Brenda Brewer: Hello, my name is Brenda and I will be monitoring this
>chat room. In this role, I am the voice for the remote participants,
>ensuring that they are heard equally with those who are "in-room"
>participants. When submitting a question that you want me to read out
>loud on the mic, please provide your name and affiliation if you have
>one, start your sentence with <QUESTION> and end it with <QUESTION>.
>When submitting a comment that you want me to read out loud of the mic,
>once again provide your name and affiliation if you have one then start
>your sentence with a <COMMENT> and end it with <COMMENT>. Text outside
>these quotes will be considered as part of "chat" and will not be read
>out loud on the mic. Any questions or comments provided outside of the
>session time will not be read aloud. All chat sessions are being
>archived and follow the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior:
>http://www.icann.org/en/news/in-focus/accountability/expected-standards
> Kavouss Arasteh:Giood Moirnng EIGHT WISE
> Guru Acharya:@Grace: Hi. Have notes from yesterdays meeting been put
>online? I missed the second half and would like to review them if
>possible.
> Holly J. Gregory (Sidley):Good morning CCWGers!
> Bruce Tonkin:Good morning Holly
> JTC:oh hey everyone, long time no see
> Matthew Shears:morning
> Seun Ojedeji:good morning
> JTC:Slide deck should be in your inbox, team
> JTC:oh I better fix the name
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur)::)
> Seun Ojedeji:Anyone with the direct url to the scribe caption
> alice jansen:@ Seun -
>http://stream.icann.org:8000/dub54-liffeyhall2-en.m3u
> Seun Ojedeji:Thanks Alice
> Seun Ojedeji:Hmm..that seem to be audio stream, I meant the scribe
> Brenda
>Brewer:https://www.streamtext.net/player?event=LiffeyH222Oct2015
> alice
>jansen:https://www.streamtext.net/player?event=LiffeyH222Oct2015
> Seun Ojedeji:Thanks
> Bruce Tonkin:My suggestion fo rhte decision making mechanism is to
>start with the 4 organizxations that appoint Board members directly -
>ASO, ccNSO, GNSO, and ALAC.   Require these 4 orgnaizations to reach
>consensus on exrcising the dutires of the single legal entity.
> Seun Ojedeji:I think thats a fair response from Julie
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):Thank you Julie for that very
>clear statement from SSAC.

> Bruce Tonkin:Require that the single legal entity formally notifgy
>GAC, SSAC and RSSAC of plans to exercise their ppowers and ask if they have
>any advice.   If they do have advice then require the ASO, GNSO, ccNSO
>and ALAC to meet with that AC to have a dialgoue, and then ASO, ccNSO,
>GNSO, ALAC then make a collective decision based on that advice.
> Bruce Tonkin:This would be more consistent with hwo the Board
>operates today.
> Brett Schaefer:+1 Bruce
> James Gannon:FUll agreement with Bruce
> Matthew Shears:this was the view of those suporting what I believe
>was the third minority option in the proposal
> Seun Ojedeji:+1 Bruce. That said, overall efficiency in these
>processes is important. I doubt these won't be running into many months
> Seun Ojedeji:<question> If 2 months is for instance set for community
>forum to determine the consensus view on an issue and then after 2
>months, there is no clear direction, what happens? <question>
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):Seun, none of our processes give
>the Forum two months to do anything, and in any case, none of our
>powers determine consensus in the Forum. So I am a little confused by
>your question
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:need to note also that in Pc 2 responses the
>ALAC on the 5:2 proposed to indicate preference for an equal ratioed
>system in the Pc stated as 5 across the system, but the primary intent
>was preference to equity
> Seun Ojedeji:@Jordan i just gave 2 months as an example and i did not
>say community forum decides. My question is generally asking what
>happens when a particular escalation step does not come with an outcome
>within the set time range. For instance IRP is set for 6months, what
>happens if there is no outcome after 6month?
> Julie Hammer (SSAC):Bruce, as I see it, SSAC would wish the Community
>to ensure that SSAC was able to be fully informed right from the
>beginning of any accountability process so that it could provide fully
>informed, independant and TIMELY advice into the process.
> Matthew Shears:this demonstrates the absolute need for clarity in how
>we describe the mechanism
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:exactly Jordan
> James Gannon:+1 Julie
> Julie Hammer (SSAC):PS I should have specified that advice on
>security and stability issues, should any exist.
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:and discussion yes I have found the SSAC
>intervention as very useful to our thinking and
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):Seun, for the community powers:
>if the timelines aren't kept, the power falls over.
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):I don't know about IRP.
> Seun Ojedeji:@Jordan can you kindly explain what you mean by "falls
>over"?
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):oh sorry - it just stops
> alice jansen:The slide-deck can be found on the wiki -

>https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56143880/CCWG-Accounta
>bil
>ity%20Working%20Session%20III%20-%2022%20Oct.pdf?version=1&modification
>Dat
>e=1445498578355&api=v2
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):e.g. if within the timeframe for
>decision, there's no decision made, nothing happens
> Matthew Shears:Hi Julie, if the community were to decide to change
>the IFO for performance failures would the SSAC decide to participate
>in the consensus call?
> Seun Ojedeji:Okay stops in the sense of not to be taken up again will
>be a good thing, otherwise it would not be helpful
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):there can't be a ban on making
>another attempt to exercise the power
> Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]:We lose granularity of views - minority
>views by moving to a single vote for each SOAC in the counting (however
>you call it). We need to ensure we can include the minority views in
>the voting / consensus - decision making - what ever it is called.
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):except in the case of no decision
>in removing an individual board member
> Julie Hammer (SSAC):Matthew, the SSAC would not participate in the
>consensus call, but in that situation I am sure that it would provide
>very specific advice regarding any security and stability aspects, and
>I would expect that advice to be suficiently powerful to enable the
>Community to make the best decision in the consensus call.
> Matthew Shears:@ Julie - thanks!
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):I think part of this is about how
>much uncertainty in decisional paths people want to wear
> Malcolm Hutty:We still need to achieve clarity as to whether GAC
>advice to the contrary would qualify as an "objection", or (like the
>SSAC
>advice) should simply be taken into account by others in deciding
>whether to object but would not count as an independent objection.
> Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]:GAC will have its vote in the
>decisionmaking process PLUS its ADVICE. This was something we got a
>lot of opposition to in public comments. How do we propose dealing
>with the giving GAC the decision PLUS the ADVICE - the double-dipping problem we heard about.
> John Curran:Interesting.   I somehow expected that use of the community
>powers would occur with clear consensus after ample community
>discussion (including minority views), while the actual decision (that
>consensus exists for their use) would be very clear and unambiguous.
> Malcolm Hutty:The previous request from the GAC (for 5 votes)
>indicates to me that they want their advice to be capable of counting
>as an objection; today's communique saying that the curent role of the
>GAC must be preseved points to following the same route as the SSAC
> Andrew Sullivan:It does seem that an awful lot of people are
>imagining that discussion and so on will go on in locked rooms where
>nobody can hear it

> Andrew Sullivan:I'd like to imagine that instead such discussions
>could happen in public, so that it would be easy to evaluate the
>strength of consensus.
> Matthew Shears:the discussions oin the community forum would take
>place in public
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:well said Thomas S
> Farzaneh Badii:GAC represents national governments not people .
> Desiree Miloshevic:congrats Thomas
> Andrew Sullivan:In the IETF, where we use humming, the silence does
>so count
> John Curran:One wonders whether there should be some form of written
>positions (or advice) from each SO/AC going into a forum... I am unsure
>how to otherwise carry the perspectives of the other SO/AC's back to the
>number community.   It's unclear that everyone will participate/watch a
>community forum.
> Andrew Sullivan:The fact that you get almost no hum on either side of
>a clear qustion, for instance, would be an important indication of
>strength of consensus
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):John, the notion is that there'd
>be a write up of the dialogue
> Matthew Shears:@ John - we have outlined the escalation path in more
>detail and it does include information sharing, etc. as you suggest
>above
> jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):the last Communique can be found here:
>https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/Governmental+Advisory+Committee
> Andrew Sullivan:https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7282.txt might be
>useful for people to have a look at on how the IETF handles these
>"consensus" questions (the IETF uses rough conensus, of course)
> Andrew Sullivan:(note also that document isn't normative. It's just
>a description of things)
> John Curran:question for cllarity purposes (not for the WG, but
>anyone on chat who might know) - Is the community forum a meeting of
>liaisons who are carrying their SO/AC positions, or empowered
>repressentatives who (in the room) must be able to express/withhold support after discussion?
> jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):and the GAC consensus input on the
>second draft:
>http://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-ccwg-accountability-03aug15/msg00
>069
>.html
> Bruce Tonkin:I assume RSSAC would likely have a similar approach to
>SSAC.
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):@John, the forum precedes the call for consensus
>among the SOs and ACs
> John Curran:i.e. would the attendes from each SO/AC be required to be
>able to express a position post-discussion, or would they carry the
>views expressed back to their SO/AC for each SO/AC to determine its
>final view based on its own consensus process?
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):the latter, John.

> James Gannon:The latter
> John Curran:so, the latter. There's a forum for sharing of views,
>and then (later) each SO/AC would formally decide its final view and
>supply to the community mechanism?
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):yes
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):Yes.
> Matthew Shears:yes
> James Gannon:Correct under my understanding
> Seun Ojedeji:Thats right John
> Andrew Sullivan:I thought the existing role was advice to the Board.
>Aren't we talking about the scenario where there's a dispute between
>the community and the board?
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):the forum's purpose is to bring
>transparency to the deliberation and to ensure SOs and ACs make their
>decisions in the knowledge of cross-community views.
> John Curran:Thanks - apologies for excessive questions.
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):hey, at least the answers are
>well-rehearsed
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur)::)
> jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):This was the GAC consensus input on
>the specific issue of voting as proposed in the second draft report:
>"However, the possibility that the GAC may, in the future and upon its
>sole decision, fullyparticipate in the "Community Mechanism" as an
>entity entitled to 5 votes (on equalterms with the Supporting
>Organizations – SOs – and the At Large Advisory Committee– ALAC) should
>be included in the Final report of the CCWG in line with what
>iscontained in Section 6.2 of the CCWG 2nd Draft Proposal."
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]:GAC's current role is to advise the ICANN
>Board. There's no question that would be preserved.   Question is, would
>GAC also like to advise the Community Mechanism we are designing.   2nd
>question: would GAC's advice to the CM sometimes be clarified as
>either Support or Objection?
> avri:I am not sure i see any reasn why the thresholds need to change
>based on having 5 instead of 7.
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):@avri, you might have a point
> avri:also, the SSAC method may give them more power in some sense as
>there is an expectation that their advice will count in each of the
>ACSO decsion proceedures as opposed to just being 1 countable unit.
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):because you are demanding
>unanimity for the exercise of community powers
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]:@Avri -- I think you are right about the
>threshholds. They may work to measure strong support in absence of
>strong objections. Even with only 5 expressing preference.
> FIONA ASONGA (ASO):@Avri I agree with you we need a decision making
>process that is clear regardless of 5 or 7 ACSO
> Matthew Shears:agree
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:thanks Kavous Infinite that two typesets
>advice helpful to understand

> Brett Schaefer:Wouldn't it be simpler to just have a decision made
>based on level of support?
> Julia Wolman, GAC Denmark:+1 Izumi
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:agreed
> Athina Fragkouli (ASO):Agree with Izumi. The most important thing is
>to hear each other's opinions and engage and the proposed framework
>allows for that
> Kavouss Arasteh:Participzation on decision making has two aspects
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):I think we need a sub-team of WP1
>to try and crunch this to a conclusion, and fast
> Matthew Shears:agree Jordan
> James Gannon:+1 Jordan
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):we clearly aint going to solve it
>in the next three minutes
> Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]:yes we do
> Kavouss Arasteh:Participating in providing input to the process and
>participatiobn providing input to be taken into account and acounted to
>fulfill the threshold required in the last column
> John Curran:If an SO does not provide _any_ response "in favor" or
>"in objection" to use of community power, how does that get counted?
>Is that what the GAC is effectively doing when it prvoides a brief
>which doesn't express formally support or objection?
> Julie Hammer (SSAC):Steve, the SSAC Charter is not only to advise the
>ICANN Board, but also the ICANN Community.
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:yes that's clear from your intervention this
>morning Julie but important to get the record clear
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]:@Julie -- and the GNSO pays keen attention
>to GAC advice.   But there's nothing in the GNSO Operating procedures to
>explicity consider or respond to SSAC.   As far as I know
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]:@Julie -- and the GNSO pays keen attention
>to SSAC advice.   But there's nothing in the GNSO Operating procedures to
>explicity consider or respond to SSAC.   As far as I know
> Julie Hammer (SSAC):No agree...I was only clarifying who the SSAC is
>chartered to provide advice to.
> Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]:how are the granuality of views taken into
>account in this proposal for each SO-AC counts as a single unit in the
>decision making process? We would lose the inclusion of minority views.
> Kavouss Arasteh:In my view GAC may provide advice to help others how
>GAC thibnks on that issue, then the next step is whether that consensus
>advice is counted in processing the requirements of the last column
> Matthew Shears:I don't think we can exclude SOs and ACs from
>participting based on the power in question
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):@Matthew, yeah there's always an exception case
>where they ARE interested
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:yes
> Kavouss Arasteh:The same input advice which may not be counted in
>the last column outcome could be given by SSAC AND ... (NON COUNTED
>ADVICES)

> John Curran:Understood... the GAC advice may often being much like
>the SSAC advice. However, if the GAC doesn't take a formal
>"support"/"object" position, is that any different (in terms of
>consensus to use the power) than when an SO fails to formally take
>"support" or "object" position? (effectively, abstain or unable to
>reach internal cosensus in the allowed time)
> Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]:This proposal does make GAC decision makers
>- that is not alligned with the existing model. It is a change in the
>corporate governance structure, which we've heard is a non-starter.
> Bruce Tonkin:Some of the "commuikyt powers" need to be thought about in
>the context of the particular change being requested.   For example with
>respect to "Black changes to regular bylaws" -= I think at a minimum
>you will need the support of teh SO or AC that may be directly affected
>by a bylaw change - e.g changing the bylaws for SSAC for example.
> Bruce Tonkin:Also if a bylaws change is an outcome of a policy
>deveopment process - e.g a change to the PDP process for the GNSO -
>again I thin that may require a different threshold for other SOs or
>ACs to change.
> Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]:Bruce, has the Board changed its previous
>stated view about not allowing a change in the corporate structure?
> Kavouss Arasteh:Bruce , that would those cases that GAC advice to be
>counted because the change of Bylaws could impact the operation of GAC
> Bruce Tonkin:The key I think is that there is a communit ofurm where
>all the advice from advisory committees can be properly consdiered -
>and then set a minimum level of support required from the SOs and ALAC.
>Ie eitehr 3 of them or all four of them.
> Pedro Ivo Silva [GAC Brasil]:+1 Jorge
> Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]:Yes, Bruce. That sounds reasonable.
> Olga Cavalli - GAC Argentina:Well said Jorge
> Bruce Tonkin:While the GNSO may not reach a unanimous decision ona
>topic - then certainly in the resolution fo the GNSO a miniotory view
>of those on the GNSO that disagee with a deicsion shoudl be duly noted.
> Bruce Tonkin:@Robin - at the mment I am making personal contributions
>to help move the discussion forward.   We have not yet had a meeting to
>discuss any of these ideas.   I am making stuff up in other words.
> Matthew Shears:@ Bruce - that is the purpose of the community forum -
>after which the existing theshold or a higher one is then set per the
>chart. are you sugesting that the post community form threshold will
>be determined at the fourm?
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:indeed Jorge thank you for your clarity of
>position Which understand and agree with
> Kavouss Arasteh:There is an important element to be serioiusly
>considered and that is the composition and defintion of column 4 which
>requires 4 support and 1 against , If SSAC and RSSAC do not participate
>or have non counted advice then remains 5 which include 3 SOs and 2 ACs
>which results that GAC consensus advice shall be counted
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):I do not support any decisional
>system that concetrates voice and decision in the way that says "each

>SO or AC participating only can say support or object." It is a far
>worse system than what we proposed in our Second Draft Proposal.
> Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]:Completely agree, Jordan.
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):@Jordan - we need to find a way to revisit their
>impressions of the proposed model now that they know the implications
> Jandyr Santos Jr:Very good comments, Jorge
> John Curran:one cannot compel an SO/AC to say either "support" or
>"object" as their final view... at a minimum, "no view"/"abstain" must
>be possible, since it is possible that an SO/AC internal timing process
>for consensus may not converge in time.
> avri:i think we have to remember that the issue of the CM is consensus.
> the pwoer exists only when the community, however many countable SOAC
>are particiting, is mostly in agreement.
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):yes that too John - it's not what
>they are going to say that is my concern so much as the fact that each
>of those aggregations only has one "say". That's a big shift from what
>we had earlier proposed. We need somehow to combine that voice with the
>drive to consensus decision-making. That's the challenge.
> Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]:I don't think we can send the report to
>chartering orgs at the same time as public comment.
> Matthew Shears:are we asking the community to comment on both or to
>hold comments until the detailed report is issued?
> Chris Disspain:The Board would like to thank you for Christmas 2015
>being a Board workshop! :-)
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):Chris: well, sorry about it. :)
> Chris Disspain:and a happy new year to you all!!
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):I might go on strikes for two
>weeks
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):hide in a beach
> Leon Sanchez (Co-chair ALAC):don't get me started on Board Christmas
>Chris
> Olga Cavalli - GAC Argentina:+1 to Avri´s comment about "professional
>writers"
> Matthew Shears:for the community outside ICANN what are we asking
>them to comment on - the summary or the detailed report?
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):both
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):but they just get the first bit
>earlier
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):@Avri, one thing to remember is that the ultimate
>audience are NOT experts in this so we need to go through the painful
>translation processd
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]:The 6 Chartering Orgs determine whether
>to advance the CCWG proposal to the board/NTIA. So public commenters should
>work to influence the Chartering Org they are participating in.   If an
>"outsider" wants to comment, we invite them to provide a comment , too.
> Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]:Great point, James, we are doing this
>backwards if we don't know the facts before filling a timeline.
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):@Steve...because the role of such an "outsider"

>would be advisory?...;)
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):the internet community outside
>ICANN are outsiders now, are they?
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]:@James -- agree about asking chartering
>orgs about timeline.   You and I are in GNSO, and it is tough to know
>dates we could meet, even knowing the GNSO has scheduled call in
>mid-December, etc.
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):@James, we need dates to which we aspire or we
>will all spend too much time thinking aboutd getting going. we've done
>pretty well thus far meeting our aspirational goals
> Chris Disspain:I suggest that the Chairs of CCWG formally write ot
>Chairs of each SO and AC asking if the peoposed time line is workable
>and whether that SO or AC is likley to require a face to face meeting
> Keith Drazek:How many people in this room are attending IGF....the
>week before the report is due to be delivered to the chartering organizations?
> Bruce Tonkin:I think it is fine to cosndier some scenarios from a time
>frame point of view.   AS others have noted it will evolve as facts
>become available.   THis is j.ust one rather ambitious scenario
> Seun Ojedeji:@James its good to have a timeline and then ask the
>SO/AC what they think about it. Its also important to ask staff/board
>as well especially if there will be intersessional
> Bruce Tonkin:At least it highlights some of the dependencies
> avri doria:Jonathan, perhaps you are right, but then we need to
>figure far more ime into the writing. though maybe a journalist would
>do. they write quickly and are versatile at understnading.
> Becky Burr:ouch Keith, good point
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):Not me, Keith.
> James Gannon:Johnathan, I think we will ahe to agree to disagree on
>our meeting our previous aspirational dates =)
> James Gannon:@Keith I know I will be and many many others
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):oh god, the IGF
> Chris Disspain:I'll be there
> avri doria:any schedule is aspirational - there is the hope that
>people will work to try and meet it.
> Keith Drazek:Perhaps a show of hands of IGF attendees? Just being
>realistic.
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):I'll be there, participating and drafting ;)
> James Gannon:Yeah would be a good point of fact Keith, can the
>cochairs do a call in the room for hands
> Keith Drazek:Sounds like we should request a meeting room with
>support at the IGF meeting.
> avri doria:one good thing about working over the holidays is that
>most other work is halted.
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):@Keith, THAT is a an excellent idea!
> Bruce Tonkin:The IGF will hold its 10th annual meeting in João Pessoa,
>Brazil, on 10 to 13 November 2015.   I don't know whther that helps - I
>guess there are some proportio nof the CCWG that will attend that
>meeting.   WOn't be me though :-)

> James Gannon:Yes if can get a room that we can work in and out of
>over the IGF ad-hoc
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]:When Roelof said "input from the
>community" I think he means from community Chartering Orgs and also
>from those who aren't part of any chartering org
> Keith Drazek:A blind squirrel finds a nut every once in a while! ;-)
> Erika Mann:We should spend Christmans and NY all together ...
> James Gannon:Pedro might be able to help us with that =)
> James Gannon:Erika I like that idea =)
> Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany):James, you're just trying to divert
>attention from the fact that we're still to hold an F2F at your house...
> Mathieu Weill, ccNSO, co-chair:I hate the idea, but it made me grin
>anyway
> Leon Sanchez (Co-chair ALAC):@Erika LOL! +1
> James Gannon:hahaha
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):Good points, Athena -- I do think
>we need to ge tthis done
> Athina Fragkouli (ASO):thank you Jordan
> Jandyr Santos Jr:Getting a meeting room with support at the IGF is
>not a problem. Can easily be done. Let us know if this is the case
> James Gannon:Ok brilliant we should discuss this under AOB
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):@Jandyr I think we need one
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:ensure there is good remote participation
>options then...
> Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany):+1 Cheryl
> Alan Greenberg:We may want to extract from the report proper the
>history and evolution and put that in an annex.
> Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany):(Guess who's not going to IGF...)
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):+1 Sebastien!
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:I had not planned to but could if needs be...
> Kavouss Arasteh:For certains ACs and possibly certains OS the need to
>have intersessional sedxsion is fundamental thus we need to have a
>tentative time for that in order that every body could prepare its
>agenda for the first two weeks of Januarya
> Malcolm Hutty:What have we got to unwrap on Christmas morning....ooh,
>a new staff summary to read. Just what I always wanted.
> FIONA ASONGA (ASO):@Mathew Weill, we may need to consider developing
>an editorial work party to ensure the writers don't misrepresent for
>any reason
> Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]:If we have an intercessional, let's please
>consider doing the intensive Adobe Connect sessions
> Alan Greenberg:I tend to agree that a F2F would be good, but the
>timeline does point to Dec 22 as the right date.
> Kavouss Arasteh:GAC will meet immediately after CCWG meeting and may
>be goiod to decide on that need provisionally
> Malcolm Hutty:Dec 22 is a crazy date for a F2F.
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):can we keep "intersessional" for
>an ICANN wide thing, and if we have a meeting of this group, call it an F2F?

> Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany):+1 Jordan
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):+1 Jordan
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):and let's stay right away from
>"intercessionals"
> Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]:Yes, 22 Dec. would be very exclusive for a
>mtg
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:where did you extract that date for F2f
>Malcolm. I see Jan
> James Gannon:Before we talk of intersessionals we need to reach out
>to the GAC and ask for their position on making the call on the CCWG
>report intersessionally,
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 Rapporteur):I know that nobody has a veto,
>but it would be beyond madness to do anything 22-27 December
> Malcolm Hutty:Jan 4th would work much better though.
> Izumi Okutani (ASO):+ 1 Alissa
> Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany):No, Malcolm! That's my birthday :)
> Malcolm Hutty:@Cheryl was replying to Alan
> Leon Sanchez (Co-chair ALAC):Agree Jordan. Complete madness in those
>dates
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:ahhh thx Malcolm
> Pedro Ivo Silva [GAC Brasil]:As Jandyr said, happy to help to get us
>a room in João Pessoa :-) Let's agree first exactly what we need
> Malcolm Hutty:@Pedro: that would be hugely helpful
> Alan Greenberg:@CLO, that was a CCWG F@F to hammer out responses to
>comments and finalize proposal.
> Alan Greenberg:F2F
> jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):thanks, Pedro!
> Andrew Sullivan:If you've got text that has never received any
>comments or hasn't been changed in response to people's comments, then
>that text is finished. I don't think that should be controversial.
> Thomas Schneider (GAC):@steve: absolutely.
> Alissa Cooper:yes Andrew, that is what I meant.
> Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]:Good suggestion from Chris about the SO-ACs
>running the webinar
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:agree ðŸ•
> Phil Buckingham:+ 1 Chris re webinars
> Leon Sanchez (Co-chair ALAC):How do you add emojis to the chat Cheryl?
> James Gannon:+1 chris
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:see I too have some secrets skills. Léon
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:ðŸ˜,
> Leon Sanchez (Co-chair ALAC):Jedi powers Cheryl
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:"these are not the druids.... .... "
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:argh auto correct droid not Druid's
> Rosemary Fei (Adler & Colvin):I liked "druids", CLO
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:as indeed I doctor...
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:doctor ðŸ˜· was typed do. to. *SIGH*
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):❤
> Rosemary Fei (Adler & Colvin):Stop showing off, Jonathan and CLO

> James Gannon:=)
> Chris
>Disspain:ðŸ˜·ðŸ˜·ðŸ˜·ðŸ˜·ðŸ˜·ðŸ˜·ðŸ˜·ðŸ˜·ðŸ˜·ðŸ˜·ðŸ˜·ðŸ˜·ðŸ˜·ðŸ˜·ðŸ
>˜·
> James Gannon:The people 'who run the internet' ladies and gentlemen,
>emoji addicts all =)
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:yep guilty as charged ðŸ•
> Rosemary Fei (Adler & Colvin):Lawyers allowed to use emojis? :)
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]:+1 on Chris's suggestion.   If, say, the
>GNSO hosts a webinar, we might skip the whole slide show thing, and let
>GNSO ask us what they want
> James Gannon:Is that a additional billing item Rosemary?
> Rosemary Fei (Adler & Colvin):Happy faces are free.
> James Gannon:I like that idea Steve
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):I can quit any time....®
> Samantha Eisner:@Steve, are we still suggesting the option B while
>coordinating with me on language on developing an operational standards
>document for reviews?
> Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany):One might also deem the "painful process"
>itself to be the superglue
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]:@Sam -- whether A or B, I woul invite
>you to give us a paragraph describing management's commitment to
>publish operational standards that lead to workable reviews
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:point @Sabine
> Kavouss Arasteh:Leon, What happened to my request sent to Lawyers to
>provide text for inclusion in Bylaws to remove defficiencies currently
>exist in separation of PTI. I have to report to ICG this morning at
>1030 pls
> avri doria:the AOC wre not imported as fundmental
> Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany):And those words were a quote...I would
>of course do it all again in a heartbeat ;)
> Alan Greenberg:What does an affirmative 2/3 majority mean in our new
>consensus model??????????
> Samantha Eisner:@Steve, thanks.
> Greg Shatan:Other than the reviews, I believe every other ICANN
>committment came in from the AoC as fundamental bylaws.
> Rosemary Fei (Adler & Colvin):While there is currently no requirement
>for any community approval to change the Articles of Incorporation, we
>would expect to add one in.
> Kavouss Arasteh:Alice
> Kavouss Arasteh:Pls kindly see my mail
> Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]:Rosemary, good catch - we better fix that.
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:yep
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):+1 Rosemary
> Greg Shatan:+1 Rosemary and Robin.
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur):I support the status quo of our
>report basically, for the reasons the report sets out
> Bruce Tonkin:Regarding review team sizes - I don;t think we need to

>lock in a number of participants in the bylaws.   The AOC for example is
>not prescriptive.   We may want to start developing a working practices
>document for each type of review and could include standard numbers of
>members through terms of reference etc.
> Jandyr Santos Jr:Well said, Fiona
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur):Sometimes I feel like our group
>likes re-considering things just because it can
> Bruce Tonkin:e.g the Baord has various committees.   We set the nujber
>of members of each committee inthe committee charters and not in the
>bylaws.
> Bruce Tonkin:I think we are trying to put too much into the bylaws.
> Kavouss Arasteh:Dear Leon
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):Wouldn't a move to Oz suggest criminal activity?
>☻
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur):Bruce: I feel like that
>specifically about the budget item
> Kavouss Arasteh:Did you kindly read my request reklating PTI
>Seoparation
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur):the Budget process, I mean
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]:In the Articles of Incorporation today:
>9. These Articles may be amended by the affirmative vote of at least
>two-thirds of the directors of the Corporation. When the Corporation
>has members, any such amendment must be ratified by a two-thirds (2/3)
>majority of the members voting on any proposed amendment.
> Alan Greenberg:I strongly support Bruce. In the early reviews, we
>pre-announced the number of members per each AC/SO. Recent reviews we
>are silent and selectors decide. GOOD MODEL TO FOLLOW>
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur):do we need a new form of
>"Community Agreed Organisational Policy" to do things like that?
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]:that says "Members" and we could change
>that to Designators, right?
> Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]:I support Fiona's statement.
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):+1 Jordan. Not sure budget process needs to be in
>the bylaws
> Alan Greenberg:@Steve, what would a 2/3 majority of the community
>mean in light of our current model?
> Brett Schaefer:@Steve, it says "members" would that also apply to
>designators?
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]:@Brett -- if we go with Designator, we
>could change that article to Designator
> Leon Sanchez (Co-chair ALAC):@Kavouss Yes. I believe we went through
>it yesterday but I am not suer if you were present or you were already
>at the GAC sessions room
> Julia Wolman, GAC Denmark:+1 Rafael
> Kavouss Arasteh:No I was not present . Pls what wass the results
> jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):what about legal fees as a factor? -
>just joking :P
> Alan Greenberg:@Steve, again I ask, what does 2/3 of the designator

>mean? ANd is it JUST controlled by those that select Board Members
>(which is all Designator means)?
> David McAuley (RySG):Good point Jordan
> Jonathan Zuck (IPC):+1 Jordan
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]:As indicated in our published analysis
>of Public Comments, the BC and IPC prefer option B -- making Article
>XVIII a Fundamental Bylaw
> Leon Sanchez (Co-chair ALAC):@Kavouss the result, if I am not
>mistaken, was that the Sole Designator model provided the means to
>comply with annex L of CWG proposal
> Finn Petersen, GAC - DK 2:+1 Jordan
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:well said @avri
> Julia Wolman, GAC Denmark:With regard to participation in AOC
>reviews, I believe it is important to diversity and balance between groups.
>Moreover, Option A would be more in line with our principle of
>simplicity
> Mary Uduma:+1 Avri
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]:@Alan -- good question, but I think 2/3
>of a Single Designator would mean that the Single Designator would have
>to say Yes
> James Gannon:That would be my understading steve
> Kavouss Arasteh:No it does not as Annex L just talk about enforcing
>the process and not enforcing the decision thus the only way to remedy
>is the recall of the Board which is disruptive. Why not having an
>exception for pti separation by inclusion an intermediatory step for
>that before going to the duisruptive process of the entire Board recall.
> Finn Petersen, GAC - DK 2:+ 1 Julia :-)
> Holly J. Gregory (Sidley):Yes @ Steve D. Correct that we would give
>designators same right to approve amendments to Articles of
>Incorporation.
> James Gannon:Kavouss there doesnt appear to be any legal way to do
>that unforunately
> Alan Greenberg:@Steve, Then it will have to be a new line in the
>chart of thresholds to say how we recognize YES.
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur):There is no 2/3 of a designator
>indeed
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur):it answers yes or no
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:encourage the generation of Standard
>Operating Procedures for the RT's
> Kavouss Arasteh:then the process is weak
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur):the question is the decision
>threshold to say that "yes"
> James Gannon:I would tend to agree Kavouss
> FIONA ASONGA (ASO):@ Thomas Rickert +1
> Kavouss Arasteh:Separation process is the heart of the post
>transition .Ifthe board object to approve it , recourse toi the Board
>is risky
> Seun:thanks Chris That's healthy

> Milton Mueller:+1 Kavouss
> Kavouss Arasteh:I do not understand why it is not piossible to add a
>provision to Bylaws or ... to establish such intermediatry step between
>the two
> Kavouss Arasteh:Then I advise ICG to indicate this weakness in the
>reoort which would have negative impact on the trasition process
> jorge cancio (GAC Switzerland):is it the Spirit of Dublin? or of
>Guinness?
> James Gannon:I like that Jorge =)
> alice jansen:scorecard -
>https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1HcUUDn5DHSVo7lLo-FWU_QMa8PGgfZW
>TP_
>kGo1EXNQs/edit#gid=1327274628
> Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany):is the spirit of sleep deprivation a thing?
> Alan Greenberg:@Sabine: Mandatory requirement
> Kavouss Arasteh:I am sorry the case has not been seriously considred
>in the CCWG
> Brett Schaefer:When was the human rights provision discussed? I
>thought it was still in WP4 under discussioon?
> Steve DelBianco [GNSO - CSG]:Parties?   We're having parties?
> Leon Sanchez (Co-chair ALAC):@Brett we are working on it in WP4 and
>hopefully have a finalized proposal soon
> Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany):Who told Steve about our parties?
> Sabine Meyer (GAC - Germany)::D
> Kavouss Arasteh:Dear Alice
> James Gannon:Damn the secret is out Sabine shut it all down!
> Kavouss Arasteh:May you send the draft btime line as I did request in
>my e-mail by a separate e-mail pls
> Samantha Eisner:@Holly/Rosemary, I understood the slide that was
>provided for yesterday's session confirmed paths of enforceability of
>Separation, on Kavouss' comment?
> alice jansen:Hi Kavouss - I emailed it you a little while ago
> Kavouss Arasteh:No nothing was provided than those already exists
> Holly J. Gregory (Sidley):@Sam, The separation process is fully
>directly enforceable and the discussion re amending the corporate
>purpose was intended to significantly narrow the gap re enforceability.
> Kavouss Arasteh:tks
> Jordan Carter (.nz, WP1 rapporteur):a small personal crusade of me is
>to see more of this stuff in front of us in terms of text
> Julia Wolman, GAC Denmark:Thanks for the clarification Holly
> Robin Gross [GNSO - NCSG]:yes, please, Jordan
> David McAuley (RySG):+1 Tijani
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:I agree Available agree ðŸ •
> Izumi Okutani (ASO):Strongly agree Tijani, + 1 Avri
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:ohh dear auto correct has just made @avri
>available.... sorry @avri embarrassed ðŸ˜³
> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:huge thanks and *hugs* all round...
> Farzaneh Badii:thank you .

> Cheryl Langdon-Orr - CLO:bye ðŸ‹
> Leon Sanchez (Co-chair ALAC):That's a wrap!
> Leon Sanchez (Co-chair ALAC):thanks everyone!