and we need to implement them first in the priority that they've been given to us.

So I hope this -- I really intended to just give you some comfort that we are on top of what you ask for and you'll be seeing some of that shortly.

Robert Hoggarth: Thanks, Fadi. This is Rob. I'm noting that as a time check, we've to about three minutes left. And Keith, you had asked five questions in the chat, which I hope that Theresa will be able to capture. Perhaps you could reduce it (inaudible) you know, the one or two main priority questions, that you wanted.

Keith Drazek: Yes.

Robert Hoggarth: Because I want to make sure that Jonathan can make his comments. And then any final questions or comments any of you have you could put them in the Chat. We'll be collecting those, and obviously giving you all the links to that, as well as the recording. I have to get those gathered after this call. So, Keith?

Keith Drazek: Yeah. Thanks very much, Rob. So just three quick things; one, I think we would all benefit from a summary and analysis of the public comments. I think, you know, Fadi and Theresa have said this proposal is the output or consistent with the public comments submitted so it would be helpful for us to be able to do that, to be able to assess, or to be able to track where they link up. My questions are, who decides on the final recommendations? Is it the Board?

And a follow on, why is it important for the VCG (ph) appoint the experts in the right-hand group? And is it not apparent that the perception could be that if the Board is ultimately deciding on these recommendations for enhanced accountability which, in fact, would be potential constraints on the Board's power, or on the Staff's influence. That's, is it allowing them to select the experts while making the final decision is almost, at least, perceptually, a fox in the hen house. Thanks.

Fadi Chehadé: Okay. Thank you. Do we have one more? Because we need to get a little bit of agreeing together on next step, so let's take the last comment then.

Robert Hoggarth: Okay, great. Jonathan, you have the last word.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, I'll be very brief. I mean, I think the challenge for me, is we've got a new structure and mechanism in place here, which poses a whole lot of process questions. We've had a sort of counter proposal, or a complementary proposal saying, we think about the use of cross community working groups for existing processes and structures. The challenge with that is, they have very well defined methods of organization and structure and process.

And we can't sort of -- without a bit of work, just pick and choose. It's either we are looking, one method or another, so that's the (inaudible) -- if we call the community assembly on accountability and governance across cross community working groups, I think it will be something different that's envisaged here. That's not necessarily a problem but we can't simply work with a structure that's proposed here and call it something else, it's sort of one or the other. All we have to do is some work to find out how they are different. Thanks.

Fadi Chehadé: Jonathan, just a quick response, would you be more comfortable if the assembly was replaced with the CCWG?

Jonathan Robinson: The challenge I have Fadi, and I really appreciate that you are being constructive and accommodating and suggesting that. The problem is that the CWG, as I see it at the moment, doesn't sit properly alongside then, the cross community group, it's that they don't have a natural interrelationship, so that's the challenge.

Fadi Chehadé: Is the proposal I made that a group identifies the community issues and catalogues them, and puts them in clear groupings so we understand, you know, what are structural accountability issues. What are strategic accountability issues, what are, maybe legal accountability issues, et cetera? What are operational accountability issues, you know, like, I don't know, whistle-blower things. So put all of this and then hand it to a group that then has the size and the expertise to actually solution these. Is that -- I mean, we've done that, you and I, at many, many places before. Any environment like this requires a team that has the broad view on issue identification and cataloguing.

And a smaller group, obviously, because you can't have 50 to 70 people solution things; a smaller group, almost like a working group, that then is able to take these things as outlined by the Cross Community Working Group and solution them, that this -- I know this is new maybe but, at least, conceptually, does this make sense?

Jonathan Robinson: Fadi, certainly it makes some sense to me, I can understand it. It resonates well, I think in many ways we've -- I was just trying to highlight it, that if we do that, we do that, and we need to work with you to make sure that's shaped and organized in a way that's acceptable, or will work in another way. What we shouldn't do, is do what you've just described, and call it a cross community working group, because therein lies the path to confusion and potentially mistrust, I feel.

Fadi Chehadé: Well, thank you, everybody for participating in this call. Theresa, do you have some final wrap up comments and things you can share about next steps.

Theresa Swinehart: Yes. Actually, as we had posted last week with regards to where we are in the process, the plan had been based on the discussions here, to post this by the end of the week in order to make sure that we could start undertaking the work that exists, and be responsive to that. I'd welcome a little bit of clarity from this call here. We would like to proceed with that in order to get this work underway, and build on the discussions that have already been occurring. I'm not quite clear where we are on the feedback though.

So if we proceed with renaming it, for example, as a cross community working group on accountability and governance, identify that observers are of course, welcome, to any of these processes, and that all the processes will be transparent on how they are being conducted.

I think, as Fadi had described, the Coordination Group is really, one has to have the mechanism to start solidifying some of the input, and the view had been that it's very important that that has community participation on that as well; otherwise it becomes just merely a staff function. But from this call, unless we hear otherwise, we would like to proceed with getting this posted in order to get this process underway, from that direction.

Fadi Chehadé: I mean, would it make sense for us to delay this a few days so that you have a chance to give us further input, for us to work with you? Or do you think it's best that we take some of the input we heard today, especially on nomenclature and things like that? Clarify some things such as what Patrick requested on advisor versus liaison, to be precise, and then provide some more clarity on the advisors, the external advisors, and then post this and allow the whole community to move forward that way? Or, should we wait a few more days, if you want us to, so that we can get more input from you?

Robert Hoggarth: And Keith's hand up, I'll let him answer that questions.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks, Rob. Thanks, Fadi. So I think -- and I'll just speak for the registries here. I mean, we don't want to delay this process. This is, you know, the most important issue for us right now. You know, setting aside the new gTLD program issues and, you know, the GDD interactions. But this, you know, at a high level, is the most important issue for us, so we don't want it delayed. We want it kicked off as soon as possible.

I have, for example, a Registry Stakeholder Group, Accountability Working Group, our internal group that's dedicated to focusing on issues. I have a call with them tomorrow; to where we are going to be talking exactly about this. I expect that I will have further feedback on some of the things we've discussed here today. For example, the first -- you know, the view that the Community Assembly, a term that had people really scratching their heads, could simply be the Cross Community Working Group, I think actually would be a very positive clarification. So I would actually encourage you, if you could, in short order, to make some of the adjustments that we sort talked about here today, the feedback you've received.

But if what you're looking for from the registries is -- and I think the words you used on the last call in talking about in Theresa's posts (ph) are, community alignment and synchronization, and making sure that we are all on the same page, and that this group, on today's call is fully supportive of what you are getting to post, I don't think I can commit to that, because our group hasn't had the chance to truly, truly assess it.

So I see it as sort of -- as sort of a challenge that we get something out and kick off the process, I would actually encourage that, but you can't do that and say that you have the full support of the SOs, ACs and SGs, in doing so. Not at this stage.

Fadi Chehadé: Okay. Thank you. And if you could send us some insights and input after your meeting with your internal team tomorrow would be great, would very much appreciated.

Keith Drazek: Of course.

Fadi Chehadé: We do have a few more days to tweak with this. And I do welcome your input on renaming this as CCWG, but I also note Jonathan's concern with that. We'll dig into this a little bit more with our teams to just make sure that any -- you know, what's really the concern in actually making this, in fact, the CCWG because I think that resonates well with me, at least. But let's think through this a little bit, and if any of you have further insights or input to us, please to send them to us, and we'll take them to heart.

But like you, Keith, we are definitely very sensitive to the fact that there's a huge -- I mean you saw the letters I'm starting to get from the senators in the U.S. Senate, from Mr. Stern (ph) and Rubio (Inaudible) wrote me last week, and we are going to get more and more of these from around the world, all focused on this. All focused on this.

So it's extremely important that we look responsive, it's been a few weeks since the comments came, and we need to move forward. Having said that, you are the most important group into this whole discussion, it's not Senators Stern and Rubio (ph), it's you. It's all of us here being aligned, as you said.

So any further input, hugely welcomed. If we received from you enough input that says give us another week so we can do a little bit more thinking together, by all means. This is not a final graph; it says "draft" on it for a reason. We will adjust it immediately with some more comments. Observers like Elisa mentioned, clarity on advisors and so on. We'll do that, and we'll resend a copy of that, so that you'll have a kind of a slightly updated draft. And then input would be deeply appreciated. Thank you.

Robert Hoggarth: Thank you, Fadi; Theresa and everyone. I've had to take -- Patrick you did raise your hand, so perhaps the final comment, if you can keep it brief, because nearly, we are now 10 minutes past the top of the hour. Patrick?

Patrik Fältström: Yes. Thank you. First of all, I'm sorry if I created confusion regarding bringing in the CCWD (ph), but this is exactly the kind of questions that you will get. So the question whether we need another -- and I'm really using the word "we" explicitly now, Fadi, to respond to what you just said, Keith,

in trying to bring this back together. I think what's important for us is that when we present this, that we can respond to all the questions they get and some of them came up during this call, and we know how ICANN works.

So the question is not so much whether we are ready, it also has to do with the case that you need to have time to update the document, and I don't really know how you manage to get Theresa to work like 24 or 30 hours a day, but I would say that releasing this, this week, would be very, very hard, given that you will get probably feedback already tomorrow. So a few more days would probably be good, and then it's up to you when you would like to announce that, because I want us to be ready. Thank you.

Fadi Chehadé: Yeah. That's fine. I think -- I'm telling Theresa here next to me--

Theresa Swinehart: That's fine.

Fadi Chehadé: --that this is very wise, and we will -- please give us all the input you have, we appreciate your meeting with your groups. Keith, yes, we will update this graphic based on what we heard and send it to you, really within the day, so that we have kind of next rev on it. You are the only people who've received this besides the Board. So no one has seen this, so we still -- it's very much work-in-progress for us to make that work together. So we'll get you that.

And, Patrick you're right. if by the end of the week some of you are still sending us, say, give me a day or two, I'm really am getting some good input here, we will keep updating this. We'll start versioning it, so we'll put a version number on it, so as we update it and you get additional versions, we'll outline also in the email what changed since the last version, so we make it easier on you. I hope this is all helpful.

Thank you. Thank you, again, for taking the time on this Monday morning, or evening, to meet with us. We are going to apply ourselves this week to do the best we can to enter the input we got from you. But please, please let's stay aligned. This is our moment to be very, very aligned as we show the world that we are taking this governance and accountability work very seriously, and I don't want to rush something that makes us fall apart; quite the opposite, quite the opposite. This was the intent of today, and this whole week, and next week if we need to. Okay?

Thank you, again. Appreciate it.

Robert Hoggarth: Fadi, this is Rob. One last logistical clarification; Olivier asks in the Chat, "May we share the current diagram with our communities?"

Fadi Chehadé: If you want us to just, if you would give us a -- less than today.

Theresa Swinehart: Yeah.

Fadi Chehadé: I mean, we'll get t it right away. We'll send you all on this call a slightly updated one based on the input we just got from you. If you could just give us a few hours, and we'll turn something around quickly that we will call version two. Okay?

Robert Hoggarth: And we will get out to everybody as quickly as they become available, the recordings, transcripts, chat from this call. It does take about 24 hours to get the transcript, but we'll get out everything as it comes in, so expect a couple of different emails over the next 24 hours.

Thanks everybody, for participating, for joining at such short notice. I believe this group will get together again. We are scheduled to on the 14th of August. Otherwise, thank you all very much for participating. Bye-bye.

Theresa Swinehart: Thanks everybody. Thank you. Appreciate it. Thanks.