**CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 2**

**Jurisdiction Subgroup, Meeting #48**

**September 27, 2017, 19:00 – 20:30 UTC**

**AGENDA**

1. **Welcome**
2. **Review of Agenda (2 minutes)**
3. **Administration (1 minute)**
   1. Changes to SOIs
   2. Identify Audio Only and Phone Number Participants
4. **Complete Discussion of “OFAC Recommendation” (30 minutes)**
5. **Discussion of “Applicable Law and Choice of Venue Recommendation” (40 minutes)**
   1. Choice of law provision in registry agreements – does the Subgroup endorse an option?
      1. **“Status Quo” option** (no choice of law)
      2. **“Menu” option** – a limited number of choices (e.g., one per region)
      3. **“California” option** – California and US law is the governing law
      4. **“Carve out” option** – specified provisions are governed by a uniform law (e.g., California) while the rest are governed by the governing law of the Registry
      5. **“Bespoke” option** – the governing law of the Registry is the governing law of the document
   2. Choice of law provision in registrar accreditation agreements
      1. Same choices as above? Same result?
   3. Choice of venue provision in registry agreements
      1. **“Status Quo”** (Los Angeles, California (or for governments and IGOs, Geneva, Switzerland))
      2. **“Venue Menu” option** – a limited number of choices (e.g., one per region) of arbitration venues (all applying ICC rules)
   4. How should these recommendations be framed?
      1. Are these only negotiating points between ICANN and the contracted party?
6. **Review of Revised “Proposed Issues” List (5 minutes)**
7. **Review of Schedule and Timeline (5 minutes)**
8. **AOB (5 minutes)**
9. **Adjourn (next meeting 27 September 1900UTC)**